

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FRANK E. BARR, FORMER ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Frank E. Barr, of Wichita, Kans., who served as Assistant Postmaster General of the United States in 1959, died on April 2, 1970. His passing marked the culmination of an outstanding and distinguished career in business and public service. Frank Barr was a mover and a doer. He was instrumental in the progress and growth of his home community and State.

When he retired as vice president of the Kansas Gas & Electric Co., he made himself available for service to his country and he subsequently was appointed director of the Wichita Regional Post Office. Three years later he was appointed by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield to the position of Assistant Postmaster General to work on reform of personnel hiring. He retired from that position in 1961.

A year later he started a new career in banking and became executive vice president of the Parklane Bank in Wichita.

Frank Barr will be missed by all of us who knew and admired him. Mrs. Shriver and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Barr and his son, Tom.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Wichita Eagle which eloquently expresses the sentiments of those who knew and will miss Frank Barr:

FRANK E. BARR

Frank E. Barr, who died Thursday in France, was one of those quiet but hard-driving men without whom our community would have been far less than it is today.

Colonel Barr, as he was known to everyone, was a self-made man who rose high in the world of business and public affairs. He was vice president of Kansas Gas and Electric Co.; he once was assistant postmaster general of the United States; he was regional postoffice director for Kansas, Oklahoma and Nebraska, and at the time of his death he was executive vice president of Parklane National Bank.

That is a notable record of accomplishment for one man. But it doesn't begin to tell the story of Colonel Barr's active life. In addition to those formal duties, he undertook good works on a scale that made him virtually without parallel in this community.

Whenever a civic or service project was going on, Colonel Barr could be found in the thick of it, working diligently and effectively. Hardly a board or council or committee in the area but benefited from his energies and wisdom at one time or another. He was into everything and he knew everybody. He lived life to the fullest, and he was a friend to literally thousands of persons.

Frank Barr was truly one of the shapers of this community. His loss will be keenly felt.

VIETNAM RESOLUTION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York State Debate Association Intercollegiate Assembly passed a resolution urging the Nixon administration to withdraw all U.S. forces from Southeast Asia within 6 months and to channel into our cities the funds now deployed for military purposes.

I am inserting this distinguished student group's resolution into the RECORD to give my colleagues an opportunity to listen to the voices of some of my State's most gifted and most dedicated youth:

VIETNAM RESOLUTION

(By Howard Pozmanter)

An act to express the sense of the New York State Intercollegiate Legislative Assembly in regard to the involvement of the United States in Vietnam and Southeast Asia.

Whereas, the United States presence in Vietnam is in violation of international agreements and the Constitution of the United States, and

Whereas, the United States involvement in Vietnam is in violation of any proper standard of national moral conduct, and

Whereas, the involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia has resulted in undeclared wars not only in Vietnam but Laos and Thailand as well, and

Whereas, the continued American involvement in Southeast Asia is a factor in the deepening urban crisis within the United States, and

Whereas, the termination of the Vietnam conflict and all American military involvement in Southeast Asia would permit the United States to meet its commitments to its own people and alleviate the growing social tensions, therefore be it enacted by the New York State Intercollegiate Legislative Assembly:

Section 1. That the New York State Intercollegiate Legislative Assembly (NYSILA) urges the immediate disengagement of all United States forces in Southeast Asia, and the withdrawal of such forces within six months.

Section 2. That the NYSILA urges the Federal Government to earmark these monies now used to support the involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia for the solution of the problems of the inner cities.

Section 3. That the NYSILA urges the immediate end of the Selective Service System, and the establishment of a new military pay scale capable of attracting a large enough amount of men to meet legitimate defensive needs.

Section 4. That the Speaker of NYSILA is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, Senators Javits and Goodell, the 41 United States Representatives from the State of New York, and the Governor of the State of New York, the leaders of the New York State Legislature, and to all the member schools of the New York State Debate Association.

Section 5. That the Speaker of the NYSILA is hereby directed to meet with the Central Committee of the NYSILA to devise a plan for future coordinated action against the war

among the member schools of the New York State Debate Association and report by mail on such a plan to all member schools within 30 days.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TO THE AMERICAN INDIAN

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the statement which I presented to the Subcommittee on Department of Interior and Related Agencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee during hearings on the 1971 appropriations bill which includes funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I will also appear before the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee during consideration of this legislation.

The Federal Government has a responsibility and an obligation to American Indians living on reservations in my own State of New Mexico as well as other States of our Nation. While we must eliminate nonessential Government spending, we must not ignore fundamental Federal responsibilities. I urge my colleagues in the House to give thoughtful consideration to the following:

STATEMENT OF HON. ED FOREMAN, SECOND DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO, TO THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR, 1971 APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill pending before this subcommittee will provide funding for the Department of the Interior and related agencies and includes the budget request submitted for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I am respectfully requesting approval of the full amount presented to the committee. I am further requesting serious consideration be given to increasing the total appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs above the total figure in the budget request.

I fully understand and support the efforts of the administration and the Congress to curb unnecessary spending by the Federal government. We must eliminate waste and extravagance in federal expenditures. There is no other way to halt the soaring inflation which threatens our economic stability as a nation and depreciates the value of our dollar.

However, we also recognize the responsibility of the federal government to continue certain vital services to all citizens. We cannot in our efforts to trim the budget—cut off funding of projects and programs—providing essentials such as housing, education, medical facilities, water, and roads—to citizens who have no other place to turn but to the federal government, and where the responsibility for such projects rests with the federal government—as in certain projects for American Indians.

The American Indians live on reservations under conditions established through legal treaties and mutual agreements with the U.S. Government. While a number of federal

agencies can contribute to projects and services for Indian citizens on reservations, a major responsibility for the obligated federal support to these citizens remains with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Approximately 20% of the American Indians in the United States live in the Second District of New Mexico which I represent. I know from my personal knowledge the conditions under which too many of the Indians in my district must exist—substandard housing—inadequate water development which could increase the land potential for agriculture products and livestock—inadequate schools—lack of opportunity to achieve economic improvement.

Because of the lack of school facilities, the dropout rate of Indian children is high. There is dangerous overcrowding in the schools and the need for increased facilities places a heavy burden on local school districts which are providing education to the extent possible to Indian children on and off the reservation. Indian children in some cases have been bussed more than 160 miles daily, a four-hour bus ride, to attend school. In many cases, Indian children are forced to attend schools far from their homes and live in B.I.A. dormitories or in foster homes in order to attend school—in some instances attending school in other states.

The incident of tuberculosis is six times as great among Indians as among all other races in the United States. 3.5% of Navajo children get a positive TB reaction at the age of six . . . 9.1 percent at the age of 14. The most recent study available reported 192 active cases of TB among the Navajos not receiving therapy—106 cases of TB were under treatment in a hospital as of June 30, 1968.

Federal funds are being spent for projects to benefit American Indians—in New Mexico as well as in other parts of the country—and the B.I.A. budget as submitted will provide for many of the projects vital to American Indians. The point I am making is that with budget trimming, many really essential projects were left out for Fiscal-71.

As an example I submit the following list of unfunded projects not included in the B.I.A. budget request in the State of New Mexico with amounts listed which either reflect total cost or expenditure which could be used in construction or development in Fiscal-71.

Unfunded projects, State of New Mexico, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE, FACILITIES AND SERVICE	
Assistance to pupils in non-Federal schools:	
Higher education	\$120,000
Johnson O'Malley	500,000
Federal facilities; Library centers in the Pueblos	100,000
Summer programs	25,400
WELFARE AND GUIDANCE	
Housing improvement: Housing improvement at Ramah (Zuni Reservation)	140,000
FOREST AND RANGE	
To intensify forest management on the Indian forests of Mescalero, Navajo, Jicarilla, Zuni Reservations and the Pueblos of New Mexico	200,000
Range seeding, brush control, and water development projects through the soil and moisture conservation program on the Jicarilla and Navajo Reservations and the Pueblos	250,000
Range water (Zuni Reservation)	43,100
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	
Soil and moisture control (flood control) (Zuni Reservation)	13,000
Repair and maintenance of	

REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS AND UTILITIES	
Youth development program (for various Northern Pueblos)	50,000
CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS AND UTILITIES	
Albuquerque Vocational-Technical School completion	5,215,000
Acoma Elementary School	1,228,453
El Morro Navajo Elementary School	1,200,000
Laguna Acoma Junior-Senior High School	1,000,773
New sewerage lagoon—Sanostee School	200,000
Rehabilitation centers (jails) Jicarilla and Zuni	100,000
All purposes building—Ramah	\$85,000
Kindergarten (1)—San Juan	35,000
Kindergarten (2)—San Felipe	70,000
Water system improvement—Mescalero	212,000
Relocatable classroom (3)—Isleta	45,000
Relocatable classroom (1)—San Juan	15,000
Relocatable classroom (1)—Zia	15,000
Relocatable classroom (5)—El Morro (Ramah)	127,000
Houses (3)—El Morro (Ramah)	63,000
Office (1)—El Morro (Ramah)	21,000
Houses (13)—Dulce	273,000
Houses (6)—Mescalero	126,000
Kitchen/dining facilities—Albuquerque Indian School	600,000
Kindergarten, 2 additional classrooms—Taos	75,000
Adult education classroom (1)—Laguna	30,000
Adult education classroom (1)—San Juan	30,000
Adult education classroom (1)—Taos	30,000
Kitchen/dining facilities and classroom—Jemez	80,000
Kitchen/dining facilities—Zia	40,000
Acoma School	1,225,000
San Felipe School	1,200,000
Alamo School	800,000
Kitchen/dining facilities—San Juan	40,000
MAJOR ALTERATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS	
Renovate Camerco warehouse	88,000
Wingate High School parking road surfacing	20,000
Renovate Wingate High School auditorium	20,000
Improve sewerage lagoon—Dzith-Na-O-Dith-Hle	15,000
Improve sewerage lagoon—Huerfano School	15,000
Improve sewerage lagoon—Standing Rock School	15,000
Dulce water systems improvements	160,000
Aztec Dormitory Road	8,000
Enlarge quarters—Crownpoint	5,000
Rewire school—Taos	14,000
Student center—Albuquerque Indian School	75,000
Reroof dormitory—Magdalena	80,000
IRRIGATION	
Middle Rio Grande Pueblos irrigation systems extension, rehabilitation and betterment	100,000
Miscellaneous Pueblo irrigation unit improvement	100,000
Navajo Hogback irrigation project extension (continuation of construction)	1,100,000
Navajo Indian irrigation project (continuation of construction)	12,000,000
ROAD CONSTRUCTION	
Washington Pass to Sheep Springs	2,002,000
U.S. 666 to Crownpoint	645,000
Tularosa Canyon	518,000

Tesuque entrance road	15,000
Santa Clara Canyon Road	130,000
Sandia Village streets	95,000
Red Rock Bridge	70,000
Torreon Bridge	200,000
Crownpoint east road	2,300,000
Streets for housing projects in the Pueblos	50,000

¹ Includes \$52,000 for water and sewerage system.

These are not requests for excessive, wasteful spending—these are requests for funds to educate children—to build homes for families—to irrigate lands for cultivation to support families—to build roads needed to open the way for economic and industrial growth. Projects are included which would eliminate existing health hazards to adults and children—and projects to make repairs on existing facilities where original expenditure can be lost if the needed work is too long delayed.

The members of the Subcommittee have a very difficult task in determining the extent to which appropriations should be approved in relation to our difficult economic situation. I appreciate the opportunity to present these facts to the committee, and want to thank the members for extending this courtesy to me.

I respectfully request that serious consideration be given to increasing the appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs so that some of the most critically needed projects—now unfunded—in the State of New Mexico as well as in other parts of the country—may be funded during Fiscal Year 1971.

RIDICULING FBI SENSELESS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star commenting on the outstanding job that the FBI is doing in fulfilling its responsibilities as the law enforcement arm of the Department of Justice. At a time when so many people are taking potshots at this agency and its Director, I believe this editorial offers a fine tribute to the excellent work that is being done by the FBI.

The editorial follows:

RIDICULING FBI SENSELESS

It has become fashionable for many of us to ridicule the FBI and J. Edgar Hoover, who have, of course, long been the targets of subversive groups and their ever-present ultra-liberal imitators.

The picture of the FBI man as a slightly kooky individual who sees Communist agents under every bed and a bogey-man behind every tree has become a bit common in TV "humor skits", and the like propaganda pieces in magazine and other print media.

Likewise, the liberal joke factory loves to make out J. Edgar Hoover as a fuddy-duddy right wing extremist coming up with absurd claims and obsolete suspicions. A good many columnists also seem to like to exploit this basic view.

Recent events have once again, as so often in the past, made it clear that this process of adopting an ideological attitude and making it dogma may feed the ego but does not jibe with the facts.

In the past year, as we review FBI reports and the annual report of the director, it becomes increasingly clear that the agency is simply doing an objective and brilliantly accurate job—whereas its detractors are blithely ignoring the realities.

FORETOLD PROBLEMS

The FBI forecast with remarkable accuracy, months ahead of the event, the actual internal splits and developments within the SDS, for example, which have since come to pass . . . including the emergency of a violence-prone "Weatherman" faction.

The FBI also forecast, soberly, with remarkable accuracy, some months ago, the preparation of a new phase of leftist activity which was a plan to take up the tactics of planting bombs in business and public buildings.

They accurately predicted this new problem, well in advance, and the timing of it.

The bombing series has occurred as forecast.

It is pretty silly to make fun of an agency that does its work that efficiently, and that consistently tells us unpleasant truths, months before the actual development.

The very ability of the FBI to make these accurate forecasts further suggests that the persistent notion among some that all these "unrest" reactions are "spontaneous" and that no planning or conspiratorial activity is involved doesn't jibe with the facts.

SAW BOMB SCARES COMING

When a series of bomb plantings can be forecast by months, the development is hardly "spontaneous."

It can only be forecast because some subversive groups have arrived at the plan in discussions and begun the preliminary work of getting hold of explosives, and training people in the use of such.

It's time to quit kidding ourselves about the work of the FBI, and about the nature of some of these "loyal but disenchanted" "idealistic" "reform" groups.

It is time to face some facts.

The facts are there for anyone who chooses to read FBI reports, old and new, and check them against the record.

Such a review demonstrates, item by item, that this organization knows its business and these people know what they are doing.

It also demonstrates that most of their critics simply do not know what they are talking about, do not know their business—or else have to be lying deliberately themselves. They are so consistently wrong on the facts that they are either misled themselves, or deliberately trying to mislead others.

There are probably some of each, and ironically, the FBI probably has an excellent record and dossiers to reveal, which is which. Which is precisely why some folks are so eager to discredit them.

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Middle East crisis is a matter which concerns young and old alike. For in this continuing crisis the fate of world peace lies in balance.

I recently received a letter from a ninth grade social studies class at Roslyn High School, which is part of the Third Congressional District which I am pleased to represent in Congress. The letter contained a copy of a proposal for a Middle East Peace Treaty which is part of a book—the Students Guide to the Middle East.

Planned under the direction of the class's teacher, Mr. Murray Kaufman, these modest suggestions are extremely insightful.

In light of the value of this document, I would like to extend my remarks to share its contents with my colleagues:

SETTLEMENT

The following proposals, suggested by Mr. Kaufman's 9th grade social studies class at Roslyn High School, are presented with the hope that they will offer a constructive alternative to the violence that now prevails in the Middle East:

1. Israel and the Arab states should accept the principle of sitting down together at the same table to negotiate and iron out their differences with the assistance and mediation of the U.N.

2. A regional, Middle East Economic Development Organization (M.E.E.D.O.) shall be formed by all the Middle East nations and funded by them. M.E.E.D.O. will establish a Middle East Bank (M.E.B.) to support and encourage economic development.

3. The U.N. Emergency Force will continue its efforts to keep the peace in the area.

4. No Middle East nation will permit independent military forces to operate within its borders, nor shall it take part in any aggressive action against any of its neighbors. The U.N. Emergency Military Force will provide assistance upon the request of any nation.

5. It is suggested that the U.N. resolve that all member states refrain from providing military aid or financial aid for military purposes to any country in the Middle East.

6. A neutral "buffer zone" shall be established along the present lines where military action is most severe. It (the buffer zone) will be controlled by the U.N. Emergency Military Force and will be eventually phased out by agreement of all parties involved.

7. It is suggested to the U.N. Secretary General that he initiate a new approach to guaranteeing that all nations in the Middle East region be given equal opportunity to serve on the U.N. Security Council in a fair and judicious manner so that all points of view are ultimately represented.

8. All refugees in the Middle East region shall be relocated to land in the Sinai Peninsula which will be returned to the control of the U.A.R. Israel and the U.A.R. shall cooperate in a joint effort to develop this area, utilizing the assistance and direction of M.E.E.D.O.

9. All Arab funds "frozen" in Israel shall be released to their rightful owners.

10. All of the following actions shall be put into effect simultaneously in order to ensure peace in the Middle East:

(a) All the signatories to this treaty shall agree to recognize Israel as a sovereign and independent state.

(b) All the signatories to this treaty shall agree to maintain and keep the peace.

(c) All conquered lands shall be demilitarized.

(d) The Sinai Peninsula shall become territory under the control of the U.A.R.

(e) Jerusalem shall become Israeli territory with the understanding that it will be an "open city" for all to live in, or freely visit, without restriction as to Race or Religion.

(f) A Suez Canal Corporation shall be organized with ownership equally divided among the U.N., the U.A.R., and Israel. The Middle East Bank will make itself available with funds to assist the re-opening of the Suez Canal to world trade. After restoring it to operation, all nations of the world will have free access to the use of the Suez Canal.

(g) The Gulf of Aqaba will be open to all nations of the world.

(h) The Gaza Strip shall be under the control of Israel.

(i) The Golan Heights shall be returned to Syrian control, with the U.N. Emergency Military Force stationed in the area to prevent any military action.

(j) The West Bank of Jordan will be returned to Jordanian control. A Jordan River Development Project will be formed by both Israel and Jordan with the assistance of M.E.B. to assist economically in the development of both nations.

LIBERALS FIGHT TO CONTROL COURT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article written by the well-known columnist, Gould Lincoln. It contains an interesting commentary on an issue of great national interest. The article follows:

LIBERALS FIGHT TO CONTROL COURT

President Nixon, in his statement, said he would go outside of the South for his next appointee to the Supreme Court, re-emphasized the desperate struggle by liberals in the Senate and outside to retain control of the high court.

Nixon said in bitter terms that the rejection of his nominations of Judge G. Harrold Carswell of Florida and of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth of South Carolina has convinced him no Southerner who believed, as he does, in the strict construction of the Constitution would be confirmed by the Senate as it is now composed. In that he is correct.

Having lost the White House to Nixon the liberals are more than ever determined to hold on to the Supreme Court. What they will do when the President names a judge outside of the South, a Northerner or a Westerner, who is a conservative, remains to be seen.

The defeat of Carswell was engineered by pressure groups, groups which have great influence on many members of the Senate. These pressure groups, as the President well understands, would fight any Southerner appointed to the court. They include civil rights leaders, organized labor, Americans for Democratic Action and anti-war blocks of every description.

Much has been said by the liberals in the Senate about the speedy and favorable action taken by the Senate on the appointment of Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, a native of Minnesota, as an indication of their willingness to confirm a widely known and qualified judge.

Burger was an excellent choice, as he has already proved. But when his name was first presented to the Senate, it is doubtful that more than a half-dozen members had ever heard of him, certainly no more than had heard of Haynsworth, or that Burger's name was widely known, as a jurist, to the American people.

Nixon has been criticized as playing politics in his announced decision not to appoint another Southerner and subject him to the character assassination dealt out to Haynsworth and Carswell by the Senate's liberals. He was merely striking back and hard, at the Democrats and liberals on the Republican side, who had hit him and his appointees below the belt.

In the Carswell vote, 13 Republican senators deserted the Republican president.

Had only three of these been willing to support the President and vote for Carswell, the judge would have been confirmed by a vote of 49 to 48. So it was the Republican desertions which made it possible for the Democrats to strike a blow against Nixon, a blow they dearly wanted.

The congressional and senatorial elections come up in November. Only three of the Republican senators who voted against Carswell will be on the firing line, Charles E. Goodell of New York, Winston Prouty of Vermont and Hiram L. Fong of Hawaii. Will the "silent majority," which does not relish the crime that has been going on in the streets and homes of America, vote against them?

Also, there is a list of Democrats who voted against Carswell who must face the voters in November. They, too, may find they have lost some ground. It would be a real blow to the liberals if the conservatives should gain control of the Senate. And to the Democrats, it would be devastating if the GOP should win the Senate—as they may do.

Among the Democrats who voted against Carswell who will be up for re-election are Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, Quentin Burdick of North Dakota, Howard Cannon of Nevada, Philip Hart of Michigan, Vance Hartke of Indiana, Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, Gale McGee of Wyoming, William Proxmire of Wisconsin, Albert Gore of Tennessee, Joseph Tydings of Maryland and Harrison Williams of New Jersey. A considerable number of these Democrats face hard fights at the polls and may be upset.

Nixon's decision to appoint a new nominee to the Supreme Court quickly may give some of the Carswell opponents a chance to get off the hook so far as the coming elections are concerned. If, on the other hand, they should vote against the new nominee they may be in for a hard time.

EDUCATION NEEDED TO COMBAT POLLUTION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill—H.R. 15638—to encourage classroom instruction on ecological and environmental problems. Many of our beautiful natural resources are suffering the blight of pollution. It is not enough to clean up presently polluted areas. We must make sure that all of our resources are protected from now on. Education is one big step toward this goal, for pollution is everybody's problem. Norwood Elementary School in Dundalk, Md., is already tackling this problem. I should like to share with my colleagues two letters I received recently from a student teacher and one of her pupils. It is a pleasure to honor their fine work in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today:

BALTIMORE, MD., April 8, 1970.

MR. CLARENCE D. LONG,
Towson, Md.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LONG: I am student teaching with Mrs. Brown's first grade class at Norwood Elementary School. We have been studying water pollution at even this low level and the children are interested in what they can do to help the problem. The enclosed letter was written as the joint effort of the entire class. I am sure they would be greatly pleased if you would send an answer to the class. The address is:

Mrs. Brown's Class—Room 3, Norwood Elementary School, 1700 Delvale Ave., Baltimore, Md. 21222.

Also, I have given all of the children your address so their parents could help them write their own personal letter.

It is surprising how much they understand the problem of water pollution and how sincere their interest is.

Thank you,

Miss SALLY LOGUE.

BALTIMORE, MD., April 8, 1970.

DEAR MR. LONG: My name is Joe Wozniak. I am in first grade. Would you stop water pollution please?

I am studying about water.

Thank You.

JOSEPH WOZNAK.

SECURE SCHOOLS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial appearing in the April 12 Washington Sunday Star dealing with the deplorable vandalism in the District public schools.

School board president, Mrs. Anita Allen, who is doing an outstanding job in an almost impossible situation, has sought help from the City Council to curb school vandalism.

I would like to concur with the Star editorial—proposals from school officials to deal with this increasingly serious problem should be considered immediately.

In fiscal 1970, vandalism has cost the system over \$813,000, with \$534,000 going to replace broken windowpanes. These funds, ideally, should have been spent to provide a better education for students in the Nation's Capital. Unfortunately, the climate in the schools is, obviously, far from ideal. Preventative measures must be taken.

At this point in the RECORD, I include the text of the Star editorial:

SECURE SCHOOLS

Some days ago the City Council asked whether the local government might do more to help curb the rash of vandalism and thefts in District schools. Mrs. Anita Allen, the school board president, has sensibly lost no time replying in the affirmative—and sounding a justified note of alarm. For the problem obviously has overwhelmed the present resources of the school system.

During the current term, for instance, the loss of educational equipment, chiefly through theft, has hit a rate double that of last year. According to Acting Superintendent Henley, the result in some schools has been "a major setback" to the entire teaching process. In the absence of some alternative relief, Mrs. Allen notified the council that the board may soon request "armed guards to protect our buildings at night."

As a matter of fact the school board, at the urging of member Bardyl Tirana, endorsed just such a move at its last meeting. And the city government should seriously consider a response to the proposal right now—and, as well, to Mrs. Allen's demand for more effective burglar alarm systems.

The problem also requires further efforts,

however, by school officials themselves. The appointment of a good man to serve as a system-wide safety officer was a promising first step. But this may be an area in which more community involvement—about which we have heard so much—might be brought into play. Perhaps, for example, parents in certain neighborhoods might be mobilized on a voluntary basis to serve on patrol teams—in sufficient numbers to assure their personal safety.

The most discouraging aspect of all this is that the needs for improvements of a purely educational nature in our schools is quite severe enough to occupy all the best efforts of teachers, principals and school administrators. Yet the realities of the situation must be faced: Unless schools can be made safe and secure as a matter of first priority, the prospects for advances in learning are poor indeed.

ANOTHER POSTAL INCREASE LOOMS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, this thought-provoking editorial by editor, Louis B. Cashman of the Vicksburg Sunday Post, points out the need for postal reform. The editorial follows:

ANOTHER POSTAL INCREASE LOOMS

To all appearances, the postal strike is over. The settlement brings a raise in pay for the postal workers, plus more than 2 million other governmental workers. The increase is 6 per cent and is retroactive to December 27th, 1969. And then, another eight per cent if the Post Office Department is reorganized.

The settlement carried with it the authority to extend the collective bargaining to employees of state and local governments, and George Meany, president of AFL-CIO, called the settlement a landmark agreement.

How will this increase be paid? Will there be an increase in the income tax or will the surtax, scheduled to die June 30th, be retained? According to administration sources, neither is considered. But there will be a cost of \$1.2 billion the first six months of this year and \$2.5 billion in fiscal 1971. How will this be financed? Mr. Nixon has urged Congress to increase the cost of mailing a first-class letter to 10 cents to help pay for the postal part of the new pay raises proposed for 5.9 million federal employees.

Ten cents for a first-class letter! The workers get a 6 per cent increase in wages now and another 8 per cent later, but John Q. Public, his wife and his children, and all citizens will have imposed on them a 4 cent increase in the first-class rate. Now four cents doesn't seem too large, but when it is considered percentage-wise, it is clear that a whopping 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ % increase in the rate is proposed.

Remember when two cents carried a letter? Then it went to three cents, and then to four cents, followed by the five cent rate, until it reached the present six cents. In that process first-class mail rate was tripled, almost in a generation. Now the proposed increase is fivefold the two cent postage we once enjoyed.

As in all things, the burden of cost is finally borne by the individual consumer. Every strike in any area finally brings to the public increases in prices, or curtailment of services. Because the post office department has always been considered as a great

source for federal patronage, it has always been completely involved in politics. So it is the department that has always been deep, deep in the red. Any other business operated in the manner of the post office department, free from just ordinary business practices, and open at all times for political exploitation, would never survive. That the post office department is still with us rests in the fact that it is always easy to draw on the people to overcome the deficits, meanwhile giving abominable service.

A reorganization of the department is urgently needed, and, if tried and tested business principles were followed, it is conceivable that the first-class rate can be brought back down. Of course, that will never happen if a stubborn Congress refuses to go for reorganization of the department.

Meanwhile, the country may well be resigned to that big, big 66% increase in the letter rate—unless, of course, enough noise is made to block the increase when it gets to the voting stage. Increases are also being considered in the rates for other classes, but it is significant that the users of first class mail total very close to 100 per cent in our nation, and the little fellow as well as the big, the rich as well as the poor, the educated as well as the illiterate, the sick as well as the well, will have to pay what we believe to be an outrageous increase in first-class postal rates.

DICTATORIAL LAWS IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the unbridled power of the South African Government to arrest and detain anybody in solitary confinement for any length of time for the flimsiest of reasons has been of great concern to many observers for a long time. Evident of flagrant abuse of this so-called Terrorism Act is now beginning to surface. I insert in the RECORD at this point recent newspaper articles from the Johannesburg Sunday Times of March 15, 1970, and the Rand Daily Mail of March 14, 1970, which discuss this law:

[From the Johannesburg (South Africa) Times, Mar. 15, 1970]

TERRORISM ACT WIDE OPEN TO ABUSE—MRS. SUZMAN

(By Margaret Smith)

(The Terrorism Act, which gives unfettered powers to the authorities and is not subject in any way to the scrutiny of the courts, is wide open to abuse, Mrs. Helen Suzman, Progressive Party M.P. for Houghton, said in Johannesburg yesterday.)

She urged a return to the principle that no person should be deprived of his liberty unless he had been charged in a court of law, found guilty and sentenced.

"The Terrorism Act has been on our Statute Book now for nearly three years and we do not know how many people have been held in solitary confinement for months on end under this Act," she said.

"We know that a considerable number are presently being held—but we do not know how many. I cannot even get answers to the questions I put every year in Parliament on this subject.

"But although we are in the dark about these aspects of this Draconian law, there is one thing we do know—and which must

surely disturb every ordinary, decent South African. That is that:

"Seven people have died while in detention under the Terrorism Act.

"Some of the inquest findings in these cases have been less than satisfactory, to put it mildly."

This week an inquest into the death of Imam Abdullah Haron, religious leader of a large Malay community in Cape Town, who died while in detention under the Terrorism Act, found that he had received injuries other than those caused by falling down 11 steps at Caledon Square.

"The Terrorism Act is the most far-reaching measure the Government has ever passed, giving greater powers than the 90-day Act and the 180-day Act," Mrs. Suzman said.

"Anyone suspected of knowing anything about terrorism or who is 'likely' to know anything about terrorism can be held indefinitely in solitary confinement for interrogation.

"And let us not be blinded in panic by the word 'terrorism'.

"FRIGHTENING

"We all oppose terrorism. But many held under the frightening powers of the Act have been subsequently charged with far less serious crimes.

"Many have been released without any charges being preferred against them."

Last year a number of simple tribesmen in Rustenburg and Hebron had been detained for several months under the Act. Of the 62 held, 16 had been charged and six had been eventually found guilty of attempted murder. The rest had been discharged.

It was clear that these cases arose out of tribal disputes and had had nothing to do with terrorism.

The example of Miss Shanti Naidoo, a young Indian woman who had been detained in June last year, was another disturbing one. After five months in solitary confinement under the Terrorism Act she was called to give evidence in a case (not a terrorism trial) and when she refused, was sentenced to two months' imprisonment.

When she had served the two months, she was re-detained under the Terrorism Act without presumably leaving the prison, Mrs. Suzman said.

"There is the case of 22 people acquitted nearly a month ago of charges of aiding a banned organisation, and who were immediately re-arrested.

"They have been held incommunicado since then. How much longer they will be held is anybody's guess for nobody—relatives, legal advisers or anybody else—is given access to them or giving any information about them.

"There was a time in South Africa when acquittal meant acquittal. Certainly 10 years ago when the treason trialists were acquitted, they went free.

"Now acquittal can mean re-arrest and indefinite detention under the far more stringent conditions of the Terrorism Act.

"What has happened to the rule of law in South Africa? Does nobody care? It is not good enough to say 'security measures' or 'the authorities must know something we don't know.'

"Let's stick to the well-tryed principle that no person should be deprived of his liberty unless he has been charged in a proper court of law, found guilty and sentenced," Mrs. Suzman said.

[From the Rand Daily Mail (South Africa), Mar. 14, 1970]

IMAM: ANOTHER NAME ON A SAD LIST

At least 14 people are known to have died while being detained, without trial, under either the 90-day clause, the subsequent 180-day clause or the Terrorism Act.

Three are known to have died since June last year—one, it was officially stated, by sui-

cide, one from natural causes and one, according to the finding of a Cape Town inquest court this week, from injuries caused in part by an accidental fall.

The man who fell was the Moslem leader, Imam Abdullah Haron. He died in custody on September 27 last year. He had been in custody for four months, having been detained on May 28 under the 180-day clause.

The court was told that the Security Police had reliable information that the Imam had been involved in unlawful political and terrorist activities.

Security police evidence was the Imam slipped and fell down the last few steps of a flight of stairs after interrogation on September 19. He did not appear to have been hurt. They denied any knowledge of assaults on the Imam.

According to the post-mortem report, the Imam had 26 separate bruises on his body, a blood-swelling on his back and a fractured rib.

The pathologist who made the report said in court that the bruises were widespread and that some were older than others. He said that they could not all have been caused by the fall. Excluding the possibilities of self-infliction or a fall, assault would then have been a "probability."

The magistrate found that the Imam died as a result of injuries partly caused by an accidental fall down a flight of stairs. He said that, on the available evidence, he could not say how the other injuries were caused.

Michael Shivute's death was revealed by the Minister of Police, Mr. S. L. Muller, in Parliament last month. He said that the man died by suicide, on June 16, the night of his detention under the Terrorism Act.

Jacob Monnagotla's death was disclosed at the trial of 10 Africans charged under the Terrorism Act following tribal unrest in the Transvaal. He died the night before the start of the trial. According to police at the trial, his death was due to natural causes. A district surgeon found that the man died from thrombosis. During the trial Terrorism charges were withdrawn against the surviving accused.

Caleb Mayesiko died of natural causes, 18 days after his detention under the Terrorism Act on May 13, according to the Minister of Police.

James Lenkoe was found hanging by a belt from the window of his prison cell on March 10 last year, five days after his detention. Traces of copper were found in a wound on his toe.

Four pathologists, one of them from overseas, said that the toe wound could have been caused by an electric burn. Security Police witnesses denied that detainees were given electric shock treatment. The inquest magistrate found that the cause, or apparent cause, of death was suicide by hanging that no blame was attached to any person and that the allegation that electric shock contributed to his death was not proved.

Solomon Modipane died approximately three days after his arrest on February 25 last year. There was no inquest. A magistrate endorsed a post-mortem report that death was due to natural causes. Police spokesmen said he slipped on a piece of soap.

Nicodimus Kgoathe died on February 2 last year after having been in custody since November 7, 1968. He spent two weeks in hospital before his death. A post-mortem showed he died of bronchial pneumonia. The doctor who had him admitted to hospital said at the inquest he found various injuries which he thought were the result of assault. A police sergeant said that Kgoathe claimed he had been assaulted by the Security Police during interrogation. Security Police evidence was that the detainee fell while taking a shower. The inquest magistrate said he was unable, on the evidence be-

fore him, to conclude that any person was to blame for the death.

J. B. Tubakwe died on September 11, 1968, the day after his detention. The verdict was suicide by hanging.

Ah Yan was found hanging by socks from the water pipe of a shower cubicle in a police cell on January 15, 1967. He has detained probably in either November or December, 1966. The inquest verdict was suicide by hanging and that nobody was to blame.

Leong Yum Pin died by suicide by hanging on November 19, 1966, after three days in detention.

James Hamakwayo's death was due to suicide by hanging, according to evidence in a Terrorism Trial. He was detained on August 26, 1966, but the date of his death is not known.

Sullman Saloojee died after falling seven floors from the then Security Police headquarters in Johannesburg on September 9, 1964, two months after his detention. A Security Policeman, who refused to answer some of the defense questions, denied that the man had been assaulted. The magistrate found that the man died of multiple injuries after a fall during interrogation. He could not say whether Saloojee committed suicide or was trying to escape but there was nothing in the evidence to suggest assault or other irregularities.

"Looksmart" Solwandie Ngudle died on September 5, 1963, after some three weeks in detention. He was found hanging by a pajama cord and a jersey in a police cell. Allegations of assaults on detainees were made and a magistrate who visited Ngudle said the man complained of having been assaulted. The inquest finding was suicide with no blame attached to anyone.

Unknown. An unknown man died on an unknown date, of cause unknown. His death was disclosed, without detail, in Parliament.

OUR COUNTRY

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, every American should be gravely concerned over the future of our Nation. Each day brings new instances of violence, disobedience, civil disobedience, and what appears to be a general breakdown in law and order and the degeneration of moral values.

Our country is beset by disunity and dissent, and we face the frightening prospect of descending from a Nation governed by a system of laws to a Government based on lawlessness by mob rule.

It is the duty of every responsible citizen—the so-called silent majority—to voice his deep concern over the deterioration of our society and demand an end to insurrection and disorder and a return to the principles upon which America was founded.

I recently read an editorial that appeared in the Adams County News of West Union, Ohio, that described far more cogently than I can, the crisis currently facing our Nation, and I would like to take this means of commending this article to the attention of my colleagues:

OUR COUNTRY

Every reader of this editorial, every American, should be—and probably is—concerned about the future of his country. And it is appropriate that one is concerned today, for

the United States system of government and the functioning of our society is experiencing a crisis.

The crisis, which is worst in some ways than that of the thirties during the depression, has been produced this time by an unpopular war, a generation of undisciplined children (the don't say no to junior generation), racial differences and discriminations among the melting pot U.S. population and a well organized and financed communist plot to overthrow the U.S. system of government by revolution and chaos, exploiting all these conditions.

That conditions inside America today are tragic cannot be denied. An Englishman, a German or an Irishman arriving in the United States today, for a visit, or to make a new home, can hardly believe the scene which confronts him. On many college campuses there are thousands of heroin addicts! Crime and drug addiction in cities like New York, where he might arrive, are at a scandalous level. Violence is everywhere. Television is rotten with violence and sadism. Millions of young people are smoking marijuana. Militants, rights crusaders, communists and anarchists are rioting, through bombs, lighting fires, disrupting both education and government processes.

This is a grave crisis measured by any standard and President Nixon and Vice President Agnew are doing their best to stem the tide of misguided lawlessness. But many are doing their best to discredit them, and the country's system of government and courts, and calling for revolution. Even William Douglas of the Supreme Court seems to condone revolution in his latest book!

What we are now experiencing, as a result of the chaos, is a turn to the right by the majority, inevitably and naturally enough, because the majority supports the President and believes in the American system. In Germany after World War I the same sort of street scenes prevailed, as militants—communists and fascists—roamed the streets and struggled to gain control of the state. Hitler followed and brought order.

There will be no successful revolution in this country. Communism hasn't a chance. The nation's future, however, does hang in the balance, as between a continuing democratic society as we have enjoyed it in the past and a more repressive society, with majority backing, if the revolutionaries and militants continue to aggravate public sentiment and defy the majority will.

The great test for us all—and many Europeans and others in homogeneous countries think we might fail it—is whether the diversity of races which make up our democracy can achieve and maintain a degree of harmony and sustain the lawful processors of democracy. Austro-Hungary fell apart under the stress and crisis of military defeat, a once-great empire of diverse races. Will this country dissipate its strength, its union, in the developing crisis, like the Hapsburg monarchy in 1919?

The future for America depends upon the actions and counter actions of all Americans, so many of whom today fail to appreciate the many blessings of the American Republic and attack its imperfections with such vehemence, violence, impatience and radicalism.

INCREASE IN MEAT IMPORTS IS NOT THE ANSWER TO FIGHT INFLATIONARY RISES IN MEAT

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned over recent congressional comment and consideration of a

proposed increase in meat imports purportedly to offset the inflationary rise in meat costs and to protect the rights of the American consumer.

I submit an increase in meat imports from foreign countries is certainly not the answer to this problem and could seriously jeopardize our national cattle industry.

While the price of steak has increased approximately 20 percent since 1951, the price received by the beef producer has actually declined 10 percent during the same period. I urge my colleagues who would support increased imports and propose a Federal commission to "ride herd on the American cattleman" to reconsider. The real problem in high beef prices is not the beef cost; it is the high cost of preparing it and getting the product to the market.

Consider the cattleman's plight:

The rancher's costs have increased 27 percent in the last 10 years while his income has stayed the same or dropped. On the other hand, he must pay 42 percent more in workers' wages, almost 40 percent more for transportation, and 46 percent more for medical care.

On the other hand, the consumer now spends only 16.5 percent of his disposable income after taxes for food as opposed to 21 percent in 1957. And he receives a higher quality product. This 16.5 percent compares with a similar figure of 25 percent for Great Britain, 28 percent for West Germany, 40 percent for Japan, and 50 percent for Russia.

Today, Americans are eating more steaks, roasts, and hamburgers than ever before. In 1969, Americans consumed 110 pounds of beef per person compared with 63.1 pounds per person two decades ago. Our affluent society is demanding and receiving a better quality, high protein diet for a smaller portion of his income. With this knowledge at hand, why should we seriously consider cheapening the product and endangering the cattle industry by increasing foreign imports?

Recently, several countries have used "third country agreements" as a vehicle to ship 18 million pounds of meat into the United States above their voluntary quotas. As a result of this increase, domestic meat markets have been disrupted and foreign interests have profited. This exploitive practice must be stopped.

Certainly the cattleman should at least expect parity regarding our national meat import policy. Last year meat imports into the United States were valued at \$1,234 million, a significant increase over the 1964 figure of \$761 million. At the same time, the United States exported \$547 million worth of livestock and meat products last year, only a small increase over the \$490 million in 1964.

In view of the present continuing cost-price squeeze in agriculture and the declining domestic price for beef cattle, meat import quotas must be maintained to protect the beef cattle industry and the consumer. If we are to continue to provide the American consumer quality meat products at the lowest possible price, the rancher must be allowed to operate where he can get a reasonable return on his investment.

Increasing beef imports at this time could very well spell the beginning of the

end for our Nation's cattle industry and at the same time would simply mean the American housewife would receive an inferior meat product with no decrease in price.

MR. JAMES G. STAHLMAN RECEIVES SAR'S PATRIOT'S MEDAL

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James G. Stahlman, the distinguished dean of southern newspaper publishers, recently was awarded the Patriot's Medal of the Tennessee Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

The Patriot's Medal is the highest honor which the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution bestows on an individual.

On the occasion of the ceremony Mr. Stahlman was the principal speaker and his address was a moving commentary based on firm belief and deep conviction built upon and enforced by many, many years of active service to his community and Nation as a publisher, military officer, and private citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Stahlman's remarks in the RECORD at this point and highly commend them to the attention of our colleagues for their consideration:

MR. JAMES G. STAHLMAN RECEIVES SAR'S PATRIOT'S MEDAL

America is passing through a period of multiple disturbances. Many have ceased to honor in any respect the Constitution of our country, and the investment of blood, sweat and tears on the part of those who first created this nation and later expanded the Atlantic seaboard to the far Pacific. Many have ceased to be patriots in any basic sense, and think only in terms of their own personal self-centeredness and advantages.

I join with those fellow Americans who strongly resolve that this nation must not die, that her Constitution must be newly recognized and honored, and that our debt to the past should strengthen all of us to safeguard our nation at this period of her history, and thereby guarantee her continuance into long and illustrious tomorrows.

It is therefore with pleasure and appreciation that we recognize one of Nashville's leading citizens as having earned the right to receive the Patriot's Medal granted by the National Society Sons of the American Revolution. So powerfully has this man established himself in terms of this community, state and nation, that none can question his integrity, his patriotism, and his service to his fellowmen. It is therefore with enthusiasm that we pause to honor one whose honor has honored all of us, and it is with a real sense of appreciation that we present the Patriot's Medal and Certificate to Mr. James Geddes Stahlman.

In accepting the award, Stahlman said:

"No man deserves extra credit for service to his country in time of peace or in war. Such is an obligation of citizenship in this great nation of ours.

"It is gratifying on occasions like this to receive such recognition of one's efforts as you have accorded me by the award of this Patriot's Medal, representative of the ideals and purposes of this society of patriots in which you and I are privileged to hold membership. I am deeply grateful to the National Society and this Tennessee chapter of the

Sons of the American Revolution for this distinguished honor.

"I lay no claim to credit for having tried to serve my country, my God and my fellowman in a long, exciting and, at times, turbulent and controversial life. Like you, I have endeavored to fulfill my duties as an American citizen, cognizant of the obligations and responsibilities imposed upon us by the rights conferred by a free government upon a free people.

"Why are we a free people?

"How have we remained a free people?

"How long can we preserve the freedoms of ours, too frequently and too lightly taken for granted, which we see being eroded daily by demagogues in public office, a permissive judiciary, left-wing professional meddlers, heretical clergy, babbling the twaddle that "God is dead," and foreign forces, paid and expertly directed to destroy from within and without, in their relentless conquest of the minds and souls of freedom-loving peoples everywhere—aimed at their inevitable enslavement and permanent serfdom.

"NO SUPERPATRIOT

"Now I am no superpatriot. I do love my country. And I love it better than my life.

"Like you, I come by that devotion honestly through a cherished and devoutly nourished heritage.

"My distinguished ancestor, William Claiborne, arrived in Virginia in 1620 slightly before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. He became the first Colonial Secretary of Virginia and prevented Lord Baltimore from his intended total conquest of the Virginia colony.

"William's great-grandson, my great-great-grandfather, served in Captain Creed Haskin's company of Virginia patriots in the American Revolution. From him I derive my proud claim as one of your compatriots.

"On another side of my family, the Geddes, later the Geddeses, drove the Roman legions of Septimus Severus from Caledonia (northern Scotland) 1700 years ago.

"Fourteen hundred years later, another Geddes, this one a woman, defied an edict of Charles II directing the resumption of the Catholic liturgy in a Church of Scotland kirk, conked the vicar with her stool which she threw with typical Scot accuracy and broke up the prospective worship. On the right side of the transept of St. Giles, Edinburgh, there is a large bronze plaque which reads: "Constant oral tradition affirms that near this spot, a brave Scotch woman, Janet Geddes, on 23 July, 1637, struck the first blow for freedom of conscience, which after a conflict of half a century, ended in the establishment of civil and religious liberty."

"Further, on my mother's mother's side I am entitled to a claim of consanguinity with the Hawkins, the Forts, the Smiths and the Burnhams, all of Kentucky.

"My great-grandfather Frederick Stahlman, a native of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, seeking a haven of freedom in America, brought his devout Lutheran wife Christina, and their brood of minor children to settle in what was then Virginia, now West Virginia near Parkersburg. Within hours after their landing in the United States, a son was born. They christened him George Washington.

"I have not given you this genealogical background to 'impress' you, but to establish the fact that through my veins courses the blood of men and women who loved freedom in its every form, who sacrificed for it and whose progeny migrated to America to find that liberty which they could not enjoy in their native lands.

"It is because of them, and others like them, that I am privileged to call myself a free man, to call this my country. You and I, with such a heritage, have a proper sense of 'belonging,' of 'ownership' as it were of a precious share of this thing which we call liberty.

"This is our country and we are duty-bound to preserve it for those who follow, just as it has been handed down to us by men and women who believed in the principles of our foundation and have been willing to die to maintain them.

"If there is one thing which I bitterly resent in this tragic era, it is the comparison of our American Revolution with the current wave of anarchy. The first was revolt against tyranny in order to establish a republic of free men. The present 'revolution' is designed to destroy that republic and substitute therefor, a mobocracy of the riffraff.

"This is not the democracy for which millions have fought and died, a democracy in which every citizen, regardless of race, creed, color, or ethnic origin is entitled to enjoy the fruits of his own labors, the sanctity of his home, the protection of his person and property, his right to free expression, free worship, free assembly and legitimate protest, all guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, but properly circumscribed by the laws of obscenity, libel, slander and treason, as well as by the tenets of common decency and personal and professional ethics.

"As a newspaper publisher, I am obligated to protect your sacred right to know. I am just as dedicated to the search for the Truth wherever it may be found. I am determined to protect all the rights and privileges of American citizenship to my last breath, but I do not intend for my newspaper to become either the forum for their vocal villainy or the show-window of the treacherous actions of the Kunstlers, the Carmichaels, the Rubins, the Hoffmans and all their hairy, filthy, hopped-up hippie legions, many of whom are defiling this country's lovely beaches and resort areas this holy Easter weekend.

"I am disturbed by much that has become an almost accepted way of life.

"I am disturbed by the decline in the quality and much of the produce of our educational system, at every level.

"I am disturbed by the decline in the exercise of and respect for parental authority.

"I am disturbed by a rather general disdain for the personal rights of others.

"I am disturbed by the assaults upon private property.

"I am disturbed by the decline in respect for law and our courts.

"I am disturbed by the dangers that lurk in our streets, both day and night.

"I am disturbed by the planned and deliberately executed reign of terror now plaguing our cities and even our smaller towns and hamlets. The torch, the bomb, the assassin's bullet have signalled the start of a guerrilla warfare whose purpose is clear, but whose end is not predictable.

"I am disturbed by the frightening spread of the use of narcotics, principally among our youth at the secondary school and collegiate levels.

"The fact that a 'majority' of our student youth have not smoked 'pot' may be comforting to a degree, but it is no offset for the knowledge afforded by surveys which find that there are 700 or more teen-agers in Hillsboro High School alone, who have tried 'pot' and some its customary consequences, heroin, LSD or other forms of deadly hallucinogenic drugs.

"Students in institutions of higher learning are reported to be experimenters with, and some 'pushers' or purveyors of the stuff that sends its victims sailing like Icarus from dormitory windows, to be scrapped up in bloody, unrecognizable mass from sidewalks below.

"This wholesale pollution of the minds, the corruption of morals, the consequent defilement of the bodies of our youth—all hold the greatest and surest threat to the future of this nation.

"What is the answer? Frankly, there is no general formula as a panacea. Each condition, each situation as it occurs, each provo-

cation requires analysis on its own basis and a determination on the part of each of us as to where we may fit into the overall solution.

"But of one thing I am dead certain: Unless you, as responsible citizens, as concerned parents, as patriotic Americans stop your wishful thinking, your futile hoping that 'this, too, shall pass,' and make up your minds, jointly and severally to put an end to permissiveness, to treasonous teaching, to open anarchy, to the master minds of the narcotic traffic, their puppet pushers and peddlers—then this nation will be well on its way to the fate of Greece, Rome and other governmental structures brought down by the dissolution of their people's morals, the corruption of their minds and bodies, and their disregard and defiance of the laws and Man, but more importantly, the laws of a loving, just but wrathful God who still lives and rules the destinies of all mankind."

PENNSYLVANIA'S HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM SECOND TO NONE IN THE NATION

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in the past 3 years the residents of Pennsylvania have invested a record \$1.4 billion in the construction of 1,190 miles of new highways. Recently Gov. Raymond P. Shafer released the following detailed report on the State's dramatic highway construction program which is second to none in the Nation:

A VIEW FROM THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

(By Gov. Raymond P. Shafer)

For the past three years, Pennsylvania has engaged in a dramatic new highway construction program second to none in the Nation.

But the progress revealed by a look at the record is not limited to road-building itself. Instead it is found in highway safety; in the protection of our environment and in total transportation planning to keep Pennsylvania the hub of the Northeastern United States.

Consider the record:

We have invested a record \$1.4 billion in the construction of 1,190 miles of roads in just three years.

More highways were contracted for and built in the first two and a half years of this Administration than in the entire term of any previous Governor.

Ninety-three percent of our goal to connect the communities of our State with a system of interstate highways has been completed.

The long hard fight for new revenues to pay for new and improved highways has finally been won.

Our communities are receiving a fairer share of the highway dollar for local road programs in the spirit of revenue-sharing by State Government.

We have pressed hard for Appalachia Regional Commission developmental highway money and the result is \$65 million for roads into the more inaccessible areas of our State—a construction program that is bringing new economic and social hope to thousands of our citizens.

The continuity of our highway construction program that was so long sought has been maintained, and the integrity of the bipartisan Highway Commission established forever.

Reform, modernization and a new professionalism have been established in the operation of the Highways Department.

In addition, we have responded to human needs by working toward an effective program of equal opportunity and by leading the way in liberalizing relocation assistance for those displaced by projects.

The slaughter of people on our roads has brought renewed efforts to do something about this most serious of problems.

A Safety Improvement Program to eliminate driving hazards on roads throughout the State is now under way.

Important legislative proposals contained in my special message on Highway Safety to the General Assembly have been or are being enacted. These proposals, recommended by the Governor's Highway Safety Task Force, include major measures to combat drunken drivers and to improve the safety of the buses that carry our children to school.

A traffic safety research center has been established to help us find new ways to improve the safety of our roads, drivers and vehicles.

Another important human need—the protection of our resources and environment—has been made an important part of highway planning.

Just last week, I signed an expanded order to insure the prevention of air, water and land pollution from highway construction.

This is a short catalogue of the record, but it is enough to indicate that major transportation achievements have been made.

But there is one major achievement—perhaps the most important of them all—that is just short of being a reality, the establishment of a new Department of Transportation and the final development of a Master Plan for Transportation.

There is, in my opinion, no more basic need for the future development of our Commonwealth in all aspects—social, cultural, economic.

It is basic to helping us find a solution to the problems of urban growth because the present inadequate transit systems of our cities are making them unlivable.

It is basic to the continued development and growth of trade and commerce through our great ports.

With a modern, coordinated transportation system, we will be able to solve many of our present problems. Without it, our State will wither as a leader in all areas of human endeavor.

DANGER STALKS USERS OF AMPHETAMINES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the overproduction and overprescribing of amphetamine or pep pills in the United States is beginning to receive the widespread public attention that is long overdue.

I was very much impressed by two thoughtful and informative articles published recently.

The first, by Mark R. Arnold, Washington correspondent for the National Observer, is entitled "Danger Stalks Users of Amphetamines." The disturbing facts brought out in Mr. Arnold's article concerning the extent of illicit traffic in legally produced amphetamine tablets un-

derscores the need for corrective legislation.

The Select Committee on Crime of this House, on which I serve, held extensive hearings in San Francisco and Washington, D.C., on this very subject. Eminent medical authorities, including Dr. Sidney Cohen of the National Institute of Mental Health, told the committee that only several thousand amphetamine tablets are needed for medical purposes. The American Medical Association lists only two noncontroversial uses for amphetamines—for narcolepsy, a rare sleeping sickness, and for hyperkinetic behavior in children.

Yet, as many as 8 billion of these pills are pouring out of the drug houses each year. What happens to all the rest?

Testimony before our committee indicates that more than half go into illicit uses as mind-altering drugs, used to an alarming extent by young people. The remainder are prescribed for such medically questionable uses as weight reduction and to combat fatigue.

For these and other reasons, a bipartisan majority of the members of the Crime Committee have introduced legislation to place a quota on the number of amphetamines that can be legally produced each year. Restrictions governing the distribution and sale of these pills are also embodied in the bills. We hope that these measures will be enacted.

The second article appeared in the Boston Globe of March 10 and is headlined "Eight Billion Pep Pills Labeled U.S. Menace." The writer, Mr. John S. Driscoll, highlights testimony before the committee in its San Francisco hearings of late last year.

Since those hearings, a growing number of newspapers have called editorially for restrictions on amphetamine production. These include the Los Angeles Times, San Diego Union, Albuquerque Tribune, and Houston Chronicle.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the two aforementioned articles appear at this point in the RECORD:

[From the National Observer, Mar. 30, 1970]

DANGER STALKS USERS OF AMPHETAMINES—SOME FOES SEEK RESTRICTIONS, OTHERS WANT DRUG BANNED

(By Mark R. Arnold)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The most widely abused drug in America is perfectly legal. It is produced by some of the largest pharmaceutical houses, in ever-increasing quantities—despite growing doubts in the medical profession as to its efficacy.

The drug is amphetamine, the central nervous system stimulant used widely as a pep pill for diet control or to combat fatigue.

Eight billion doses of amphetamines are produced annually, enough to supply every man, woman, and child with almost 40 doses. Housewives take amphetamine pills to perk up, truck drivers to keep awake, athletes for bursts of energy, and students to cram for exams.

In the form of injectible methamphetamine, better known as "Speed" or "Crystal," amphetamines can kill or seriously incapacitate, as increasing numbers of student-age "Speedfreaks" are discovering.

Now, for the first time, some authorities are saying the dangers of amphetamine abuse exceed the drug's medical benefits. Some of them are calling for an outright ban on amphetamines. Others want to clamp new restrictions on the drug. Items:

Just recently, a parade of medical witnesses told the House Select Committee on Crime that amphetamine addiction is "more widespread, more incapacitating, more dangerous and socially disrupting" than narcotics addiction. Dr. Sidney Cohen, chief of the drug abuse division of the National Institute of Mental Health, stated that amphetamine abuse among white middle- and upper-class youth has reached epidemic proportions. One important source of the drug is "the family medicine cabinet," said Dr. Cohen.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which oversees the safety and effectiveness of pharmaceuticals, commissioned the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council to investigate the efficacy of amphetamines, among other drugs. In August 1968, the academy recommended limiting the medical use of amphetamines to treatment of two rare disorders, narcolepsy and hyperkinetic behavior in children, plus a third use—"as an adjunct" in the early stages of weight-control. The FDA accepted the recommendation but has still not put it into effect.

The drug companies, responding to the growing controversy over amphetamines, have been sending up their own warning signals. One major manufacturer is issuing new instructions advising physicians to avoid prolonged use in treatment of obesity for fear it may be habit-forming.

Behind these developments lie two distinct problems. First, a significant amount of the amphetamines legally produced end up on the black market. Dr. James L. Goddard, former commissioner of the FDA, estimates as many as half of the amphetamines produced under law are eventually sold illegally. In past years, efforts to curb amphetamine abuse have centered on trying to stop the diversion—the thefts, phony wholesalers, illegitimate mail-order companies, and other offenders who obtain and dispense amphetamines illegally.

But now there is a growing awareness of another problem in amphetamine abuse. This results from the way they are legally dispensed—by physicians. More than 90 percent of all amphetamine prescriptions are written for weight control—the drug works as an appetite suppressant—and to counter mild depression and fatigue. But critics say the billions of amphetamines produced for these purposes are widely abused and of doubtful medical benefit anyway. So now there's a move afoot to plug the amphetamine traffic at its source: by curbing production.

Says Florida Democrat Claude Pepper, chairman of the House Crime Committee: "The production of amphetamines in the United States vastly exceeds the legitimate medical needs of this country. Unless we restrict production to treating those diseases in which it has a legitimate role, we won't lick the problem of amphetamine abuse."

The problem dates back at least to World War II, when military doctors began dispensing amphetamine pep pills—now known also as "bennies" (Benzedrine) and "dexies" (Dexedrine)—to combat battle fatigue and increase the alertness of pilots and others on long missions. Postwar dumping of the drug in Japan created a major epidemic of abuse in that country and led to the drug's being outlawed there in the mid-1950's. A similar problem of abuse, reflected in a mounting volume of crimes of violence, caused Sweden to ban amphetamine and methamphetamine two years ago.

In the United States, amphetamines are legal if prescribed by a physician and they can be purchased in almost any pharmacy, with up to five refills in a six-month period. They also are available to "authorized purchasers" from mail-order drug houses. In small doses and under a physician's direction, the drug can combat mild depression, fatigue,

and can serve as an appetite-suppressant in weight-control regimes. A vast diet pill industry, estimated to gross \$400,000,000 a year in obesity-specialist fees and prescriptions, has grown up around the drugs.

Abuse of amphetamines takes three forms, according to Dr. Cohen: First, and relatively minor, are quick doses taken for an added burst of energy—by students, truck drivers, or athletes. A second form of overuse consists of taking larger-than-recommended amounts of amphetamine or methamphetamine pills or tablets to achieve an artificial lift or "high."

This practice, increasingly common among teenagers and college students, is also turning many ordinary housewives into what Dr. Goddard calls "peppill junkies." They get diet pills, then continue to use them long after they have been discontinued by a physician. If their refill prescription runs out, they go to another diet doctor.

The third and most pernicious form of amphetamine abuse is that experienced by the "Speedfreak," says Dr. Cohen, the person who relies on intravenous injection of hundreds, perhaps a thousand milligrams of the drug in a single dose. Methamphetamine is particularly popular among Speeders, though other injectible amphetamines give the same "kick." The injection gives an initial "rush," similar to that experienced by heroin users, and the resulting euphoria lasts for hours. During that time, the Speeder becomes impulsive, hyperactive, aggressive, and sometimes destructive.

Dr. Cohen believes crimes of violence are more apt to be caused by Speeders than by users of any other kind of drug. The reason: Most drugs make users less able to function effectively. Amphetamines make them more able, and more confident, about what they do.

Habitual use of amphetamines can be addictive because the body builds up tolerance to the drug, requiring ever larger doses to achieve the same effect. Speeders can go for days without food or sleep, but when they "crash" or come down from their high, they go through a period of withdrawal (depression, convulsions, pains) similar to that experienced by heroin users. In addition medical authorities say chronic use of heavy doses can result in hepatitis, heart irregularities, brain damage, or death.

THE PRODUCERS' VIEW

Producers of amphetamines and methamphetamine argue that the way to control abuse is through better law enforcement. The drugs used by Speedfreaks, they contend, emanate from illicit laboratories, where a \$1,600 supply of methamphetamine can be produced for an investment of \$200.

Others disagree. "The industry, in one recent year, produced 150,000,000 units of injectible methamphetamine," says Donald E. Miller, general counsel of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. "You can sure cure a lot of narcolepsy and hyperkinesis with that."

How amphetamines get into the illicit stream of traffic was explained in detail at hearings held in San Francisco by the House Select Committee on Crime. Those hearings showed an Alice-in-Wonderland pattern of unreality all the way down the distribution pipeline.

Manufacturers of amphetamines, barbiturates, and other dangerous drugs fill the orders they get from wholesalers, presuming that the wholesalers are legitimate. Wholesalers fill the orders they get from distributors presuming they too are legitimate. And so on, down to the corner pharmacy and the prescribing physician. "Everyone," says a congressional critic, "fills the orders and washes his hands of the consequences."

A FICTITIOUS COMPANY

A sample case: A private-label drug manufacturer in Illinois, with annual sales of

\$1,500,000 a year, shipped approximately 15,000,000 amphetamines over a decade to a Mexican company in Tijuana, through a broker in San Ysidro, Calif. Customs agents, acting on leads from the House crime committee, investigated and found the company was fictitious. A representative of the fictitious company had actually been claiming the drugs in San Ysidro, and selling them illegally in the United States.

The committee made a study of Mexican towns along the U.S. border, since many U.S. drug companies have Mexican subsidiaries. They found that production in some of the companies' Mexican plants was higher per capita than in their U.S. plants. Smith Kline & French, which employs a full-time "manager of distribution protection" just to thwart diversion of company products into the illicit market, said the company had seven distributors in the Mexican city of Monterrey, 145 miles from the U.S. border.

This exchange occurred between Rep. Jerome R. Waldie, a California Democrat, and Donald K. Fletcher, Smith Kline & French's manager of distribution protection.

Mr. Waldie: Is there any effort made by you or the company to determine, for example, when you have a request for a new wholesaler in Monterey . . . medicinal needs [or is it] what the market will bear in terms of selling the product, with the assumption that the product is always sold legitimately?

Mr. Fletcher: Yes, I do not know if anyone has determined an accurate method of specifically and accurately measuring medical need. . . . Our criteria for adding a new wholesaler . . . is primarily the providing of services to pharmacies.

Other witnesses testified that Mexican pharmacies in border towns do a brisk business in dispensing legal amphetamines and barbiturates under the counter. Most of them are then smuggled back to the States.

Drug companies naturally are sensitive to charges that they produce, even indirectly, for the illicit market. Several have stopped producing injectible methamphetamine as a result of the widespread abuse of the product. Some authorities, and all amphetamine producers, insist that most of the "meth" on the streets is produced in illegal laboratories. Under present law, anyone can order the ingredients of amphetamine. It is illegal only to synthesize them—to produce amphetamines without registering with the Government.

A visit to the world headquarters of Smith Kline & French (SK&F) in Philadelphia throws some light on the production and distribution of amphetamines. SK&F, the world's largest amphetamine producer, is acknowledged to have the best security system in the industry to protect its amphetamines and barbiturates from diversion. Those seven distributors in Monterrey, says Donald K. Fletcher, serve a wide area in Mexico, not just the city itself. The proof that its products are not sold under the counter, he says, is in the Customs' seizure reports. They show 20,000 units of SK&F amphetamines seized in a recent 18-month period, out of an estimated 6,000,000 units produced by the company.

But not all companies can boast a track record to match that of SK&F. Studies by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs indicate that more than 80 percent of the dangerous drugs seized because of illicit use were legally produced. There are about 10 major producers of amphetamines, and hundreds of smaller ones, which pay varying degrees of attention to security. Output of amphetamines has increased 25 percent since 1966.

Furthermore, the companies have done little to alert physicians to the abuse potential of legal use of their amphetamine products over a prolonged period. Authorities say the effect of the drugs as an appetite-suppressant

wears off after six to eight weeks, yet it is common to find women whose doctors prescribe amphetamines for weight control over several months or even a year or more.

Dr. H. J. Anlage, Smith Kline & French's associate director of clinical services, says, "Prolonged use of amphetamines for diet-control is bad medical practice. It can produce psychological dependence." Yet there is nothing in the prescribing information the company sends to physicians that would indicate any danger in prolonged use. On the contrary, its products are advertised as giving "continuous and prolonged control of appetite." The instructions another major amphetamine producer issues to physicians say its product can be used "until optimal weight (is) reached."

Dr. Anlage says future editions of SK&F's prescribing information to physicians will contain a warning against prolonged use. That warning, if approved by the Food and Drug Administration in its present form, will read: "As with any central nervous system stimulant, the possibility of tolerance and psychological dependence should be kept in mind, particularly with prolonged or excessive use. Therefore, care should be used in the selection of candidates for (name of drug) therapy and prescriptions should be no longer than necessary to achieve immediate therapeutic goals."

Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, figures more Americans are hooked on the so-called dangerous drugs—amphetamines and other stimulants; barbiturates and other depressants—than on any other class of drugs. And he adds: "There is no generation gap in the misuse of stimulants and sedatives."

The question is, what can be done about it? The drug industry argues that amphetamine abuse is part of the over-all drug problem, to be dealt with by public education, better law enforcement, more attention to ways of stopping the diversion of legally produced drugs. They favor the approach of President Nixon's Controlled Dangerous Substances Act, which has passed the Senate and is in committee in the House. It would require Federal registration and more record-keeping by drug handlers. It would also provide stiffer penalties for abuse—including unauthorized ordering of ingredients of dangerous drugs.

But Congressman Pepper and a few other lawmakers want a direct curb on the production of the drug. Mr. Pepper's bill, which has received almost no public attention, would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to determine the "legitimate" medical needs for amphetamines, then restrict production to conform with them, setting up production quotas for companies in the same way quotas are now used to regulate production of hard narcotics. Rep. Paul Rogers, Florida Democrat, wants the Government to ban use of amphetamines for obesity control entirely. That would eliminate more than 90 per cent of the present supply.

It is noteworthy that the World Health Organization's Commission on Narcotics recently proposed placing amphetamines in Schedule II, a category for drugs with low medical utility and a high potential for abuse. That would require much tighter national controls than the Administration proposes for amphetamines in its new legislation.

DR. NOVITCH'S VIEW

A few Federal officials admit to being concerned with the present "overproduction" of amphetamine. One is Mark Novitch, special assistant for pharmacological affairs to the U.S. Surgeon General. Dr. Novitch said in an interview last week:

"There is a substantial and growing body of opinion which holds that the benefits of these drugs do not match their risk, in view of the widespread abuse which we see

around us. In addition, we know they pose additional hazards to persons with incipient heart disease."

The FDA will end some of the controversy when it acts on the recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences' National Research Council. That body, which is investigating the medical usefulness of 3,000 drugs produced between 1938 and 1962, recommended limiting amphetamines to treatment of narcolepsy, hyperkinetic behavior, and as an adjunct in the early stages of weight control. The FDA has said it would issue regulations in conformity with that recommendation "in due course."

[From the Boston Evening Globe, Mar. 10, 1970]

EIGHT BILLION PEP PILLS LABELED U.S. MENACE

(By John S. Driscoll)

A drugstore in Tijuana, Mex., for the last few years has been ordering millions of pep pills from U.S. manufacturers. A check on the given address of the "store" found it would have been located on the 11th hole of the Tijuana Country Club.

An estimated 8 billion amphetamine pills are produced annually in this country. One expert says only a few thousand a year are needed to meet our medical needs.

Over 80 percent of Federal seizures of illegal amphetamines were originally manufactured legally.

These are among the reasons why Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.), chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime, has filed a bill calling for amphetamine controls that are stricter than those in a recently passed Senate bill.

Amphetamines are stimulants used chiefly to reduce appetite and to relieve minor cases of mental depression. They often are used to promote wakefulness and/or increase energy.

Methamphetamine or "Speed" is a related, more potent stimulant. Taken improperly, both can have serious mental and physical effects ranging from addiction to death.

Under Pepper's bill the Attorney General would set amphetamine production quotas; manufacturers, distributors and dispensers would have to be licensed; separate records would be required for all controlled dangerous substances; approved order forms would have to be used for all drugs; prescriptions would be limited to three months' duration with only three refills, and methamphetamines would be banned except for scientific research.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare, Pepper cited an American Medical Association handbook which lists eight reasons why physicians might prescribe amphetamines.

Except for two uses—control of narcolepsy and hyperkinetic behavior disorders among children—the handbook says the other uses are subject to "varying degrees of professional controversy."

Another of the eight, diet control, can now be handled by Fenfluramine, an appetite depressant which is not a stimulant drug, Pepper reported.

Regulation of the precursors of amphetamines also is needed, said Pepper. In San Francisco his committee heard testimony from a man who for an initial investment of \$200 and a monthly overhead of \$1800 made a net profit of over \$30,000 a month.

He had a clandestine "Speed" lab. And he learned his meth methods from a fellow inmate during a 40-day jail term.

To back up information received from hearings and from his investigators who uncovered the Tijuana problem among others, Pepper solicited the opinions of 75 medical school deans plus 16 other groups, including the World Health Organization and the American Society of Bariatrics.

"Though few would welcome a total ban similar to that imposed in Sweden, the majority agreed that tighter controls were needed," Pepper said.

Among those participating in the survey were Dr. Richard Reth of Dartmouth, Dean W. F. Maloney of Tufts and Dean E. C. Andrews of Vermont.

POEMS OF LT. COL. JAMES PATRICK MCCARTHY, U.S. AIR FORCE

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have had the opportunity of working closely with Air Force Lt. Col. James Patrick "Pat" McCarthy, a congressional liaison officer, who is known, I am sure, by many of my colleagues. I wish that all of our colleagues could have the opportunity of speaking with him as I have had, as I think he has much to say regarding America's position in the world.

Colonel McCarthy enlisted in the Air Force in 1951 and spent the first several years as a supply sergeant and student pilot, graduating in September 1953, as a second lieutenant. He alternated assignments between the cockpit and logistics work. He recently completed 157 combat missions in the F-100 Super Sabre as fighter pilot and executive officer of the 35th Tactical Fighter Wing at Phan Rang Air Base, Vietnam.

His military career can be appreciated by a mere listing of his awards. Colonel McCarthy has received the Distinguished Flying Cross, Bronze Star, Air Medal with seven Oak Leaf Clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal, and various unit awards and service ribbons.

His accomplishments are more than military. He entered the service after attending two universities. He attended five more in night school and on-duty programs throughout the past 11 years. He has received a bachelor of science degree in business and a master's degree in management plus attending Squadron Officers School, the Armed Forces Staff College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

I am taking this opportunity of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two poems written by Colonel McCarthy.

The first, "Prayer for the Fighter Jock," was written on January 26, 1969, when the colonel's base at Phan Rang was under attack. At that time, one of the aircraft sustained a direct mortar hit and was burning. The bullets from it set an aircraft across from it afire. Billowing flames in the sky at 2:30 a.m. had Colonel McCarthy and his fellow fighting men believing that they were in Dante's Inferno. Colonel McCarthy wrote this poem in behalf of his friends who had been killed in air missions in the previous 4 months and, of course, in behalf of their widows.

Colonel McCarthy's second poem, "A Half 'O World From Home," was written in March 1969. It, too, was drafted under emotional circumstances. Colonel Mc-

Carthy and his fellow fighting men had attended a going away party for a friend who was returning home after having flown his last combat sortie. He proceeded to toast every fallen comrade he had known in his year in Vietnam. Colonel McCarthy told me that by the time toasts had been offered in behalf of over 20 fellow pilots, there were a lot of grown men with tears in their eyes in attendance. Colonel McCarthy wrote this poem for all the other men who wanted something to identify with as the pilot had in "Prayer of the Fighter Jock."

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important that we recognize that Colonel McCarthy—the father of four boys and two girls—realizes that the burden of the war in Vietnam is shared by the wives who assume the role of head of their families while their husbands and fathers are half a world away. Colonel McCarthy's poems are as follows:

PRAYER FOR THE FIGHTER JOCK

Don't badger me for facts my friend about the stinkin' war.
My limited myopic view is warped by blood and gore.
Where others see divisions poised in battle gear,
I see fourteen bodies, of friends I've known this year.
A locker standing empty—devoid of signs of life;
A tragic haunting letter from a forlorn wife.
Relentless plodding hands of time recording endless days
Wailing sirens cry at night for sight of morning's rays.
Raucous laughter, too much drink and talk of many flights.
And dreams of round-eyed girls you've known on much more pleasant nights.
My friend, my friend I say to you, "It's been my longest year!"
Emotions run the gamut from love to hate and fear.
But on my knees I'll thank my God no matter where I roam—
For He's the one who guided me, and saw me safely home.
—James Patrick McCarthy.

A HALF 'O WORLD FROM HOME

You wonder, my friend, what you're doing here,
A half 'o world from home.
Your wife left behind in a quandary of tears,
A half 'o world from home.
The world is home, but home is gone
And here you fight your war,
Among a land of strangers, alone among a crowd,
Alone as never before.
You read the words of the hawks and the doves,
They melt to a meaningless blur.
The issue, you see, is a personal one,
You can't avoid it sir.
Civilians think you started this mess
For personal pride and gain.
Where other wars spawned heroes, friend,
This one spawns disdain.
Your thoughts are upon the enemy,
Does he really exist?
A cancerous sceptre that shadows the land
And never may desist.
And then a buddy buys the farm
Nipped by a .30 cal.
A useless loss, you grieve for him
And toast your fallen pal.
You're a pawn in a living chess game
Doing your part each day,
Hanging in there and holding the line
In your insignificant way.

It all adds up to a bucket of worms
For the Communist way of life.
You've stemmed the tide without knowing it
As you head home to your wife.

A fifth of the world went Red, you see,
In the decade past World War Two,
But not an inch have they gained in years,
And partly 'cause of you.

So rest, my friend, and go in peace,
A half 'o world from home.
And rest assured you've done your share,
A half 'o world from home.

—James Patrick McCarthy.

REJECTION OF JUDGE HAYNSWORTH AND JUDGE CARSWELL

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the people of my congressional district are very much distressed that the Senate did not confirm President Nixon's nomination of Judge Carswell to the U.S. Supreme Court. The reaction throughout the State of Illinois is somewhat the same as in my congressional district.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD a statement I released last Friday on the rejection of Judge Haynsworth and Judge Carswell.

I am also inserting William S. White's column entitled, "Carswell Affair Is a Tragedy at American, Personal Levels," which appeared in the Washington Post of last Saturday.

The materials follow:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LESLIE C. ARENDS, REPUBLICAN, OF ILLINOIS, HOUSE MINORITY WHIP

I agree with President Nixon that this Senate will not approve any appointee to the Supreme Court, whatever his qualifications, if he is a "strict constructionist" and also from the South. He cannot be both and expect confirmation by the Senate as presently constituted.

If the appointee were a Southern liberal, acceptable to labor and the civil rights activists, he probably would be confirmed whether he had any judicial experience or not.

If he were a liberal from the North, he would probably meet all the requirements of this Senate so long as he was admitted to the bar.

If he were a "strict constructionist" from the North, this Senate would reluctantly confirm him provided he met the most rigid of every conceivable requirement as to character, ability, learning and experience.

President Nixon is determined to bring balance to the Supreme Court. It is to be regretted that he cannot accomplish this by a Southern appointment that the Court will have balance geographically as well as philosophically.

In the forthcoming elections the American people themselves will lend a hand in this objective by bringing balance in the Senate itself. The qualifications argument made against Judge Haynsworth and Judge Carswell, both experienced Federal jurists, was merely a cover up. The liberals are determined to resist President Nixon's efforts to have a Supreme Court that confines itself to its Constitutional function of interpreting the laws, not writing them.

CARSWELL AFFAIR IS A TRAGEDY AT AMERICAN, PERSONAL LEVELS

(By William S. White)

The Carswell affair is an American as well as a personal tragedy. This is the plain fact of the business when one strips away all the self-justifying flummery while simultaneously and readily conceding the presence here of a substantial measure of sincere and intellectually honest opposition.

For the Senate's rejection of Harrold Carswell of Florida for the Supreme Court, in the wake of its rejection of Clement Haynsworth of South Carolina, is far more than an unexampled rebuff to an American President.

In a judicial sense it amounts to notice, now twice given, that a Northern liberal coalition is determined to defeat every presidential effort to restore some kind of balance to a presently very liberal high bench—and implacably determined to bar any conservative who is also a Southerner.

In the social sense, it amounts to notice, now twice given, that this same coalition is equally resolved to frustrate a new administration's civil rights approach that has the novel purpose of ending a double standard on school integration by applying sanctions to North as well as South.

In the constitutional sense, it amounts to notice, now twice given that this coalition seeks, with the aid of labor and Negro leaders, to impose a practical veto upon the appointive power of the institution of the presidency itself.

In the human sense, what has occurred here will be seen in the South, even by moderate people, as a new effort to outlaw a whole region. Just as was Haynsworth, Carswell was pursued with a remorselessness reminding of the saddest lapse in the career of one of the great senators of history, Robert Taft of Ohio. Taft, at a time when he did not truly understand what Sen. Joseph McCarthy was really all about, advised that professional witch hunter that if one charge failed he should at once only put up another one.

This is what happened to Carswell, as it had happened to Haynsworth: If you can't get him at one point then find another point. Haynsworth, at the end, was destroyed because of alleged "insensitivity" in his private business affairs; at the end, was destroyed upon basically two indictments: He had many years ago had some tenuous connection with a segregated club—and many a senator solemnly voting against him has belonged or even now belongs to segregated clubs.

Again, it was said that Carswell's long record as a judge was "mediocre"—where many an appointee had sailed untouched through the Senate with no judicial experience whatever and not too much experience even at the bar, for that matter. One thinks of one of the best of current justices, Byron White, a nominee of President Kennedy who had been a local lawyer in Colorado and a star halfback in college.

The one true crime of Clement Haynsworth and Harrold Carswell was simply this: "Southern conservative." The one true crudity of the Senate was its lack of candor, except among a distinguished few who honestly thought Carswell not qualified and did not merely punish him obliquely for thinking the wrong thoughts.

To read of the "heroism" of those Northern urban Republicans who voted against Carswell is to laugh; it was far the safer course for them. And there will be more laughs when the President takes this thing to the country in this year's senatorial elections. It will be interesting to see how widely Sens. Albert Gore of Tennessee and Ralph Yarborough of Texas will advertise their valor down home, come November. Of course, both are only pseudo-Southerners in any case, and have long since gone in with the ultra-liberals. "Hero" is hardly the word for

them, either, since they had nowhere else to go.

Finally, what of the two pro-Carswell Republicans so long all but unanimously held up by the liberals—up to now—as “the consciences” of the Senate? Have John Cooper and George Aiken suddenly lost their sensitivity? This columnist thinks not.

THEME BASED ON ALEXANDER
POPE'S ESSAY ON MAN

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD an in-class theme by Miss Ashley Dahlgren of Oklahoma City. Miss Dahlgren's theme, based on a quotation from Alexander Pope's "Essay On Man," is written with real maturity of thought and is worthy of the attention of every Member of this House:

IN-CLASS THEME

(By Ashley Dahlgren)

(Assignment: Relate your essay to the following quotation from Alexander Pope's *Essay on Man*.)

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,

As to be hated needs but to be seen:

Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,

We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

VICE VERSUS THE UNITED STATES

The United States of America was founded with the purpose of constructing a nation in which people might live peacefully with a great amount of personal freedom. Every man was given the freedom to think, speak, and live the way he desired, as long as his actions did not infringe upon the rights of others. Throughout the history of this country, Americans have held their citizenship dear and have been willing to fight—even to risk their lives—for the preservation of peace and of the nation. Our country is envied by the world because it holds the primary status position among the great powers. However, in recent years another great power has vowed to destroy the United States. Their plan is intricate and designed to crumple the nation from within, using "social" weapons, instead of brute military force from without.

A speaker once said that when a country loses its morals, then it will also lose its strength, because the general apathetic condition that follows would be too great to overcome. This may seem illogical, but examination of our country's problems today would reveal data to support this idea. However, our problems are not unique. Every generation has been plagued with some sort of revolution, although the issues at hand have changed with the times. Each time destruction has seemed imminent, but somehow the pendulum has swung back the opposite way, correcting the condition the instant before it was to be too late. Will the decay that seems to be menacing our country today eventually reach its limit as the pendulum swings its farthest before changing direction? Or will our country indeed be conquered by the problems of modern times?

One of the enemy's weapons is vice. Vice is something that becomes less abominable as contact with it is made more frequently. Today, the movies often deal with subjects of sex, insurrection, prejudice, and other social "ills" of the country. Many are exag-

gerated, but they have the ability to condition man's mind to heretofore immoral and absolutely unpublicized social vices. As a result, most people today at least endure these films, while many actually have shown their support for such matter through attendance at the local "shows". Ideas have been presented and accepted. Occasionally, crime has been linked directly to a production because the production has presented an idea in such a way that an individual has actually placed himself in a fictitious role in the real world.

In all fairness, however, one cannot blame movies or other media alone. The gullibility of the populace and the frequency of vicious presentations (in a variety of situations) are the main factors supporting decay. According to Alexander Pope, "vice is a monster" when seen for the first time, but familiarity makes people "first endure, then pity, then embrace." Our country has passed the point of mere endurance. Many have begun to embrace that which they first condemned.

We, the people, need to notice the situation at hand. A country with social vices will not be able to withstand the conquest of greater "vices" or misuse of government processes. Our laws have begun to embrace the underprivileged and the criminal by protecting their rights through constitutional interpretation while often infringing upon the rights of others. However, these interpretations have not yet reached the point of being endured by the citizens. But these ideas are new, and should they become familiar, great catastrophe could fall upon the nation.

Although much of our nation's future looks bleak now, I believe the pendulum will swing back. I believe that the citizens will awake to the vicious problem at hand. Our country, although troubled, is still the greatest in the world; and until the line waiting to get out is longer than the line waiting to get in, we are still "okay".

WELFARE REFORM AND REVENUE
SHARING

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, with the Family Assistance Act of 1970 scheduled for consideration in the House of Representatives soon—possibly this week, I believe an article in the April issue of *Tax Review* by John G. Veneman, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is timely and informative. The article follows:

THE NEW FEDERALISM: FISCAL RELIEF FOR
THE STATES

(By John G. Veneman)

Legend has it that Ralph Waldo Emerson left his home in Concord, Massachusetts to travel to a mid-western meeting of world federalists in the mid-19th century. He grew increasingly irritated during the convocation, but when one speaker proposed that the capital of the world be Constantinople, he walked out, growling, "It's too far from Concord."

Many Americans feel that their national government is "too far from Concord" today. The predominant direction of change in American government over the past three decades has been toward centralization of authority created by the need for a total national response to World War I, the depression of the 30's and World War II. The flow of power from the states to Washing-

ton continued in the 50's and 60's as the government initiated scores of new programs and devoted billions of dollars to healing the wounds of a deeply divided America.

In its 16 years of existence, the budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for public service programs has mushroomed from \$2.5 billion to \$60 billion and the services it provides to meet human needs have been upgraded and extended to a point never before contemplated.

But a concomitant result has been the dehumanization of government . . . a hardening of the arteries of communications between the government and the governed.

When President Nixon first discussed his domestic programs last April, he pointed out what he considered to be the country's most pressing need:

"If there is one thing we know, it is that the Federal government cannot solve all the nation's problems by itself; yet, there has been an overshift of jurisdiction and responsibility to the Federal government. We must kindle a new partnership between government and the people and among the various levels of government."

The need for such a new partnership has never been more apparent. The limits to the Federal government's effectiveness have become increasingly obvious. The country's problems have resisted Federal solutions, while the fiscal ability of state and local government to provide solutions has depreciated.

Consider these facts:

The traditional mainstays of state and local finances have been property and sales taxes. These taxes lag 40-50 percent behind the rate of growth in state-local expenditures.

The mainstays of the Federal Treasury are the personal and corporate income taxes. These taxes tend to be more equitable and grow rapidly, as much as 25-50 percent faster than the economy.

The result is what President Nixon has called a "fiscal mismatch" and its cumulative impact is illustrated by recent experience with State tax laws.

More than half of all state tax revenues during the 1950-67 period were the result of rate increases or the enactment of entirely new taxes.

Over 200 rate increases were required in major state taxes between 1959 and 1967.

More than 4/5 of the state legislatures which met early last year faced requests for tax rate increases.

Yet, the services the public demands of state and local governments . . . education, environmental control, transportation, health and welfare programs . . . have often been beyond the capacity of their resources.

The Federal government has not been oblivious to these problems. Through grants-in-aid, over \$25 billion were passed to state and local governments in FY 1969. But the offspring of grants-in-aid has been an ever-growing maze of program restrictions, formulas, matching provisions, project approval requirements and administrative burdens . . . a bureaucratic monster of grand proportions.

The President has accepted the challenge of reform. Last August, he announced a program of "New Federalism in which power, funds, and responsibility will flow from Washington to the states and to the people."

In separate speeches, he proposed two interrelated programs—welfare reform and revenue sharing—which reflect the belief of the Administration that the Federal government should do what it can do best and that state and local governments should be strengthened to do what they do best. Providing basic cash assistance and Food Stamps to the poor is a task which the Federal government can accomplish efficiently and equitably by bringing to bear its vast reve-

nue collecting capabilities. On the other hand, providing social services to people is typically a task which requires state and local talent and administrative capability.

Both revenue sharing and welfare reform, as proposed by President Nixon, provide needed fiscal relief to state and local governments. In the first year under the proposed Family Assistance Plan (FAP), the Federal government would begin to turn the tide away from rising state costs by absorbing a portion of those costs. These savings, combined with revenue sharing, would provide a considerable and rising amount of resource support for state and local governments.

COSTS OF PROGRAMS DOUBLE TO \$6 BILLION

The inadequacies of the present system are most evident in the recent increases in costs and caseloads. In the 60's, total costs of the four federally-aided welfare programs more than doubled to a level now of about \$6 billion per year. The number of beneficiaries of the four programs rose from 5.8 million in 1960, to a total of 10.2 million in June 1969.

In all of the adult categories, the aged, blind and disabled, the caseloads increased only about 3.5 percent in the last year. The major problems in these categories are very low benefits in some states and lack of uniformity of eligibility requirements.

The President's program for the aged, blind, and disabled would establish for the first time a Federal floor . . . \$110 per month . . . of combined income and assistance which would be assured to adult recipients in any state. The most substantial fiscal relief would be realized by those 30 states which presently pay more than \$110 per month in benefits.

Most of the controversy over welfare centers around another Federal program . . . Aid to Families with Dependent Children. What began as a benevolent program to aid "nice widows" and their children has become a burgeoning population of 6.1 million people. Costs have more than tripled since 1960, and the number of recipients has more than doubled.

Prospects for the future show no likelihood of relief from the present upward spiral. Conservative estimates show that AFDC costs will double again by FY 1975, and caseloads will increase by 50-60 percent.

The present AFDC program embodies several fundamental inequities.

First, children of a parent who had died, is incapacitated, or is absent from the home, are eligible in all states. Those with an unemployed father are eligible in about half the states. Those with a father employed full-time are not eligible in any state. Many men in this last group—the "under-employed"—work full-time, but still earn less than is available to families on welfare. The exclusion of these working poor is a central structural defect of the system since it creates a powerful economic incentive for a father to leave home so the state may better support his family. It undermines the rewards of work and peoples' willingness to work.

Second, it is characterized by unjustifiable discrepancies between regions of the country . . . with no national standards for benefit levels, AFDC payments vary now from an average of \$39 per month for a family of four in Mississippi to \$263 or such a family in New Jersey.

Third, the present system discourages the move from welfare to work by cutting benefits too fast and too much as earnings begin.

Fourth, families headed by "unemployed fathers"—defined by regulation as those working no more than 30 hours per week—are eligible in only half of the states. In those states, a father will be better off working, so long as he doesn't work more than 30 hours

per week. He will then receive supplementary welfare benefits.

With these points in mind, the Administration started during the transition period to develop a Family Assistance Plan (FAP) which would abolish these inequities and meet the major goals of providing the minimum degree of income support for those who cannot support themselves, providing maximum incentives for recipients to begin working and to sustain the effort of those who are now working, and relieving the states and localities of some of their financial burdens. The total Federal cost for all proposals in the Family Assistance Act is \$4.4 billion per year. This is the new cost of the program and is in addition to the \$3.2 billion spent on welfare in 1968. The Family Assistance Plan tries explicitly to achieve those goals in a complementary way.

For the first time, it purposes a national floor under welfare payments of \$1,600 per year for a family of four with no other income. Although these payments would be insufficient to support families without other sources of income, they nevertheless represent a substantial improvement in the level of payments now made in eight states.

PLAN WOULD ALSO REACH UNDER-EMPLOYED WORKER

Unlike the present program of AFDC, the new plan would expand and mandate for the first time benefit supplements to all American families headed by a full-time but "under-employed" male worker. No state today provides assistance to a family headed by a father who is working full time . . . even though the family may be living in poverty. This is the group of some 2 to 3 million families which we call the "working poor."

The Federal benefits would also be provided throughout the nation to families headed by a mother or an unemployed father. Today such assistance is available in only 25 of 54 jurisdictions. Eligibility of the working poor for assistance and a nationwide program for families headed by unemployed and "under-employed" fathers are the critical steps toward eliminating the harshest inequities of the present system. Without including the working poor, fundamental improvement of the work and family stability incentives is impossible.

Generally, assistance benefits would be reduced \$1 for each \$2 of earned income that the family has. This kind of offset would provide an in-pocket financial incentive for the family to work and increase its earnings, and would continue until the family of four had reached an income level of \$3,920 per year.

As an additional work incentive, and to cover the costs of going to work, the first \$180 of earnings in a calendar quarter (\$720 per year) would be completely excluded or disregarded in determining the amount of payments for a family.

The new system is designed to fulfill the mandate of the President that government has "no less of an obligation to the working poor than to the nonworking poor; and for the first time, benefits would be scaled in such a way that it would always pay to work."

The built-in guarantee that people would always be better off by working would be bolstered by strong work requirements in the system itself. Failure to register or accept a suitable job or training opportunity would result in termination of the individual's benefits.

All able-bodied adult family members would be subject to these provisions, with certain defined exceptions such as mothers with children under six years of age or mothers where the father is present in the home as the primary worker.

The Administration felt it was critical to maximize the incentives and require-

ments for work, both for those on welfare and for those working people who are likely to enter the welfare population.

To make the work incentives and requirements effective, the program contains proposals for a major expansion of job training, employment child care programs and vocational rehabilitation services. In this last category, whether afflicted by a minor or major disability, the Secretary would refer the individual to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation for specialized individual attention. Over \$600 million is being requested for these elements, of which \$386 million is for the child care component.

Under the Administration's proposed welfare reform system, all states would receive some fiscal relief. In addition to basic payments, the Federal government would supplement 30 percent of state payments over \$1,600 per year for a family of four. The plan guarantees that no state will spend more than they would if the present welfare program continued in effect.

Because the plan contains a build-on savings mechanism for the states, it might be considered an efficient and substantial means of monetary relief for the states. This is not its primary purpose. State fiscal relief is simply a by-product of structural reform of the welfare system for under the Family Assistance Plan, the amount of relief enjoyed by the states and localities is not necessarily related to the tax base of that state. Relief through structural reform is unrelated to any such equitable distribution and is not the best mechanism for revenue sharing.

For this reason, the President in a special address to Congress on August 13, 1969, announced a separate plan for revenue sharing.

In doing so, he made it clear that the success of revenue sharing depends upon the restructuring of welfare. For, if the burdens of the present welfare system remain, and the state must continue to support them, the increased elasticity of the tax base encouraged by revenue sharing is negated by the rising costs of welfare.

Revenue sharing would provide both the encouragement and the resources for local and state officials to exercise leadership in solving their own problems and make the overall tax structure of the nation more equitable. The proposal contains four major elements:

The amount to be shared will be a percentage of personal taxable income;

The allocation of the fund will be made on a basis of each state's share of national population adjusted for that state's revenue effort;

The allocation of a state's share among its units of local government will be established by a prescribed formula; and

The administrative requirements will be kept to a minimum.

The revenue sharing proposal is expected to return to the states some \$5 billion, or one percent of the personal income tax base, per year "without Federal strings" by FY 1976. Because specific functions will not be designated for these federally shared funds, there is no way to be certain how they will be spent, but an analysis of existing state and local budgets does provide some clues. It can be expected that education which consistently takes over two-fifths of all state and local revenues, will be the major beneficiary of the new funds.

Together, the Family Assistance Plan and the revenue sharing package can give to the states fiscal relief which will hopefully allow them room for state initiative in solving some of the social problems which they face.

As the President has said, "the investment in these proposals is a human investment." If we fail to radically alter a faltering machine at this point in time, we will pay for our mistakes many times over in the future

MAJ. GEN. JAMES E. RUDDER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Houston Chronicle for March 25, 1970, eulogizing the late Maj. Gen. James Earl Rudder, president of Texas A. & M. University and former classmate of mine at that institution. Earl Rudder was known nationwide and his loss will be felt both in academic and military circles alike.

The editorial follows:

JAMES EARL RUDDER

The death of Maj. Gen. James Earl Rudder at 59 ends a life that was the embodiment of the American dream. His athletic prowess, his valor in battle, his success as a rancher and businessman, public servant, civic leader and educator placed him in the mold of a Horatio Alger hero. Whatever the task or the challenge, he accepted it and did well.

When great men pass, society is the loser. So it is with Gen. Rudder. Those who knew him or his deeds mourn the loss of this man.

Gen. Rudder served as major of Brady from 1946 to 1953, when he was named to a two-year term on the State Board of Public Welfare. In 1955, Gov. Allan Shivers named Rudder land commissioner. He served until Feb. 1, 1958, when he resigned to become vice-president of Texas A & M University in College Station.

As a soldier, he was highly decorated during World War II. He was the recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross, the nation's second highest military award. In 1967, President Johnson presented him the Distinguished Service Medal, this nation's highest peacetime honor.

As the commander of the Provisional Ranger Force, Gen. Rudder gained lasting fame on D-Day, 1944, when he led a select force up the 100-foot cliffs at Pointe du Hoc, France. This action played a decisive part in the success of the Normandy landing. Gen. Rudder was twice wounded in bringing off the difficult mission against fantastic odds.

In December of that year, he was given command of the 28th Division's 109th Infantry Regiment, later involved in fighting during the Battle of the Bulge in Belgium.

In 1954 he was promoted to brigadier general in the Army Reserve and the next year named commander of the 90th Infantry Reserve Division. In 1957 he was made major general. In 1963 he left the 90th to become assistant deputy commanding general for mobilization of the Continental Army Command. In the summer of 1967 he retired from the Army, ending a 35-year career.

For his undergraduate gridiron feats, Sports Illustrated magazine named him to its 1956 Silver Anniversary All-American football team.

Gen. Rudder's death is a particularly severe blow to Texas A&M. Gen. Rudder was more than just the president of the Texas A&M University System. He was an Aggie himself. He graduated in 1932 with a bachelor of science degree in industrial education and a reserve commission as a second lieutenant of infantry.

Moreover, he became president of the school in July, 1959, at a time when it was at an ebb, troubled with divisiveness. He ended the factionalism, rekindled school spirit, eliminated student unrest and focused the energies of the school on the continued improvement of education. With typical

mental and physical vigor, he led Texas A&M to its finest days.

His death at a relatively early age is especially sorrowful since the school's period of greatest achievement—due partly to his personal work and vision—lies ahead.

Not only Texas A&M but American colleges and universities throughout this nation need leaders and friends of the stature of Gen. Rudder. And they are rare.

PATRIOTISM DEFINED

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, patriotism, in some quarters, has suffered from a severe redefinition—one that discourages its public expression and causes it to be spoken of in low tones and only to proven friends. What a shame that this distortion of a most basic value should have occurred in our great Nation.

Yet, some may claim that patriotism can be expressed in many ways. While this may be true, some of these ways seem utterly strange and alien to those persons who have the courage to speak forthrightly about their country rather than in phrases coined to fit a fad.

I was recently impressed by a refreshing and clear expression of patriotism—one that resulted from a searching inquiry into the recesses of one's heart and mind—and one that does not hesitate to say, "I love my country and I'll tell you why."

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD, a speech recently delivered by Leonard M. Shane, president of the National Customs Brokers and Forwarders Association of America, on his view of patriotism in America:

PATRIOTISM

Fellow Americans, fellow veterans, my remarks are highly personal for I consider that patriotism is a personal emotion. Therefore, I am honored to be able to address you today but at the same time I am somewhat embarrassed to discuss what have been my private thoughts.

Men have created many beautiful works of art—some of the greatest of these I have been privileged to see and to admire the world over. But no other thing that man has made gives me the thrill and the excitement that I feel when I see my flag, the flag of our country, our star spangled banner. Its brilliant colors, its shape, its design are to my eyes a thing of never-ending beauty.

Yet, I ask myself, Are red and white and blue any more beautiful colors than green or yellow or any other color? Do not men of equally critical faculty admire their own national flags as much? If I am an honest man, must I therefore not admit that my flag is beautiful to me because my eyes see the symbol but my heart and mind see something else beyond? Without doubt it is the love of country which makes us admire our flag, and without doubt when we pay our reverent respects to our flag, we try to express our attitude towards our country.

Our country! The country we love. The wondrous, rich, bountiful land which by grace of God we were born in. The land to which by His grace, and by our courage and intelligence or that of our forefathers, we

migrated. It is a lovely land. No river or valley exceeds in majesty that of our own Hudson. No seacoast is superior in beauty to that of Maine, nor beaches to those of Cape Cod, nor mountains to the Grand Tetons. One could catalog our nation's natural wonders for hours. It is easy to love the beautiful handiwork of nature we find here—it is easy to love our remarkable land. But, stop now—what of the sights of other countries that I have seen—the towering Alps, the Mediterranean coasts, the rolling green fields of England and of Ireland. Surely these are beautiful too. It cannot be only the land of America that I love, for the wonders of nature are everywhere in the world.

Perhaps it is the works of my fellow men I see about me which inspire my admiration—this towering city, our institutions, museums and universities, our places of worship, our public monuments such as this magnificent building in which we are assembled. I admire so many of them, and I am proud to see what my countrymen have built. But, my friends, there is Paris, London, and Rome—there are the wondrous remains of Ancient Greece, and, in all truth, what we have made here may be bigger or different and we may prefer it to what men have created elsewhere because it is our creation, but it is hard indeed to say that ours is better in the absolute sense than that which other men have created elsewhere.

Perhaps my love of country is based upon the beauty of our people—but in truth our people are but the immediate descendants, and in many cases of the same generation, as their brothers and sisters of other continents. We do not have our own language. Most of our customs are not our own. Our people are vigorous and creative and have that special spirit which is "American". But all in all we are not native to this land. We are native to the whole world. They are us, and we are they.

Our form of government is surely to my preference. I like the fact that I can speak my mind and vote secretly as I choose. I cherish the right to believe or not to believe as I choose, to worship as I choose, to aspire as my imagination leads me. I value the security of my home and I feel that it is secure. I value the knowledge that the corner cop is there to protect me, the certainty that our citizen armed forces are our defenders—the mighty arm of civilian government, the knowledge that our courts presume every man innocent of wrongdoing until proven guilty, the sense of government by the people for the people which finds each public official to be at once a citizen like me and a man of conscience, and a servant of the people. The entire fabric of democratic government chosen by a free and educated electorate is necessary to me. Yet, the citizens of Great Britain, the Scandinavian countries, France, our Canadian neighbors and many others in today's world have a basically similar atmosphere of government.

I ask myself then, what is it that makes an American love his country? What should he love about it? Why do I?

It is the *idea* of it. Not the symbols, not the flag, not just the land, nor the things we have wrought, nor our people who are our partners during these brief years we have on earth, but the totality of the *idea* of America which is unique and precious and superior to any other *idea* of nationality that has existed and survived.

Thomas Jefferson and the founders of our country summed it up better than I can.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

This is what we fought for in war. This is what we worked for in peace. This is what Americans have died for on battlefields

around the world. This is what Americans live for and work for at all times.

Friends, I thank you for inviting me to speak to you on this important occasion because it has given me an opportunity to consider seriously these matters which we tend to forget during our busy daily lives. Fellow citizens, I repeat—patriotism is a personal matter, and I admonish myself as follows (for I do not presume to suggest to others), I admonish myself: Wave the flag for the sake of the pleasure it may give you, but remember the republic for which it stands. Work for the ideals of that republic, for much remains to be accomplished. Love your country—be proud of its heroes—but do what you can to make their sacrifices worthwhile. Regretfully, the dead are dead, no pomp or circumstance can affect them or bring them back. So, think of their families, think of their loved ones, think of their ideals. Think of those who are fighting for our country today on foreign fields, think of their loved ones and those who love them. Think of all our living fellow Americans everywhere who need us. Think of the living who are in pain, or in want, or who suffer injustice. And thus remembering, let me express my appreciation of the privilege of being an American not alone by my thoughts or by my words, but my deeds of every day.

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS: 2,500 A MONTH AND RISING FAST

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Virginia Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, in an article in the March 23 Republican Congressional Newsletter, discusses the problems and complexities that her office deals with. She writes of the many complaints her office receives and the way in which they are handled. For those who wish to know a little more about the Office of Consumer Affairs, I certainly recommend this personalized "birds-eye view":

CONSUMER COMPLAINTS: 2,500 A MONTH AND RISING FAST

(By Virginia H. Knauer)

The key to obtaining effective consumer protection legislation, adequately funded programs and qualified personnel, is full participation at the grass-roots level by consumers. If you have a complaint, let somebody know it.

"Write your Congressman" is an old piece of advice. In actual practice, however, there is no one outside of your own family who is as sensitive to your troubles as your Congressman. To be a bit cynical, he cannot afford to lose your vote through inaction. If enough constituents get up in arms over consumer fraud, you can be sure your Congressman will respond or face the threat of unemployment at the next election. A few voters can't do the job, but a few thousand can.

My own consumer mail has doubled in the past year. I am receiving more than 2,500 complaints a month. One fourth of my mail is from members of Congress, and the total number is growing rapidly.

In January, we began a system we hope will enable us to give real help to consumers. We are now personally contacting the manufacturer on behalf of individual consumers when we believe that consumer has a legitimate complaint.

So far, the results have been better than we had anticipated. The number of letters marked "complaint resolved" is increasing daily. The response of company presidents to our requests for assistance has been characterized for the most part by cooperation.

Since many of the problems consumers have are with local businesses, we asked the American Society of Association Executives to contact all its consumer-related associations, approximately 3,200, with a request that they aid us in passing on complaints to their members.

We have already heard from over 200. And the number of positive replies is increasing at the rate of about 10 to 15 more each day.

Smart top executives want to learn about these problems because it gives them a better insight into their product, the operations of their franchises, and the efficiency of their complaint-answering services.

They are finding out that when only computers handle complaints, they are increasing consumer frustration in the marketplace.

Of course we have run across a few dinosaurs—businessmen who refuse to act on legitimate consumer complaints.

Right now one of our success files is about as thick as the Manhattan telephone directory. And that file covers only one month.

One of the objectives of our new system is to help break down the communication barrier so often existing now between business and consumers. Anyone who has tried to return a product with a money-back guarantee knows what I mean. Witness the growth in computer-answered mail. People are sometimes four times removed from the manufacturers of the products they buy.

While I am very proud of the progress of my office, in solving consumer complaints, I must stress that, when possible, consumers should first try to solve their problems at the local level.

This is also where the Republican Party organization and Republican women's councils can effectively and dramatically demonstrate their concern for consumers and their problems. They can seize the initiative by lobbying for stronger local or state consumer-protection bureaus, more laws, and adequate funding.

A fine example for us all has been set by the "Action Now" program started by Elly Peterson in Detroit's inner city. And six other Republican Action Centers are also functioning now in Southgate, Mich., Hartford and New Haven, Conn., Milwaukee, Wis., Dallas, Tex., and Albany, N.Y.

These Centers, which I hope will eventually be established in every major city, can make invaluable contributions to the improvement of our present consumer-protection system. By solving problems at the community level, not only can consumers receive personal help but also the speedy service which can sometimes be so crucial.

To quote Rep. Rogers Morton, Republican National Committee Chairman: "The city is the heart of the problem—and that's where we Republicans ought to be."

A LEGISLATIVE WAY TO SAVE THE "QUEEN"

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced legislation to continue one of our country's great traditions. Only by action of the Congress can we keep this tradition alive.

I refer to the *Delta Queen*—a paddle wheel riverboat—the only overnight passenger vessel left on our rivers. She is the last of her class and if Congress fails to act, she will be forced into retirement and another of our great American traditions will have passed from the scene. If that happens it will mean the end of nearly 160 years of paddle wheel history in this country and particularly on the Mississippi River.

Under legislation enacted in the 89th Congress—Public Law 89-777—certain standards for the safe operation of deep-draft cruise vessels were enacted into law. Inadvertently, it seems, this legislation was made broad enough to include passenger vessels carrying overnight passengers and operating in our inland rivers and waterways.

This original legislation gave the inland water passenger vessel owners a short period of time to permit the companies involved to assess their situation. As a result, one company operating on the Great Lakes went out of business, ceasing all its operations. The last remaining company, Greene Line Steamers, Inc., the owners and operators of the *Delta Queen* decided to attempt to build a new vessel and thus continue its operations. An extension of time was enacted by the Congress in 1968—Public Law 90-435—allowing the *Delta Queen* to continue operating until November 1970.

This extension was granted in order to permit the owners and operators of the *Delta Queen* to have time to design and construct a new vessel to replace the original *Queen*.

The owners and operators of the *Delta Queen* found, to their dismay, that with the rise in the costs of construction, material, and labor, under competitive bidding, a new replacement vessel would cost in excess of \$10 million, instead of the \$4 million—not to exceed \$6 million—which had been estimated. This is believed by all to be prohibitive.

Therefore, unless the Congress takes action, the last overnight passenger steamer operating on the rivers will have to cease such operations by November 1, 1970.

This is distressing not only to me but to thousands of persons throughout the country. As a young girl, I remember with pleasure overnight trips on the river on vessels similar to the *Delta Queen*. I have received letters, cards, telegrams, and all other forms of communication from every part of this country from people who have traveled on the *Queen*, urging that something be done to keep it in operation. Those who have written me have ranged from youngsters to oldsters, from every walk of life.

Later this week the *Delta Queen* is scheduled to arrive in Hannibal, Mo., the famous river hometown of Mark Twain, on its last trip to that area unless a reprieve is granted. The citizens of that area, as well as my home city of St. Louis, and the citizens from other river towns across the country, do not want to see the cessation of this great tradition.

They feel, as I do, that special consideration should be given since these inland passenger vessels are never more

than a few yards from any shore, presently meet certain Coast Guard safety standards, and are frequently operated in water no deeper than the middle of the ship.

The legislation which I have introduced today would except the *Delta Queen* from Public Law 89-777 and would permit the continuation of the great tradition of overnight passenger service to river cities on the Mississippi, Ohio, Illinois, and other rivers.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION, MANPOWER, AND RESEARCH, INC.

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, in 1969, a unique effort was begun in Texas to meet the tremendous future manpower shortages this country faces. The Construction Industry Council for Education, Manpower, and Research, Inc., formed to serve the interests of all components of the construction industry, and the Texas Education Agency, the State agency charged with the supervision and administration of the State's public education programs, have begun pilot programs designed to teach young people through vocational-technical education the excitement and skills required in order to be employed in mechanical construction.

The course is designed to meet the interest and the ability of the students and the skills learned are geared to available jobs. The course called "Environmental Technology" takes 4 years and will be offered in grades 9 through 12. Basically, it consists of:

Ninth Grade—a 1-hour vocational exploratory class in which the students are counseled in the many occupational opportunities, taken on field trips, tests for aptitude, and counseled by businessmen from the industry on career opportunities.

Tenth Grade—a 2- or 3-hour pre-employment laboratory in plumbing and pipefitting.

Eleventh Grade—a 2- or 3-hour pre-employment laboratory in air conditioning, heating, and refrigeration.

Twelfth Grade—regular industrial cooperative training and distributive education classes, on-the-job training selected in keeping with the students' interest, aptitude, and educational achievements.

Burbank Junior High School in Houston, Tex., has begun the program and the 10th grade section will begin in Sam Houston High School next fall. Other Texas school districts participating in the pilot classes are McAllen, Harlandale, and North East school districts in San Antonio, Irving, Beaumont, Dallas, and Tyler.

Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that unemployment can be eradicated if a unified approach to job training were instituted. One important factor—if not the

most important factor—in this approach is the bringing together of the resources of industry, labor, education, and all levels of government in programs that will provide young people with functional training in needed new skills. This pilot program that is beginning in Texas is such a program and has my full support.

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF HARLAN CLEVELAND, EIGHTH PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most stirring speeches that I have had the opportunity to read is the one delivered by President Harlan Cleveland at his recent inauguration as the eighth president of the University of Hawaii.

The inaugural address is noteworthy not only for its superb literary style, but also for the profound message which it has for all Americans.

President Cleveland took note of the significance of Hawaii's very special experience in achieving cultural equality and racial peace. He related this experience in a most meaningful way to the larger world society, and stated that it was his hope that the University of Hawaii would continue to be known in the 1970's for openness and for cross-cultural tolerance. But most of all, he said, "I hope it will be known as a center for thinking."

Dr. Cleveland is an outstanding educator and administrator, and he will no doubt play an important role in shaping educational policy in the 50th State—and indeed the entire Pacific area—during the new decade. Envisioning Hawaii's role as one that could "cut the pattern for elsewhere," he stated—

Part of Hawaii's destiny, then, is to be an entrepot for intelligent people, a mecca for intellectual tourism, a center for international training, a laboratory for cross-cultural operations, technology assessment, environmental planning and the public management of problem-solving.

I commend Dr. Cleveland's inaugural address to my colleagues in Congress and to others who are concerned with the future course of higher education in this era of rapid change and crisis. The March 18, 1970, speech by President Harlan Cleveland of the University of Hawaii follows for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(By Harlan Cleveland)

This is a funny kind of job. In every other form of employment, they swear you in first and then put you to work. But in academic administration it's the other way around. They put you to work, and tell you to organize your own swearing-in. Maybe they want to make sure you survive the first few months before they have to buy all that champagne.

Even the compliments and congratulations are mildly equivocal, with mental reservations—as in the exchange of compliments between Winston Churchill and George Bernard Shaw before the opening of one of

Shaw's plays. Shaw began it by writing to Churchill, enclosing two tickets to the opening and inviting Churchill to bring a friend, as he put it; "if you have a friend." Churchill promptly replied that he was busy on opening night, but would appreciate a pair of tickets to the play's second night, as he put it, "if there is a second night."

Well, I can certainly say that I have more friends in Hawaii than I had a year ago; I hardly knew anybody in Hawaii then. And here I am six months and 18 days on the payroll already, being "inaugurated." It's no longer opening night, yet this must by definition be the beginning of something. What is it the beginning of?

For me, this is the beginning of an association with a congenial people in a precious environment—a first full taste of Aloha, that spirit which is impossible to define but equally impossible not to feel. This is also my introduction to a State which really believes in education—students who believe in education, a faculty that believes in education, alumni and parents who believe in education, Regents who believe in education—and political leaders who, together with the people they represent, genuinely want a first-rate system of public higher education in the State of Hawaii. In six months and 18 days, I have yet to meet a leader of any political persuasion who thinks it good politics to campaign against education. I will not detain you by reading the long list of American States in which the Presidents of the public universities cannot make that claim.

A visitor in my office the other day asked what I hoped the University of Hawaii would be known for, during the time I am here. I suppose that anyone with pretensions to be an educator has some private image of what the people who touch his school should take away with them. Some of these desired outcomes are universal among universities: both Johns Hopkins and the University of Hawaii hope that they can help students discover their hearts, develop their minds, and add to the range of their imaginations. We even join in hoping that they will find interesting jobs and happy marriages. But each of us is bound to have some special ambitions for his own institution. So here are some personal hopes of mine for the kind of place the University of Hawaii can be.

First of all, I hope that in the 1970's the University of Hawaii is known as an experience in openness—its campuses open to a free market in ideas, the open minds of its students and their teachers grappling together with the mysteries, the uncertainties, and the dilemmas of science and society.

Our doors of admission will be open too. Go out on the streets of Honolulu and ask the first adult you see which of his children is going to college. I'll guarantee you an argumentative response. "All of my children are going to college" he or she will probably reply.

In these islands, the State Legislature has already, in effect, declared a policy of "open admissions" to the University of Hawaii.

II

My second hope is that the University of Hawaii can continue to be a very special experience in cross-cultural humility and tolerance.

Every one who comes to live in Hawaii must be impressed, as I am, by the variety of its peoples and their comparatively tolerant attitudes toward one another. But on closer inspection, paradise seems based on paradox: the tolerance is not despite the variety but because of it.

For it is not through the disappearance of distinctions in a melting pot that Hawaii has achieved a level of cultural equality and racial peace with few parallels around our discriminatory globe. Quite the contrary: the glory is that each of Hawaii's main ethnic groups retained or developed enough pride,

enough self-confidence, and enough sense of its cultural history—in a word, enough distinctiveness of its own—to establish its right to be separate. And this group separateness was, paradoxically, the first step in establishing the rights of the individuals in each group to equality with people of different racial aspect, different ethnic background, and different cultural heritage.

Perhaps after all the Hawaii experience is not so different from the transatlantic migration of the various more or less white Caucasians. On their way into New York they read a sign on the Statue of Liberty: "Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me." But on arrival they didn't melt into open arms of the white Anglo-Saxon Protestants who preceded them. Quite the contrary: each new arrival glued himself to his own kind, shared the religion and language and humor and discriminatory treatment with his soul-brothers, and gravitated into occupations which didn't too seriously threaten the jobs of earlier-arriving ethnic groups.

In Hawaii as on the East Coast, waves of new Americans and older Americans have been thrown together in the tides of democracy, and have learned in time to tolerate each other—first as groups and only thereafter as individuals. As they rubbed against one another in an urbanizing America, they gradually discovered not just the easy old Christian lesson that all men are brothers, but the hard new multi-cultural lesson that all brothers are different.

So maybe the lesson from both Atlantic and Pacific migrations is that each ethnic group must first find its own identity, before the members of other ethnic groups will treat its members as individual human beings—as respected, valued citizens of a common polity—as brothers who are different and therefore brothers.

The lesson of Hawaii has plenty of modern relevance. The lesson has to be that black Americans who want to establish their blackness and glory in it are on the right track. It is important that a black child knows where he comes from, relives the history of his forefathers, feels the shame of historical failures and the pride of historic contributions, uses the flexible English language in ways that are distinctive, and brings to the forceful attention of all Americans that the various colors called black can be beautiful. Only when the distinction is fully accepted, will mutual tolerance likely follow—that, it seems, is the general meaning of Hawaii's very special experience.

For equality is not the product of similarity. It is the cheerful acknowledgment of difference.

Here in Hawaii, we have an incomparable opportunity to honor a wide variety of differences—and put them to work in higher education. I hope that it will be said of a University of Hawaii degree that its holder seems better able than other Americans to function across the barriers of color and culture; that he knows his own workways and his own outlook are not a valid standard by which the workways and outlooks of others are to be judged—and always found wanting.

We need not be embarrassed, as newcomers sometimes are, to list among Hawaii's natural resources the quality of aloha, which is another name for love. "Some day," says Teilhard de Chardin, "after mastering the winds, the waves, the tides and the force of gravity, we shall harness the energies of Love, and then, for the second time in the history of the world, man will have discovered fire."

III

Our best laboratory of practical aloha is right here on the Manoa campus and the other campuses of the University, the eight we have now and the two we are looking for

this year. The University of Hawaii has the broadest ethnic and cultural mix of any American university; visiting academic consultants have recently praised the quality and dedication of its faculty; some outside experts credit our students with an unusual motivation for education.

This faculty, these students, and the administrators who are here because the faculty and students are here, will have to make together some far-reaching judgments—about what is learned and how, and about the management of our burgeoning campuses.

Our cultural diversity gives us a special opportunity to broaden the participation in University decision-making, and a special obligation to devise a system of governance, which matches participation to responsibility.

Academic faculties have traditionally dealt with faculty problems, students with student problems, and administrators with anything left over—which too often includes the most excruciating dilemmas and the most unanswerable questions. Without derogating from the elected organs of faculty and student governance, I think there is a place for a broader organization of representatives with whom the Regents and I can share the ethical dilemmas, the judgments about priorities, and the visions of future opportunities affecting the University as a whole. I will therefore suggest soon the framework for a University of Hawaii Conference—not a one-shot meeting but an on-going broadly representative group to help in developing consensus on all-University issues.

IV

I have said that I hope the University of Hawaii will be known in the Seventies for openness and for cross-cultural tolerance. But most of all I hope it will be known as a center for thinking.

"Thinking," said Josiah Royce, "is like loving and dying. Each of us must do it for himself." Yet the thinking the world needs most is done by the dozens, by the hundreds, sometimes by the thousands of educated people, working in groups to solve problems so complex that no individual can presume to tackle them alone. The great issues of our time—the organization of world order, the deterrence of ecological disaster, the achievement of a quantum jump in the quality of life will yield only to the organized application of human brainwork. There is no reason why a disproportionate share of that brainwork should not be done in our pleasant surroundings, and there is no reason why we cannot keep our surroundings pleasant.

Without posing as an instant oracle on Hawaii in the year 2000 or any other year the futurists want to pick, I do have an idea that a very large part of Hawaii's future role depends on the excellence of Hawaii's University. Hawaii's attractive environment—if we can keep it that way—will attract more and more people who think for a living—if we already have here a "critical mass" of bright and creative thinkers.

The smokeless think-industries—a more enduring asset than some agricultural products, a more stable economic asset than mass tourism or military spending—cluster around good universities. If we can keep the first-rate thinkers who are here, and get a good many others to join them, Hawaii is a "natural" headquarters for organizations which can do their thinking anywhere, just so the surroundings are congenial and the intellectual company stimulating.

Part of Hawaii's destiny, then, is to be an entrepot for intelligent people, a mecca for intellectual tourism, a center for international training, a laboratory for cross-cultural operations, technology assessment, environmental planning, and the public management of problem-solving.

There will be a thirsty market for organized brainwork in the years before and after 2000—of that there can be no doubt. Never has our destiny had less to do with the

specialized search for knowledge; never has it hung so clearly on the capacity of men and women to encompass in their thinking the situation as a whole. Only the poets have captured the drama of this moment, as Christopher Fry does in a "A Sleep of Prisoners".

"The frozen misery of centuries breaks, cracks, begins to move,

The thunder is the thunder of the fates,
The thaw, the flood, the upstart Spring.
Thank God our time is now when wrong
Comes up to face us everywhere,
Never to leave us till we take
The longest stride of soul men ever took
Affairs are now soul size."

Our affairs in Hawaii are soul size, because what we do here can cut the pattern for elsewhere, on the big island of North America and the bigger island of Eurasia. As we plan ahead there is no difficulty finding an enormous role for Hawaii; the problem will be to live up to the education requirements of that role.

That is why this State is so wise to bet so heavily on the academic excellence of the University of Hawaii. Governor Burns in his talk at our Interim Session last January, said it all in one sentence: "If education isn't booming, nothing will."

V

New friends and new colleagues, a good many extravagant things have been said about me this week. I am grateful to their authors, and I shall treasure them all, to remember on the days when the things being said will be less flattering and less elegantly expressed.

For those days of disillusion, when the eighth President of the University of Hawaii turns out to be a little lower than the Angel Gabriel, I remind you of the dialogue between two newlyweds. Right after their honeymoon, the groom took his bride by the hand and said, "Now that we're married, dear, I hope you won't mind if I mention a few little defects that I've noticed about you."

"Not at all," the bride replied with a deceptive sweetness. "It was just those little defects that kept me from getting a better husband."

As for the marriage which is celebrated here today, it is enough to say quite simply that I am in love with Hawaii.

"IMPACTED" AID PROGRAM NEEDS A GOOD OVERHAULING

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Montgomery County, Md., has the second highest per household income among the United States approximately 3,000 counties, its figure of \$20,831 per annum being exceeded only by Westchester County, N.Y., \$21,115.

The primary reason for Montgomery County's high figure is the fact that thousands of well-paid Federal employees live there, our Nation's Capital having been right next door to it since 1800. Despite the proximity which has attracted such affluent people, who contribute substantially to the tax coffers of the county and its numerous local governments, Montgomery County receives millions of dollars additionally each year because it has been designated as an impacted area.

The impact is not new or sudden or overwhelming as the District of Columbia as presently constituted was originally a part of the State of Maryland. Every President of the United States except the first one has resided in the District and every Congress from the seventh to the 91st has met in Washington, D.C. The

huge growth of the Federal Government that has occurred through the years has been of tremendous benefit to Montgomery County rather than a detriment.

If there was ever a Federal program which need overhauling, it is this one.

A table that I am submitting for the RECORD shows that during fiscal 1969

Montgomery County, Md., received over \$15 per capita from payments under sections 2, 3, and 4 of Public Law 81-874. My colleagues will, I am sure, find the compilation interesting as they compare the county's payments with those of 17 other selected counties.

The table follows:

County	Population July 1, 1966	Fiscal 1968 payments	Fiscal 1969 payments (estimated)	1968 per capita	1969 per capita
Montgomery County, Ala.	174,200	\$893,183	\$960,300	\$5.13	\$5.51
Montgomery County, Ark.	5,500		26,568		4.83
Montgomery County, Ga.	7,200				
Montgomery County, Ill.	30,900				
Montgomery County, Ind.	32,200				
Montgomery County, Iowa	13,100				
Montgomery County, Kans.	40,300	39,793	63,282	.99	1.57
Montgomery County, Ky.	15,200	21,996	22,674	1.45	1.49
Montgomery County, Md.	440,300	5,704,065	6,636,130	12.95	15.07
Montgomery County, Miss.	14,900				
Montgomery County, Mo.	10,800				
Montgomery County, N.Y.	57,900	12,709		.22	

County	Population July 1, 1966	Fiscal 1968 payments	Fiscal 1969 payments (estimated)	1968 per capita	1969 per capita
Montgomery County, N.C.	20,000				
Montgomery County, Ohio	576,400	\$2,431,340	\$2,934,307	\$4.22	\$5.09
Montgomery County, Pa.	588,600	306,086	323,696	.52	.55
Montgomery County, Tenn.	60,000	528,313	605,267	8.81	10.09
Montgomery County, Tex.	33,300	33,635	43,679	1.01	1.31
Montgomery County, Va.	40,000	190,683	220,072	4.77	5.50
Total	2,160,800	10,161,803	11,835,975	4.70	5.48
Montgomery County, Md.	440,300	5,704,065	6,636,130	12.95	15.07
Remaining 17 counties	1,720,500	4,457,738	5,199,845	2.59	3.02

Note: Payments are made under Public Law 81-874 (secs. 2, 3, and 4).

ONE MAN'S VANITY COSTS BILLIONS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable and penetrating observers of the Washington scene is Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune. He has earned a well-deserved reputation among his colleagues of the fourth estate for his ability to penetrate through smokescreen and reach the basic facts for his stories. Therefore, I direct the attention of the Members to his column of April 6 summing up the administration of former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara:

ONE MAN'S VANITY COSTS BILLIONS

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—The stubborn arrogance of one man's vaulting vanity has cost American taxpayers billions of dollars and seriously imperiled national security. This same vanity also showered cruel criticism and violent vilification on a group of Senate investigators interested in promoting that security and saving money.

The man is Robert S. McNamara, formerly secretary of defense who still holds an honored and responsible position as president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The senators are the members of the Senate permanent subcommittee on investigations of the committee on government operations, under the chairmanship of Sen. John L. McClellan (D., Ark.).

For almost 7½ years the subcommittee has been investigating the fiasco of the TFX plane or the F-111. This aircraft was designed to perform the different missions of the navy and the air force. The navy was interested in a plane with a short take-off so that it could readily be launched from carriers, and the air force, with long air lanes available, couldn't have cared less.

McNamara overruled the recommendations of the highest ranking military and aeronautical experts in the adoption of the plane and the selection of its manufacturer. Adm. George Anderson was removed as chief

of naval operations, because of his opposition, and kicked upstairs to the embassy in Portugal by Former President Kennedy. Others paid for their opposition in loss of promotion and pay.

For years the Senate investigators who uncovered the McNamara machinations, including falsification of figures, were ridiculed by the establishment and its kept press. It was said that when the plane began to fly, the senators would be revealed as obstructors of progress, if the most favorable light was placed on the investigation, or as enemies of security, if the worst interpretation was placed on their investigations.

Now that the plane has flown and not at all well—the navy has abandoned it and the air force has grounded the plane—the Senate subcommittee has entered the final phase of its investigation. It will measure the cost of the colossal failure.

In 1963 McNamara said the dual purpose plane would save a billion dollars. It now appears that it will cost at least 8 billions without providing security needs.

Originally it was estimated that the plane would cost about 3.5 million dollars. Actually those produced have cost 16 millions each. The Senate subcommittee disclosed startling performance failures, including the fact that total weight is almost 7 tons over specifications, take-off distance is 28 per cent greater than specifications, the ferry range is some 1,500 miles less, the maximum speed is 12 per cent under, and the dash distance is 85 per cent below specifications.

Now that the development has proved it to be a fiasco, those who vilified the Senate subcommittee have not apologized. They have been silent, especially on the final phase of the investigation under which McClellan will seek to determine the cost to the taxpayers and to fix the responsibility for the failure.

During the investigation a newspaper which supported McNamara said that McNamara would have "the last laugh," when the plane proved successful. At the time McClellan reported on the floor of the Senate that he did not regard the TFX fiasco as a laughing matter.

Now, McClellan insists, the time has come to tell the whole story and to put the committee's disclosures in perspective, not in any spirit of gloating or revenge, but in the interests of promoting the national security, curbing undue exercise of power, and saving money.

YOUNG PEOPLE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, young people of today are on the move against the destruction of our environment. They are ready and willing to act to combat the ecological problems facing our country.

I should like to salute and commend the actions taken by a group of young adults in Greene County in the Seventh Ohio District. Concerned by the threatened destruction of both a hillside and a creek by erosion, girls in a local Scout troop asked, "Can't something be done?" and then proceeded to organize and carry out a project which returned the hillside and creek to their natural state.

As Donald W. Jackson, Soil Conservation Service district conservationist, in an article contained in the Soil Conservation magazine, told it:

GIRL SCOUTS ORGANIZE A "HILL DAY" TO STABILIZE ERODING SLOPES

One hundred and sixty tons of sediment deposited in Little Sugar Creek each year—that was the dirty record of this ½-acre gullied hill at the edge of Bellbrook in Greene County, Ohio.

Little Sugar Creek is the pride of scenic Sugarcreek Township, but the eroded area was not exactly America the Beautiful. The hill was bulldozed for a shopping center several years ago, but construction never materialized. The unprotected cut slopes became a gullied eyesore and a threat to the creek.

Girls of a local scout troop voiced their concern and their leader, Mrs. Robert M. Hunter, asked the SCS soil conservationist, "Can't something be done?"

"Yes, of course, if the owner is interested."

He was. Gomer Bledsoe became a cooperator with the Greene Soil and Water Conservation District, and his conservation plan included provisions for smoothing the gullied area, then planting trees, shrubs, vines, ground cover plants, and grass. The Girl

Scouts offered their help in planting the trees and shrubs.

Four of the girls volunteered to sponsor the effort as a community service project. They notified the leaders of every Boy Scout and Girl Scout troop in the Bellbrook area of their plan and secured most of the plants used.

"Hill Day" was set for Saturday, April 26. Different troops were scheduled to arrive at the hillside every half hour and work for 1 hour. Some 300 girl and boy scouts participated during the day.

Mr. Bledsoe, the owner, did much of the advance earthmoving, operating a bulldozer himself. He also purchased fertilizer, seed, and straw for mulch. He planted the grass and applied the mulch before Hill Day. The youngsters planted more than 400 trees and shrubs on the slopes.

Erosion of the hill is now halted. Today the area has a new look to complement the surrounding hills of Sugarcreek Township.

The area will be a real test plot, too, because of the variety of plants used. Kentucky 31 fescue and crownvetch were seeded over all. Trees, shrubs, and other perennials were planted in selected areas. They include: autumn olive; white, red and Austrian pine; Norway spruce; iris; dogwood; junipers; and ivy and myrtle vines.

NEW ATTENTION GIVEN
CONSUMER

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, until very recently, one of the least heard or considered interests in Washington was that of the consumer, whose voice was rarely raised above those of organized lobby groups representing special interests.

That situation has improved in the past few years, as both Congress and the executive branch have given steadily increasing attention to the housewife who does the Saturday grocery shopping, the man who buys a new car and automobile insurance, the family who borrows money for home improvements, or the merchant who must assume responsibility for the manufacturer's products he sells to his customer.

This new focus of attention and concern is a direct result of the most vigorous and concerted lobbying effort, for the first time, by the wide variety of interests who come within the general definition of consumer. In our own State, for example, a consumer's league has been formed under the leadership of women's groups, educators, attorneys, cooperatives and farm groups, labor unions, community action agencies, newsmen, and local officials.

That growing concern has resulted in the most significant body of consumer legislation in history, including motor vehicle and highway safety laws, the National Commission on Product Safety, truth in packaging, truth in lending, and the Wholesome Meat Act.

There are still additional areas for legislative attention—the safety of tires and drugs, effective warranty protection, and power reliability; for example, but however many laws we put on the books,

the effectiveness of the consumer protection efforts will rest ultimately on adequate funding and effective rulemaking and implementation by the responsible agencies.

For that reason, many in Congress have been advocating the establishment by law of a separate Federal office devoted exclusively to the consumer. The Office of Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, created several years ago in the White House by Executive order, has done much to focus attention on consumer matters. The current proposal, which President Nixon endorsed in his consumer message to Congress would establish that office by law rather than Presidential decree, and would increase its budget and its areas of responsibility.

One of the most far-reaching proposals, again endorsed by the President, would replace the present one lawyer consumer counsel in the Justice Department with a full Consumer Protection Division, headed by an Assistant Attorney General to act as the consumer's lawyer before Federal agencies, in judicial proceedings and in Government councils.

That division would be armed with a new consumer protection law which would clearly define a broad range of prohibited frauds and deceptions, with adequate notice to business and manufacturers of activities to be considered illegal.

Private citizens would then be given the right to bring action in Federal court to recover damages under the new law, either individually or as a class action.

Protection of the consumer also means protection of the vast majority of businessmen, creditors, and manufacturers who operate honestly and fairly in this country. It is the abuse of the few that casts shadows on the legitimate operations of the rest. Increasing numbers of those who provide products and services for the consumer have recognized their own interests in halting deceptive and fraudulent practices, and have joined ranks to help restore public confidence in the marketplace of our free enterprise system.

ESCAMBIA BAY JAYCEES HONOR
OUTSTANDING YOUNG SOLDIER

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased and proud recently to have the opportunity on behalf of the Escambia Bay Jaycees to present to S. Sgt. Richard Allen Davis, Jr., of Pensacola, Fla., the club's annual Distinguished Service Award. The DSA is presented traditionally each year during January by the Jaycees to a young man "whose dedication to service to humanity will serve as a lasting reminder and inspiration to all men of all nations." I quote Jaycees President Stanley Wilson that "although the DSA Award is not unique

as it was begun in 1938 and is traditionally given annually to a young man in the community who is head and shoulders above the crowd, and has honored such men as Orson Welles, Howard Hughes, Richard Nixon, John F. Kennedy, and Capt. Gus Grissom, it is unique in that we are giving it this year to a young man from the Pensacola area serving his community and country on the front lines in Vietnam and who is showing leadership and dedicated service qualities. We felt that this award is particularly fitting as a means of demonstrating the Jaycees' support of their country and the young men serving it in a time when elements within America are actively demonstrating their rejection of it and the principles for which it was founded."

Staff Sergeant Davis, who has served two consecutive tours in Vietnam on a volunteer basis, was most recently assigned with the U.S. Army 10th Cavalry at Pleiku. This admirable young man, who joined the Army in August 1967 and has risen rapidly in the ranks, has established an outstanding military record. To date he has received the Combat Infantry Badge, Paratrooper Badge, two Army Commendation Awards, two Bronze Stars, the Air Medal, the Vietnam Campaign Medal, National Defense Service Medal, and the Vietnamese Service Medal. Richard, who is just 21, is to be highly commended for his record of achievement in his military career and for his selection to receive the Escambia Bay Jaycees Distinguished Service Award.

At the same time, may I warmly congratulate the Escambia Bay Jaycees organization on the important role they are playing in the recognition and encouragement of these deserving young people. Participating in the award ceremony from the Jaycees organization were Stanley Wilson and Zearl Lancaster.

FOR A 50-CENT PERMIT YOU CAN
BLOW UP A BUILDING

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the rash of bombings which have swept the Nation has exposed the shocking shortcomings of our present laws governing the sale and distribution of explosives.

There can be no question that tougher laws are needed in dealing with the radicals and crackpots who spread terror, death, and destruction. I recently co-sponsored a bill which would make possession of untaxed explosives a Federal crime, levy a tax on the transfer of all blasting materials, and require that all parties to such a transaction be registered.

President Nixon has proposed legislation calling for capital punishment when a death has resulted from bombings and he is asking for penalties of 10 years in prison and fines of \$10,000 for persons found guilty in the transportation and

receipt of explosives for unlawful purposes.

In all our 50 States, less than a dozen actually have laws restricting the purchase and use of deadly explosives. In the majority of the other States, the laws deal mainly with the safe handling of explosives, and contain only a minimum of guarantees against criminal use.

The ease with which one can obtain explosives is frightening as was demonstrated recently by television station WGR in Buffalo, N.Y., following a bombing that caused heavy damage to a downtown building and bombing scares which caused the evacuation of other buildings including schools.

Newscaster Henry Marcotte went out and bought a stick of dynamite and a blasting cap for a total cost of just 95 cents, including 5 cents for the sales tax. It was as simple as that. No questions were asked by the salesman because Mr. Marcotte had less than an hour previously obtained for 50 cents a license to purchase the dynamite. In addition, he had also received an instruction sheet, with diagrams, showing him how to make a primer.

Later that night on WGR-TV's 6 and 11 o'clock newscasts, Mr. Marcotte related how easy it was for him to purchase explosives. The station followed up with several editorials calling for stricter laws controlling such sales and rightly so.

WGR-TV is to be highly commended for exercising special journalistic enterprise in making the public aware of just how weak our present laws are and how much we need effective regulations as a safeguard against the indiscriminate sale of such explosives.

I am including in the RECORD transcripts of Mr. Marcotte's broadcasts, hoping that they will help spur quick action on this much-needed legislation.

HENRY MARCOTTE COMMENTARY, MARCH 17, 1970

There has been a wave of dynamite bombs across the United States . . . many more bomb threats . . . today the U.S. Treasury was threatened with a scare and there were several in the Buffalo area . . .

The ease with which anyone can buy dynamite is no joke. It took me less than an hour today to buy this dynamite and this blasting cap . . . legally . . .

It took a trip to my town hall where I purchased a license which allows me to purchase, own, possess, transport and use explosives. Then I bought one stick of dynamite for thirty cents and the blasting cap that detonates the stick for sixty cents. No questions were asked by the salesman in Orchard Park because I had a valid license obtained legally that allows me to purchase, own, possess, transport and use explosives.

In concluding the purchase, I signed a sales slip that acknowledged that I had received the pamphlet . . . prevention of accidents in the use of explosives . . . and that I will heed its warnings and follow its instructions.

After reading the first few pages, I realized how dangerous this small amount of dynamite can be and I am turning it over to the sheriff's department for disposal.

It also proves to me how dangerous the New York State law governing explosives is and the need for tougher legislation.

HENRY MARCOTTE COMMENTARY,
MARCH 18, 1970

Police said that today's blast was equal to about a dozen sticks of dynamite . . . just three dollars and sixty cents worth. Last night I showed you how easy it is to purchase this license for fifty cents . . . which then allows you to buy as much dynamite as you want.

Fortunately, no one was killed in the Lafayette Building today. But within the past week, several persons were killed in a New York City explosion . . . caused by dynamite bombs, two men died in Maryland, and if there's another explosion here . . . we may not be so lucky to escape without any casualties.

In addition . . . the actual explosions have caused a wave of bomb threats resulting in business disruptions . . . and causing fear in thousands of people. In Buffalo today . . . the Rand Building . . . across the street from the devastated Lafayette Building . . . received a bomb threat and had to be evacuated for ninety minutes while police conducted a search. No bomb was found. Another threat kept people out of the Statler Hilton Hotel for a time. Other bomb threats were made at Kensington High School and several other places. Explosions and bomb threats will continue to plague our society as long as explosives are so easy to obtain . . . and until tougher penalties are imposed on those who call in phony bomb scares.

PURCHASE OF EXPLOSIVES No. 1

For fifty cents the State of New York will sell you a license to destroy anyone or anything. A stick of dynamite and the cap to detonate it cost less than a dollar.

Mysterious bombings, unexplained explosions, and frightening bomb scares have been rampant across the country. The situation is serious in Western New York. On January 26th of this year a live bomb was found in an East Aurora shopping center. Bomb threats in schools have been numerous. In downtown Buffalo an office building was extensively damaged by explosives recently . . . a Niagara Falls man found dynamite wired to go off in his automobile.

Anyone is able to buy explosives; this indicates the present selling control isn't effective.

Very tight controls on the sale and possession of explosives are necessary. They have to be more than just signing a piece of paper with a few meaningless phrases on it.

Legitimate users of explosives won't be seriously inconvenienced.

We support the Governor's proposal for greater control of explosives and have a couple of suggestions which we'll make tomorrow.

PURCHASE OF EXPLOSIVES No. 2

The New York State license to purchase, own, possess, transport, or use explosives, asks questions which are meaningless; they contribute nothing to the control of the sale of explosives.

Question 9 is "Are you either disloyal or hostile to the United States?" Now, would a person about to purchase dynamite for illegal use admit it? Question 10 requires a yes or no answer on having served time in prison. Question 11 addresses itself to those who have been or still are mentally ill.

It is our suggestion that the license be restricted only to those people who have legitimate use for explosives . . . industry, farming, mining, and construction. An inventory control system similar to that set up for narcotics should be formulated. The detonation of explosives should be restricted to qualified experts, licensed by the state.

We believe improved regulations, set up by

the Department of Labor and strictly enforced by the police, will reduce the incidence of mysterious explosions and near explosions.

The over-the-counter sale of explosives is not necessary.

THE ANTICRIME EFFORT BELONGS INSIDE THE PRISON AS WELL AS OUTSIDE THE WALLS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I think few of us are unaware of the extent to which our Federal and State penal institutions have been criticized for their unfortunate record in rehabilitating inmates convicted of crimes. The recidivism rates are astonishingly high; our prisons detain and punish but apparently do little else to turn the offender away from a life of continued crime when he or she is freed. The first offender who may still be very young is treated in exactly the same manner as a hardened criminal who may have spent most of his life involved in crimes and prison sentences to pay for them. Many hold that this practice has made prisons into training schools where hard-core criminals are produced far more often than are rehabilitated, useful members of society.

Strict uniformity is also the rule governing paroles for inmates. A certain equal portion of every sentence will be served regardless of all other factors. The same uniformity applies to treatment in most institutions. Inmates adhere to basically the same standards of strictness and behavior regardless of what their offense or temperament may be. Genuine, rehabilitative therapy is absent from most prisons and consequently it becomes of lesser importance that different prisoners be separated because needed treatment is simply not available on a personal need basis.

I think it is clear that while we are doing all we can to bring down high crime rates, we cannot forget that whatever we do to combat both the causes and effects of crime will be badly diluted if we ignore the fundamental importance of accomplishing a high degree of actual rehabilitation within our Nation's correctional institutions.

With this in mind, I am sponsoring the Correctional Services Improvement Act, introduced earlier by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) and others. This in my judgment, is worthwhile and well-constructed legislation which recognizes that the vital work which should be done within our prison system cannot succeed without badly needed assistance.

This legislation acknowledges the difficulty which prison administrators face in attempting to run positive rehabilitation programs on the very limited budgets available to them. The Attorney General is, therefore, authorized to make available grants to various States in order that they may adhere to stand-

ards which the bill authorizes the Attorney General to set in contract with the States. The measure also permits "half-way houses" to be set up as areas of treatment for those preparing to reenter society.

A Federal Corrections Institute to serve as an information bank is also called for in the bill to help in improving the training and number of qualified Federal, State, and local corrections personnel; \$300,000,000 is authorized for the creation of demonstration correctional centers for special groups of offenders such as short termers, the young, the mentally ill, women, and others. A Federal Corrections Coordinating Council would be established for examining and researching new methods of treatment and rehabilitation. Greater flexibility for officials granting paroles to specific inmates, especially the young, is also part of this bill.

I believe the provisions of this bill add up to a logical and well-reasoned approach to a problem which is very real and which will continue to defy solution as long as we are unwilling to commit the resources necessary to do the job. I am persuaded that this new act is an excellent vehicle through which to begin a meaningful effort to rebuild the rehabilitation process in our correctional institutions.

EDITOR OF THE WEEK

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Publishers' Auxiliary, which calls itself the newspaperman's newspaper, recently paid a well-deserved tribute to one of Massachusetts' outstanding newspapermen with a special feature story on Herbert Austin, editor of the Wellesley Townsman.

Because my home is in Wellesley, I know of the respect Herbert Austin enjoys in the community and the excellence of his newspaper. I am delighted that he was honored as "Editor of the Week."

Herbert Austin edits one of the larger weeklies in the suburban Boston area. He is one of those remarkable jacks-of-all-trades of his profession. He edits the paper and contributes thoughtful editorials on local issues. When required, he can fill in as a printer, solicit ads, or turn out a sports story or a society item. He travels abroad and around the Nation as often as he can and finds time to participate in professional organizations and in church, town, and charity activities. Even at the age of 78, Herbert Austin is still going strong with no thought of retiring.

He is well known in his field. He is a past president of the Massachusetts Press Association, which he joined 35 years ago and which he has served as secretary-treasurer for 15 years, and is a founder and past president of the New England Press Association. He is active

with Sigma Delta Chi and has been listed in "Who's Who in the East."

It is hardly surprising that he has also edited the Kiwanis Club district publication for the past 20 years. Herbert Austin is a man of many unusual talents, broad interests, and inexhaustible energy.

I know the people of Wellesley admire this man as much as he loves Wellesley. I want to join in congratulating him. The article about Herbert Austin reads as follows:

EDITOR OF THE WEEK—AUSTIN'S "SECOND LOVE" IS TRAVEL

An active, enthusiastic, travelling editor is the way to describe Herbert Austin, the 78-year-old editor of the Wellesley (Mass.) Townsman and perennial secretary-treasurer of the Massachusetts Press Assn.

"Retirement should appear to be logical at my age, but I enjoy what I am doing and expect to continue until the management can no longer put up with my approaching senility," explained Austin.

He started on the Townsman on a part-time basis in the middle 30s after a bout with the depression. The job eventually became full-time, and he was the advertising manager until 1960 when he took over as the editor.

"We have over 8,000 circulation and 90 percent coverage of Wellesley, being one of the larger weeklies in the suburban Boston area. Thus far we have stuck to letterpress but offset is definitely in the future," he said.

Austin joined the Massachusetts Press Assn. 35 years ago, and he has been their secretary-treasurer for the last 15 years. He also served as president in 1952.

In 1950 he helped start the New England Press Assn. and was elected their president in 1958. He is also active in Sigma Delta Chi and has been listed in Who's Who in the East.

The editor has taken every opportunity to travel and see the United States and Canada. He has also toured Alaska and the Canadian Rockies.

When the National Newspaper Assn. began to sponsor study missions abroad Austin joined many groups and since has been in all parts of the world including some 50 countries.

"For a newspaperman with what is supposed to be a desk job, I have been far ranging."

Austin is a Kiwanis Club member and has been the editor of their district publication (12,000 circulation) for 20 years. He is also active in church, town and charity affairs.

Before coming to the Townsman, Austin was with the Babson Reports for 12 years. He received his bachelor of science degree from Dartmouth in 1914.

"I have no hobbies to indulge other than travel and as yet do not wish to retire to New Hampshire where I have a lake cottage. Neither have I any urge to retire to Florida or the other warm climates, Wellesley suits me fine," commented Austin.

MEMBER OF DEDICATED MAJORITY WILL BE HONORED

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, in these times of momentous and fast-breaking events we sometimes fail to acknowledge the accomplishments of individuals whose

dedication and labors have contributed so significantly to their local communities and, in turn, to the Nation as a whole.

I am particularly proud to commend one of these individuals, Luthur C. Klosterman, a member of the dedicated majority of Americans, as he is honored on the completion of a remarkable career in veterans' work, government, and politics. Mr. Klosterman, who lives in Upper Dublin Township, Montgomery County, Pa., is a constituent of mine whose activities have demonstrated that one person can make an impact for good on the fabric of our society.

When Mr. Klosterman is cited on Saturday night, April 18, 1970, by his American Legion comrades, he will be looking back on more than a half century filled with memories of meaningful achievements.

Luther Klosterman devoted some 60 years to political activities, in this case, the cause of the Republican Party. For more than 20 years he served as a committeeman and for more than 10 years as township chairman. I, of course, am pleased that he is a Republican, but more importantly that he showed the individual citizen can play an important role in politics if he wants.

As an employee of the Montgomery County government, Mr. Klosterman worked diligently and faithfully. For the many years that he served in this capacity, he helped county government meet an amazing growth—growth that say Montgomery County increase its population from less than 200,000 persons at the end of World War I to its present three-quarters of a million.

But Luther Klosterman's drive for community and civic activities best can be illustrated by his veterans' work.

A World War I inductee, he trained at then Camp Meade, Md., before joining Battery E, 310th Field Artillery, 79th Division. He left Philadelphia on July 13, 1918, and arrived in Liverpool, England, on July 27, 1918. Transferred to France for further training, he eventually was assigned to artillery loaded on trains and ready to leave for the front. Before the trains could move, armistice was declared on November 11, 1918.

On his discharge from the service as a corporal on June 2, 1919, Luther Klosterman began his veterans' activities. He was a charter member of William Boulton Dixon Post No. 10, Fort Washington, and launched a career of more than 50 years in helping servicemen and veterans.

Mr. Klosterman was the first post adjutant. A post commander twice, he has served in every position at the post level. Remarkably, he still is the post's service officer, a position in which he has aided untold thousands.

His distinguished Legion career includes tenure as a commander of the Ninth District of Montgomery and Bucks Counties, a founder of Voiture 927, Forty and Eight, and as department hospital chairman for Valley Forge Hospital. He was department rehabilitation chairman for 4 years.

Mr. Klosterman was a member of the National Distinguished Guests Committee for 5 years. He is serving as a vice

chairman of the National Security Committee. Other assignments included vice-chairman of the resolutions assignment committee, member of the American Legion Press Association, Keystone Go-Getters Club, past district commanders memorial fund drive, and United States Officers Association.

In these positions, Mr. Klosterman has more than worn the title. He contributed, by dint of his amazing capacity for work, to the well-being of servicemen and veterans. He must be very proud. All of us who know him are very proud indeed.

The worth of individuals such as Luther Klosterman to their communities cannot be weighed in words or commendations alone. Yet, I would not feel that I had done him justice without citing his contributions to his country and community. He merits our highest plaudits and "a job well done, Luther."

ANNIVERSARY OF LENIN, THE BOLSHEVIK BUTCHER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the world is about to celebrate with appropriate Red fanfare the 100th anniversary of one of the bloodiest murderers in its history—Nikolai Lenin, whose real name was Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov. This character is the hero of the United Nations Organization humanist religion, as well as the patron saint of the new-breed ecologists who will spend April 22 honoring him by whining about decadent capitalist civilization.

In order that we may have ready reference prior to the celebration, I include in my remarks pertinent published items dealing with the true activities and accomplishments of this internationalized Red hero:

[From the American Legion magazine, April 1970]

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF NIKOLAI LENIN (By Albert L. Weeks)

April 22, 1970, is a red-letter day for Communists all over the world. It is the 100th birthday of the founder of modern Communism—Nikolai Lenin.

Lenin's real name was Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov. He used many others, but to history he is Nikolai Lenin, born April 22, 1870, in Simbirsk on the Volga River.

His central claim to fame is as the creator and leader of the small Bolshevik Party which took over the Russian Revolution, cementing its power in November, 1917. A spontaneous uprising by others had overthrown the Tsar's government eight months earlier, while Lenin was in Switzerland; and Alexander Kerensky, a mild socialist, became the temporary leader.

To the Communists, whose Russian leaders have succeeded to the power structure set up by Lenin in 1917, Lenin is a saint, the holiest of the trinity of Communist deities consisting of the German Karl Marx, Marx's colleague Friedrich Engels and Lenin. Although the Communists profess atheism and condemn religion, there is nothing snide about likening their own regime to a religion.

The Lenin anniversary slogans emanating from Russia are full of religious symbolism. Some of these are: "Lenin is eternal," "Lenin is life itself" and "The Leader is the greatest genius of all time." The Russian Orthodox Easter falls on April 26 this year, four days after Lenin's birthday, and the Soviet propaganda bureau, Agitprop, has referred to the birthday as a "rebirth," a phrase with strong connotations of a resurrection. You frequently see such expressions in the Soviet press these days as "We vow to Thee, oh dear Ilyich," "Lenin bequeathed to us his sacred commandments" or the "sacred word of our dear Ilyich."

The Kremlin is pulling out all the stops for its worldwide commemoration and veneration of Lenin. Moscow radio and TV are broadcasting such programs as "Chronology of the Life and Work of Lenin," "Music the Ulyanov Family Listened To," "The Importance of V. I. Lenin's Book, 'Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,' in the Struggle Against Contemporary Bourgeois Philosophy and Sociology." Movie theaters across the U.S.S.R. and abroad are showing such Lenin films as "Mother's Heart, Mother's Devotion" (a glamorization of Lenin's stormy and unhappy boyhood), "The Living Lenin," "Lenin in Poland," "Lenin in October," "Lenin in 1918," "Stories about Lenin," and ". . . Man with a Gun." Hundreds of thousands of rubles have been spent to set up "Leniniana" exhibitions; to publish Lenin's writings in 150 languages; to sponsor tours to Lenin shrines inside and outside Russia; to fly teams of speechmakers to remote Siberian villages, as well as to thickly populated areas; and to ship abroad "Leniniana kits" consisting of "study materials" destined for such remote places as Surinam, Zanzibar, Chad, Malta and San Marino, as well as large countries like the United States, West Germany, France, Britain and India.

The tiny eastern Siberian village of Shushenskoye has had its face lifted, and is decked out in banners and huge Lenin posters. It is a big tourist attraction in spite of the climate. Shushenskoye is the place where Lenin spent three years in serene exile, from 1897 to 1900. Today's visitors to the site are guided to the places where Lenin slept, took his meals, wrote pamphlets and letters (which were mailed back west), hunted and fished, skied and ice-skated, wrote a long book on capitalism in Tsarist Russia, and married Nadezhda Krupskaya, his homely lifelong "Girl Friday." Siberian exile in the days of the Tsar wasn't so bad if you were a well-known prisoner like Lenin.

Two years ago the Soviet Union asked the United Nations to join in the celebration. In October 1969 UNESCO agreed to sponsor the observance of the Lenin centenary after the Soviets insisted that its participation in Mahatma Gandhi's centenary (October 2, 1969) was a precedent for joining in Lenin's in 1970. The Soviet-backed resolution passed UNESCO by 48 to 7, with 21 abstentions and 47 members reporting themselves "absent." As finally approved, the resolution calls on UNESCO to "initiate certain activities to commemorate the centenary of the birth of V. I. Lenin, including . . . a symposium on the theme: 'Lenin and the Development of Science, Culture, and Education.'" A sum of \$5,000 will be allocated toward the Lenin Symposium, to be held in Tampere, Finland, from April 6-10, 1970. The United States, which cast one of the 7 dissenting votes, protested against the symposium through an official spokesman. "[Lenin's] greatness," he said, "was of the sort that puts him in the historical company of Bismarck or Napoleon, not of Gandhi or Buddha or Marx . . . Like Napoleon, Lenin came to power promising freedom and became instead the innovator in what might be called the technology of

the police state; just as Napoleon became the patron saint of military strategists in the nineteenth century, so has Lenin become the patron saint of advocates of violent revolution in the twentieth century." The U.S. spokesman asked if they are the kind of accomplishments to which UNESCO wishes to lend its name.

Lenin was a "compulsive revolutionary," writes Dr. Stefan Possony, the Rand Corporation Soviet expert, in his 1964 biography of Lenin. He was also a compulsive writer. He wrote no fewer than 100 million words during his 54-year lifetime, or about the same as Voltaire had produced by the time he was 84. The works of Lenin, according to *Pravda* (Dec. 28, 1969), have gone through 10,096 printings running to 348 million copies.

When one reads through a large share of Lenin's writings, he is struck by the contrast between what Lenin had to say before the Revolution and what he said after 1917. There is Lenin the promiser in the pre-revolutionary pamphlets and Lenin the dictator in the post-revolutionary decrees and secret letters to the Politburo. Just before the Bolshevik seizure of power on Nov. 7, 1917, Lenin promised to deliver the Russian people from Tsarist tyranny and give them "peace, land, and bread." Once in power he founded the oppressive "dictatorship of the workers and peasants," the Cheka or secret police, the Revolutionary Tribunals (imitated later in Castro's Cuba), concentration camps, the four-year civil war, the cult of the modern dictator and the international Communist revolutionary apparatus. All of these deeds were accomplished by Lenin in the short space of six years, from 1917 until 1924 when he died, presumably of a stroke. Part of that time he was laid low by a bullet from a female would-be assassin. The toll in lives stemming from those six Lenin years was staggering:¹

Civil War in Russia (1917-1921) -	3,000,000
War against Finland (1918) -	50,000
War against the Baltic States (1918-19) -	110,000
War against Poland (1920) -	600,000
War against Georgia (1921-22) -	20,000
Red Terror (1917-23) -	2,290,000
Starvation (1921-22) -	6,000,000
Total -	12,070,000

Faced with the contradictions between the pre- and the post-revolutionary Lenins, today's Party is fabricating a third Lenin, in the shape of a saint. It is at the Lenin tomb in Red Square that the present-day Politburo ritualizes its legitimate succession down from Lenin.

But the Lenin religion has its heretics. Whispers of bitter criticism of Lenin and Leninism can be heard today within the Communist world. Some of it started to leak out of the Soviet Union just around the time when preparation for the Lenin jubilee got under way, back in 1968. The anti-Lenin criticism amounts to spreading disillusionment with "St. Vladimir," as his detractors call him. "Roy Medvedev," a Russian intellectual whose real name is his secret, has recently composed a 1,000-page indictment of Lenin. Written on a typewriter and stealthily circulated in numerous carbon copies inside and outside Russia, this document blames Lenin and Leninism, point by point, for all the evils of Stalinism (1928-1953), and beyond, and for Stalin himself, whom Lenin appointed to the highest post in the Party's executive organ, the Secre-

¹ Statistics courtesy of Prof. Ivan A. Kur-ganov, former Director of the Leningrad Finance Institute, and published in *Novoye Russkoye Slovo* (New Russian Word), N.Y. Nov. 5, 1967.

tariat, as "General-Secretary." The Medvedev manuscript has found its way to France where it will soon be published in English under the tentative title, "The Genesis of Stalinism in Russia."

The three Lenins bother other sensitive Russians who see the "Lenin cult" as a blind or rationalization for the many excesses of the Lenin, Stalin and post-Stalin periods—or as the Russians call them, the "dark side of the moon." The Lenin cult is seen as a mere pretext for the continuance of "modern Bourbonism" or royal rule, to use Boris Pasternak's phrase in his novel, *Doctor Zhivago*. It exists like a dangerous relic in an era of H-bombs and automation. The ever-growing number of anti-Bolshevik Russian intellectual, including the "father of the Soviet H-bomb," Dr. Andrei Sakharov, want to reform Russia, and reform it thoroughly. The Kremlin leaders, who call themselves "The disciples of Lenin," seem unable to throttle these protests altogether. The authentic Lenin has never been revealed to the whole Soviet people. No complete biography of Lenin has been published in Russia. But the men like Medvedev are beginning to piece together the flesh-and-blood original. If an authentic biography should appear in Russia, the damage to the present ideology and justification of authority could be irreparable.

Who was the real Lenin?

He began life in the medium-size Volga River town of Simbirsk (renamed "Ulyanovsk" with Lenin's approval, in 1923), in April 1870.

Like many ultra-radicals, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov was born in comfortable circumstances. His mother's father, Alexander Blank, was a serf-owning landlord, a fact that is omitted from the very long article on Lenin in the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*. Blank's large estate in Kokushkino served as the Ulyanov family's summer vacation home. Lenin's father, Ilya, was a public school administrator with a high rank and a Tsarist uniform to go along with it. Father Ilya was often away from home on alleged "inspection trips." This dismayed the mother because she suspected her husband of two-timing. She threatened several times to sue him for divorce, but didn't. Lenin's mother, Maria, who is depicted by Soviet propagandists as a sort of "Holy Mary," was of Swedish and German stock. On his father's side, Lenin's ancestry was Finno-Ugrian (Volga Chuvash) with an admixture of the Kalmuck Mongols. Moscow Party historians have clamped a tight lid on the genealogy of the Blanks. From his various ancestors Lenin inherited a swarthy complexion, deep-set almond-shaped eyes, high cheek bones and premature baldness (one of young Lenin's earliest nicknames was "Starik," or Old Man). At times, he bore a striking resemblance to the wild Asian Tartars from whom he was partly descended.

Lenin, the boy, was a "problem child," by far the most unruly of the six Ulyanov children. A seventh, Olga, died in infancy, a fact omitted for no special reason that I can think of in officially-approved "Reminiscences of Lenin." Lenin became especially difficult after his father died when the boy was fifteen. His school principal described him as a morose loner who "kept apart from the others." When he played chess—always within the family circle—he went about the game as if his whole life depended upon it. If he lost, which was seldom, he ranted and raved. Rebellious and contemptuous of all authority, he once tore off his Orthodox cross, threw it to the floor and then spat on it. He gravitated toward the most radical and uncompromising of political programs for reforming Russia. When he was seventeen, an event within the family bruised Lenin for life, and further impelled him in political pathological directions. His only older brother, Alexander, was executed on the Tsarist gallows in a

much-publicized trial at the age of twenty-one. Alexander, a brooding ascetic type, had participated in an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate Tsar Alexander III. Once Lenin's grief, and that of his mother, had subsided, young Vladimir became coolly vengeful over what had happened to "Sasha." "We shall not take [Sasha's] road," he said. "Our road must be different." And indeed it was. No revolutionary heroics of "individual terror" would do the job, said Vladimir. His brother's revolutionism was hopefully idealistic and naive. Instead, Lenin painstakingly developed the concept of a tightly organized and disciplined underground band of "professional revolutionaries," adept with guns, manifestos, and the derring-do to rob banks for party funds. Lenin also developed the outlines of a post-revolutionary dictatorship which would unleash mass terror for the purpose of cleansing and "re-educating" remnants of the old society.

Long before he became an "orthodox Marxist," Lenin was the supporter of a species of home-grown Russian revolutionism called "Jacobinism." Named after the most ultra-radical and dictatorial sect of the French Revolution, the Russian Jacobins were unpopular with the rest of the Russian revolutionists. The latter condemned the Jacobins for their dictatorial methods and their cynical view of human affairs. Lenin was attracted to the Jacobin sect not only because it appealed to his arrogant, restless and secretive nature, but through his attachment at the age of about twenty to a woman revolutionary nine years his senior. This forceful personality, Maria Yaseneva, became Lenin's revolutionary teacher and mistress. For several years, she instructed Lenin in the Jacobin tradition in Russia, particularly in the writings and deeds of such firebrands as Sergei (The Eagle) Nechayev and Peter Tkachev. Nechayev was a murderer, terrorist and blackmailer of the 1860's who trusted none of his comrades, nor did they him. Tkachev, known as the "first Bolshevik" of the 1870's to Western historians, once recommended shooting everyone in Russia over 25, thereby starting the New Order "from scratch." Lenin later read, and copied from, Tkachev's numerous writings.

Only some years later, after the Yaseneva period, did Lenin decide to graft Western Marxism upon earlier beliefs. Thus, the Bolshevism which was to take shape in his mind was, by around 1900, a mixture of the German Marx and the Russian Jacobins. The revolutionaries would all be professionals, observing iron discipline, following without question the orders handed down from the Leninist "Center" of "talented leaders." Eventually, Lenin taught, the Center would order the seizure of power from the Tsar or whoever overthrew the Tsar, if someone else did. In that case, power would be "lying in the streets," and the Bolsheviks would pick it up, as Lenin was to say later.

Lenin soon set about making himself known to the budding Russian Marxist circles of the 1890's and early 1900's. The book that he wrote in exile at Shushenskoye, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, was an imposing work, replete with long, Germanic-like sentences resembling the heavy style of Dostoevski. It was accompanied with numerous statistical tables. The book immediately caught the attention of the "dean of Russian Marxism," George Plekhanov. Plekhanov eagerly awaited making the acquaintance of this "talented writer." That day came in 1900 when the thirty-year-old "Tulin" (Lenin) showed up in the Russian emigré haven of Geneva, Switzerland. Altogether,

Lenin used almost 100 pen names during his adult life. He rather enjoyed the secretiveness of the whole thing, and he knew he was not fooling the Tsar's police. His attachment to old Plekhanov was brief. Willful and self-assertive, intolerant of anyone who disagreed with him in the slightest, Lenin began

to employ his famous salami-slicing tactics within socialist organizations. By splintering and breaking the back of more conservative revolutionary groups he was able to forge a small party of his own, carved out of the larger Russian Social Democrats. His followers called themselves "Bolsheviks" (from the Russian word, *bolshinstvo*, meaning "majority"). They were the most cynical and ruthless of the many Russians who hoped to end the Tsar's regime. Like almost everything else about the Bolsheviks, even the name was cynical. They became a "majority" of the Russian Social Democrats only because the rest of the SDs had walked out of a London party conference in 1903. The real majority, the democratically inclined Russian socialists who had left, were ironically labeled "Mensheviks" (from the Russian word *menshinstvo*, meaning "minority").

The major work written by Lenin at this time was *What Is To Be Done?* Often given the silent treatment in Russia today, this pamphlet is crucial for a true understanding of Bolshevik ideology, and of Lenin's politics.

The main points of the writing can be summarized as follows:

1. Socialism, he claimed, is the product of talented middle class minds (like Marx, Engels or Lenin himself), and is by no means the result of the thoughts and activities of the "ignorant" workers, as the Mensheviks and other "opportunists" maintain.

2. Revolution and his form of socialism must be forced on the workers "from outside," since they couldn't think out what they needed, or how to get it, or even stick to a plan of action if someone gave it to them. Workers, when left to their own devices, develop only money-grabbing "trade-union" ideas, said Lenin, as he named himself the head of the working classes.

3. Bolshevik revolutionary organizations must combine legal activity (via a political party, newspapers, agitation within unions, demonstrations, etc.) with illegal subversion (plotting the over-throw of the government, whether Tsarist or democratic, and shooting politics out of the barrel of a gun).

4. Bolshevik revolutionary organizations are to be run from the all-powerful Center, assuring perfect unity between scattered revolutionary cells, unquestioning obedience and iron discipline.

These were the main points of *What Is To Be Done?* Many of its principles were carried over into the post-1917 period and put into practice in the Soviet Republic in the form of "Essentials of Leninism," as Stalin put it. After 1917, the same enforced obedience to the ruling Communist Party in the Soviet State was demanded of the people as a whole, as it had been of Lenin's revolutionary cells before the Revolution. Moreover, the workers were told that "their" dictatorship required them to submit to ironclad discipline. He enforced it with the secret police and the new Red Army, which Lenin's colleague, Leon Trotsky, organized.

These policies bore no resemblance to the "anarcho-syndicalism" that Lenin had preached before he captured power. Before 1917 he had said that the workers would make decisions via "soviets" in "their own" socialized factories. A "soviet" was a local council running its own affairs, and a factory soviet was a council of workers running a factory. When Lenin needed the support of mobs and armed remnants of the Tsar's military to overthrow Kerensky's temporary revolutionary regime, he gave them the slogan "All power to the soviets!" When he achieved control, he suppressed the soviets at gunpoint when need be, but incorporated their name in the title of the new government.

In all of this he was true to the authoritarian spirit of the 1902-03 work. *What Is To Be Done?* which had not been meant for the eyes of rank and file workers. It, like other pamphlets soon to follow it, was addressed exclusively to potential recruits for

Bolshevism among the members of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party.

In March 1917, Lenin was in Switzerland when the Tsar was suddenly overthrown by a spontaneous and leaderless uprising of city mobs. Lenin had not been in Russia for ten years, and he had recently predicted that revolution in Russia "would not come in my lifetime." Now it had happened and "power was lying in the streets." Dispirited, hungry citizens and mutinous soldiers had come to the end of centuries of suffering under aristocratic rule, capped by the Tsar's incompetent management of the war economy and the military in WWI. In the confusion that followed the deposition of the royal house, a Provisional Government was set up, first under Prince Lvov, and then under Alexander Kerensky, a member of one of the many underground socialist parties. Kerensky, who lives in New York City today, was such an agreeable and liberal man that hardly anyone objected to his temporary leadership until a constitutional convention could be called to establish a social democracy. The little Bolshevik cells in Russia, including men like Stalin and Molotov, had been operating by remote control during Lenin's long absence, and they, too, joined in support of the Provisional Government.

These events caught Lenin by complete surprise. He saw that, if he remained in Switzerland, opportunity to take charge during the confused state of things in Russia would slip through his fingers. He had to return home, he told his wife, Krupskaya.

After several weeks of negotiations between himself and agents of the German Kaiser in Berlin, Lenin and several of his followers were granted permission by the German Emperor, and indeed were eagerly abetted by the Germans, to make the long journey by sealed train from Switzerland into Russia and the "Finland Station" in Petrograd, Russia, though prostrate, was still technically in the war on the Allied side. The German motive in aiding Lenin was to help overthrow the new revolutionary regime in Russia and knock her totally out of the war.

Once back in his native country, Lenin took command of the confused Bolshevik cadre who had strayed from his party line. Instead of support-for-the-Provisional-Government line, Lenin preached subversion of the budding new democracy. At the same time, he ordered his Bolshevik editors and propagandists to shower a whole catalogue of promises upon the restive workers and peasants: peace, land, and bread; calling of a freely-elected Constituent Assembly which would draft a Constitution for a free Russian Republic; socialized factories in which the workers would run things and share in the profits; freedom of speech, press, and assembly, no strings attached; abolition of ranks and privileges in the armed services and civilian administration; abolition of the death penalty and Siberian exile; a prosperous material life in which there would be no inequality. And so on.

The basic Lenin work, in which these recipes for Bolshevik pie-in-the-sky may be found, is the August 1917 pamphlet written by Lenin under the title *State and Revolution*, a title borrowed from Peter Tkachev. According to a recent issue of Pravda, *State and Revolution* is the Lenin writing most exported out of Russia for consumption by "class-conscious toilers in foreign countries." There is much in the pamphlet that would appeal to unsophisticated audiences in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Many Russians, some of them avowed Bolsheviks, were themselves fooled by Lenin's promises. Some years after the November 1917 Bolshevik *coup d'etat*, Lenin made some rather rare, frank statements about the kinds of promises he had made in 1917 just before the *coup*. In his speech made to the party in May 1919, Lenin rebuked those comrades who always kept

bringing up the subject of his "unfulfilled promises." He explained that the promises on which his party got itself into power were made under "adverse conditions" and were directed only at the emotions of the masses. Such promises, he said, "do not count."

Reading Lenin's utopian promises in Soviet Russia today, a Russian does not know whether to weep bitterly or to laugh. Lenin the promiser wrote in August 1917:

"All governmental power will begin to be diminished immediately after the revolution.

"The military, the police, jails, etc., will start to disappear once the 'democratic dictatorship of the proletariat' comes into operation.

"Everyone, including ordinary workers and Russian housewives, will participate directly in the 'simple operations of control and accounting' within socialist society, and everyone will govern.

"Authorities will enjoy the same rank, station in life, even salary, as the workers and peasants, or about 6,000 rubles per year [today's average worker's salary is about 1,500 rubles].

"The 'workers' democracy,' which will replace 'middle class democracy,' will be ten times more democratic.

"No violence will be permitted 'against men in general' and 'all need for the application of force will vanish, as will subjection of one man to another, or one part of the population to another.'"

Lenin's very words.

But once Lenin the promiser became Lenin the leader of the Soviet State, the promises began to be cast aside.

Describing his Soviet Government as temporary in the decree signed by him on Nov. 8, 1917, Lenin immediately set about making it permanent. "Hostile" newspapers were suppressed, ditto political parties. Revolutionary Tribunals were established all over the country and justice, if it can be called that, was meted out to "counter-revolutionary elements," by means of drumhead firing squads. The Cheka (abbreviation for the Russian words for "Extraordinary Commission for Fighting Counter-revolution") was established under the sadistic non-Russian, Felix Dzerzhinsky. The Cheka was the forerunner of the later state police agencies—GPU, NKVD, MVD and KGB.

Lenin and his tiny group of about a dozen Commissars and other Bolshevik colleagues, abetted by some 25,000 loyal and disciplined local Bolshevik agents, had seized power and intended to hang onto it forever. Dictatorship became the order of the day. As Lenin said soon after the 1917 seizure of power: "How can the strictest unity of will be guaranteed? Only by the subordination of the wills of thousands to the will of one."

One very big promise, however, stuck, like a bone in Lenin's throat. Even some of his Central Committee comrades thought it should be fulfilled, at least in part. This was the long-standing pledge made by all political parties before November 1917, to call an all-Russian Constituent Assembly, reminiscent of the Convention that wrote the U.S. Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787. For weeks the Bolsheviks debated the question among themselves, while Lenin stubbornly said "No!" Eventually, a majority of Lenin's comrades prevailed upon him, and the Assembly was permitted to meet.

Perhaps no other event in Soviet history reveals so much about Lenin and the Communists as does that tragic one-day meeting of the last freely-elected assembly in Russia. The precedent of how the Communists destroyed it, and Russian democracy along with it, is a reminder to any contemporary non-Communist democratic country not to neglect, but to defend its democratic institutions.

Elected by no less than 36 million Russian

voters, an Assembly that was largely non-Bolshevik and considerably anti-Bolshevik took its seats in Tavrda Palace in Petrograd (renamed Leningrad three days after Lenin died) on a bitterly cold January 18, 1918. The Bolsheviks had won only about 20% of the vote. This was quite a setback when you realize that much of the country was honey-combed with Chekists and Communists during the time of the balloting. But still the Russian people refused to support the Communists. Lenin had been proved right in his fear that the Bolsheviks would be roundly rejected in a free contest. And so dozens of speeches were made inside the Tavrda Palace while Bolshevik armed guards, consisting mostly of Latvian sharpshooters, ringed the building and were posted at all doors to the palace. Lenin's behavior was typically contemptuous. He lounged in the front of the hall, slouched rudely down in his seat, his feet propped up against the raised platform. At intervals he yawned audibly, smirked or guffawed at non-Bolshevik speakers. Occasionally the Bolshevik claque noisily interfered with the speakers.

As if to signal that an end should be put to what Lenin called the "bourgeois-democratic talk fest," Lenin abruptly left the auditorium, returning to his headquarters in Smolny Institute down the street. Then the going really got rough inside the hall. By repeatedly stamping their feet, shouting and jumping up on the speaker's rostrum, Bolshevik agitators made it all but impossible for anyone to finish a sentence. Suddenly, the lights were turned off. "We're going home!" shouted one of the riflemen-guards, and his comrades proceeded to empty the hall, at gunpoint when necessary.

The next day, Tavrda Palace was bolted tight and guards were posted to cordon off the building. Meanwhile, many of the delegates, especially the better known socialists and liberals, were arrested, sent to labor camps, imprisoned, banished from the country or shot. The Constituent Assembly "is hereby prorogued," announced the Soviet Government, with the authority of the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, V. I. Ulyanov (Lenin). "Prorogued" means "deferred to a later date." This ended the one day that did not shake the world, nor Lenin's dictatorship. Today, as I found on a recent trip to Leningrad, Tavrda Palace functions as a "Higher Party School." The words of Lenin hover over the palace like an unwelcome ghost—"The dispersal of the Constituent Assembly by the Soviet Government is a frank and complete liquidation of formal democracy in the name of revolutionary dictatorship." Which explains why the Assembly is still prorogued after 52 years.

From mid-January 1918 forward, Lenin's regime was on the defense, as anti-Bolshevik sentiments within the population began to be converted into armies of counter-Bolshevik soldiers. Prisons began to fill up with "pol-pleniki," or political prisoners. The Lenin toll in lives began to mount. But, at the same time, a virulent political opposition within the Bolshevik party began to develop, much to Lenin's horror. The famous Tenth Party ("Unity") Congress (1921) went down in Communist history as Lenin's classical way of dealing with opposition in his own party. Disagreement with the party line by party members, he said, is a "breach of party discipline" and will not be tolerated. "We have had enough of opposition!" Lenin insisted at the congress. The Cheka and Trotsky's soldiers stood behind these declarations.

What were the gripes of the Bolsheviks who thus opposed their founder? The best statement ever made by disillusioned Communists—with the possible exception of the Czechoslovak reformed-Communists in 1968—is that of the Kronstadt sailors and their Communist leaders. It was this island

fortress of garrisoned Red sailors situated in the Baltic Sea near Petrograd which openly revolted against the Lenin regime in March of 1921. Some of them had held the rifles that sent the Constituent Assembly home.

The first grievance of the Kronstadters against Lenin was aimed at his government's poor economic performance. Production of consumer goods, sorely needed by the Russian population, was not more than a fourth of the pre-World War I figure. Peasants could not work the soil properly since production of agricultural tools and equipment was neglected in favor of production of weapons and vehicles needed for enforcing the dictatorship. Paper-money inflation reached such astronomical heights that workers' wages were often paid in kind—food rations, clothing, shoes—since the real value of their earnings had been reduced nearly to zero.

Second, the Kronstadt rebels, and they had many sympathizers beyond Petrograd, demanded an end to dictatorship by a single party and the single leader, Lenin.

Third, all land was to be returned to the peasants, from whom in many cases it had been appropriated in the name of "nationalization of all property." Factories were to go to the workers to be run by the soviets, as promised by Lenin in *State and Revolution* and in other articles and speeches before November 7, 1917. And so on.

Naturally, Lenin and his men did not intend to stand by and watch Kronstadt become a national insurrection. Trotsky unlimbered part of the Red Army and marched it on Kronstadt. The sailors asked for a meeting to state their grievances. Instead they were given an ultimatum to surrender, followed by an armed attack.

Lenin sent his white-garbed Red Soldiers across the ice in a driving snow storm on the night of March 8, 1921. The sailors defended themselves valiantly but hopelessly. The attackers suffered 4,127 wounded and 527 killed. No figures for the losses inflicted on the rebels have ever been released, but they were overcome. "Once Kronstadt had been taken," writes Roland Gaucher in his new book, *Opposition in the U.S.S.R. 1917-1967* (Funk & Wagnalls, 1969), "the Cheka's tribunals moved in. There were mass arrests. Petrograd's prisons were jammed. Every night little groups of prisoners were taken out of their cells and shot . . . Those who were spared were loaded on to trains and shipped to the north and the camps of Arkhangel. These men would never be seen again."

Should the presently spreading anti-Lenin campaign, represented by the Medvedev manuscript, ever build into large-scale insurrection, the "Kronstadt Program" of the demands made by the sailors against the Lenin regime would undoubtedly be resurrected.

Just before he died and while he was prevented by illness from working in his Kremlin office for over a year, Lenin seems to have been plagued by a dozen demons besides popular dissatisfaction. He began to become aware of a conspiracy against him from within his own Politburo (some say Stalin had Lenin poisoned). He became increasingly confused as to how to handle the ponderous bureaucracy which he had created. The Soviet State had become a Frankenstein's monster and its creator had no idea how to manage it. Utterly useless "secret letters to the Politburo" were written by the ailing leader. All sorts of new agencies were created to "combat bureaucracy." Having become suspicious of Stalin, Lenin advised his comrades to find some way of "removing Stalin." But in this, as in many other respects, the comrades ignored him. One night, on the spur of the moment and with almost frantic suspicion, the ailing Lenin ordered his chauffeur to drive him unnoticed and unannounced to his empty Kremlin office. There he saw terrified looks on the faces of

underlings who watched him stalking his office like an unwanted ghost. The visit lasted only a few hours, after which Lenin's doctors ordered him to return to his suburban Moscow retreat of Gorky. That was the last time he came to the Kremlin alive.

A few months later he died. Stalin, whom Lenin had belatedly warned his followers to cast off, jockeyed himself into position as the chief mourner, and the Lenin cult was born.

The rest of the heritage that started with Lenin has been surveyed time and again—the brutal collectivization drive, the ever-increasing number of labor camps, violent insurrections among the population that were put down by the Soviet police and military, the bloodbath purges of the 1930's, the wartime and postwar Soviet take-overs in the Baltic States, Eastern Central and Balkan Europe, the lack of elementary civil liberties and so on.

The celebration takes place this April 22.

ECCE HOMO—BEHOLD THE MAN

You will be hearing quite a bit this year about Lenin and his "humanism" . . . his concern for the toiling, oppressed masses. Be careful! These are lies!

For, in truth, Lenin was a cunning, self-centered, cynical bigot who didn't give a whit about anybody or anything. His sole concern was *violent revolution* to save and expand the Russian Empire, and the power that flows from revolution. Although bemoaning the plight of the proletariat, he ridiculed those liberals who were trying to legally reform the system or who personally performed philanthropic work among the masses. He, himself, having been born into a well-off family, and preferring to subsist off his mother's pension, never knew the meaning of manual work. Even as a lawyer, with the opportunity to defend the exploited from the exploiters in a court of law, Lenin was a complete flop: out of ten cases he won only one—his own.

The particular kind of psychopathy that had taken possession of Lenin would, in contemporary psychology, be diagnosed as megalomania. Traces of it can be found very early in his childhood, and, after several nervous breakdowns, terminated in a brain hemorrhage. As a child he was rejected by his peers because of his mocking, arrogant attitude and ill-tempered intolerance. A biographer has described him at this time as . . . "cruel by nature. As a boy, he liked to shoot at stray cats, or to break a crow's wing with his airgun." This cruelty was to exert itself a thousand times more strongly, when he ordered his Red Troops to "pry bread from the peasants with bayonets," and to apply the "most drastic measures" in destroying the Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Caucasian, Baltic, and other national republics that had declared their independence of the Russian Tsarist Empire in 1917-1918.

Regarding his personal ethics, Trotsky referred to Lenin as "opportunistic" in his standards. Lenin, himself, admitted that he had learned to regard "all persons without sentiment; to keep a stone in one's sling." For Lenin, the fulfillment of his psychotic dream—a communist world under Moscow's absolute control—was greater than life itself (particularly somebody else's); in his own words: ". . . it doesn't matter if three-fourths of mankind perish! The only thing that matters is that, in the end, the remaining fourth shall be communist."

George F. Kennan, America's top Sovietologist, describes the Bolshevik clique that grabbed power in 1917 as "frustrated, discontented, hopeless of finding self-expression—or too impatient to seek it—in the confining limits of the Tsarist political system, yet lacking wide popular support for their choice of bloody revolution as a means of social betterment, these revolutionists found in Marxist theory a highly convenient rationalization for their own instinctive de-

sires. It afforded pseudo-scientific justification for impatience, for their categorical denial of all value in the Tsarist system, for their yearning for power and revenge, and for their inclination to cut corners in the pursuit of it. . . . But in seeking that security of their own rule, they were prepared to recognize no restrictions, either of God or man, in the character of their methods. And until such time as that security might be achieved, they placed far down on their scale of operational priorities the comforts and happiness of the peoples entrusted to their care The security of Soviet power came to rest on the iron discipline of the Party, in the severity and ubiquity of the secret police, and on the uncompromising economic monopolism of the state."

HAS ANYTHING CHANGED?

Has anything changed since the overthrow of Tsarism in the Russian Empire? Yes . . . for the worse! The 5,000 Tsarist secret police were replaced by the Soviet secret police of 2,000,000. The Tsarist policy of Russification of captive, non-Russian nations such as Ukraine, Esthonia, Armenia, Turkestan, etc., became a more refined policy of outright physical extermination, mass deportation—resulting in a staggering 72,000,000 deaths since 1917. Tsarist imperial expansion under the guise of Pan-Slavism was replaced by a globe-girding Bolshevik program of expansion under the guise of Communism. Tsarist feudal exploitation of the peasantry by the wealthy aristocracy, was replaced by state exploitation of the peasantry by the party bureaucracy. Even the highly-touted industrial development of the Russian Communist Empire has yet to match the 19% annual rate of growth of the Empire industry prior to the Bolshevik Revolution. Absolutism, despotism, centralism, and the law of force became the keystones of this "workers' paradise" founded by Lenin and his cronies. All non-Russian churches were virtually destroyed.

Yes, Lenin would have been proud to see how "mother Russian" has advanced in the last 52 years . . . like a large, bloated parasite feeding off the blood and sweat of Eastern Europe, Cuba, and now is reaching out over the Mediterranean to snuff out the life of tiny Israel, and thereby ensnare the whole Arab world. Today Russians are in control of all the administrative positions in the USSR, in the universities, behind desks, while the colonial non-Russian republics, are providing the man-power and natural resources to fuel this gigantic machine of oppression.

Yet, in spite of Lenin's extensive and serious criminal record, the U.N. educational division, UNESCO, has authorized a symposium on Lenin in April, 1970 to greet the centenary of his birth in 1870, and empowered the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva to hold a special meeting as a memorial for the "humanist ideas of Lenin" and the "significant practical and theoretical contributions of Lenin, prominent humanist, to the development and realization of economic, social, and cultural rights."

By authorizing a symposium and a special meeting for the glorification of Lenin, the U.N. has trampled upon the misery of the people enslaved by the communist tyrants, and especially those of the captive, non-Russian people in the USSR; has perverted the concept of peace, freedom, humanity and justice into a monumental, perfidious hypocrisy; and has become a willing accessory for the promulgation of red fascism.

What a travesty against history!

That any organization—other than communist—would attempt to prostitute education by peddling Lenin as a humanist is an insult to the civilized world community.

Shame on the U.N.! Shame on UNESCO!
Freedom to Nations! Freedom to Individuals!

Achievements of the U.S.S.R. after 52 years of existence—the human victims

The Russian Civil War (1917-21)	1,000,000
War against Ukraine (1917-22)	2,000,000
War against Finland (1918)	50,000
War against the Baltic countries (1918-19)	110,000
War against Poland (1920)	600,000
War against Georgia (1921-22)	20,000
War against Japan (1928-31)	30,000
War against Poland (1939)	3,000
War against Finland (1939)	400,000
Second World War (according to Khrushchev data)	20,000,000
The Red terror (1917-23)	2,290,000
Second wave of terror of Cheka (1923-30)	2,000,000
First Famine (1921-22)	6,000,000
Second artificial Famine in Ukraine (1933)	1,000,000
Killing of "kulaks" (collectivization)	1,000,000
Third wave of terror by the NKVD (1933-37)	1,600,000
Yezovshchina (1937-38)	2,500,000
Years of antiwar and postwar (1937-47)	2,700,000
In concentration camps in Siberia	20,000,000
Total	72,303,000

American Friends of Antibolshevik Block of Nations, Washington Metropolitan Branch, Post Office Box 4212, Washington, D.C., 20012.

AN APPEAL TO THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD

In 1970 the Soviet government is going to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the birth of Lenin, the founder of the USSR. Grand parades will take place in Moscow and the Russian people will be compelled, for fear of severe reprisals, to glorify the fanatic who enslaved them to Communism.

It has been announced in the newspapers that the United Nations intend to pay their tribute to V. I. Lenin, honoring him for his alleged "humanitarian ideas" and his "activities inspiring and developing economic, social and cultural rights".

We, Russian immigrants, who chose freedom earnestly protest against the celebration of V. I. Lenin by the United Nations because such a glorification of this Communist leader would be a proof of complete ignorance of historic facts by the participating Nations and a bitter mockery at the suffering Russian people.

We are speaking on behalf of several millions of Russian immigrants who left their homes in their Fatherland and immigrated to foreign countries all over the world because of the intolerable oppression of the Communist regime imposed by Lenin in the Soviet Union that deprived the people of human rights and made them slaves.

We accuse Lenin and the Comintern of having seized Russia by deceit and terror and having established their Headquarters (the Soviet Government) in Moscow. They have abolished even the name "Russia" and changed it into a "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" pending the formation of a World Socialist Union under Communist rule.

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Soviet government of regicide: the brutal massacre of Emperor Nicholas II and Empress Alexandra, their son the heir to the throne Czarovich Alexey and their beautiful young daughters in the basement of the Ipatiev's house in Ekaterinburg, which has been renamed Sverdlovsk in honor of the man by whose order the massacre had been committed.

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Soviet government of the murder of scores of millions of Russian men, women and even adolescents in the prisons of the Cheka and in the slave-labor camps beyond the Arctic

Circle, submitted to torture, exhausted by hard labor and shot, their bodies being thrown into ditches without Christian burial.

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Soviet government of the tragic plight and death of millions of children who had been made homeless orphans, their parents having been shot or imprisoned, who were roaming all over the country in quest of food, sleeping under bridges, traveling on tops or between wheels of railway carriages, gathering in packs, robbing vegetable gardens and being shot like little wild animals, dying by thousands from accidents, sickness, hunger and early vice. According to the Soviet census in 1927 there were 9,000,000 such destitute children, called "bezprizorniki" which means "those who are not cared for."

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Soviet government of inhuman "collectivization" of peasants whose will they had broken by ruthless shootings and the organization of an artificial hunger which brought death to millions of people and depopulated whole regions.

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Soviet government of ruthless persecution of religion and especially of the Russian Orthodox Church, of having imprisoned and shot thousands of priests (among them 51 bishops and 2 metropolitans), of deporting to slave-labor camps, monks, nuns and Christian believers, of demolishing the beautiful cathedral of Christ Our Savior in Moscow, of transforming the highly venerated Solovky Monastery into a terrible prison, of destroying and desecrating thousands of Russian churches and of carrying on a vicious militant propaganda of atheism. We also accuse Lenin of vandalism; of the destruction of historical monuments and landmarks and beautiful works of art precious to the Russian culture.

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Soviet government of having robbed the Russian people of their wealth and of having abolished private property. We accuse Lenin of his senseless economic policy because of which Russia, formerly the granary of Europe, but since transformed into the USSR, has to buy wheat from the United States and Canada.

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Soviet government of inculcating the Marxism-Leninism and the deadly Dialectical Materialism into the minds of the people, stifling and killing every free thought, every free word, every initiative, transforming a human being into a soul-less robot. We accuse Lenin of exploiting and harnessing the Russian genius with the purpose of deceiving the Free World and destroying it.

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Soviet government with the diabolic organization of the CHEKA, GPU, NKVD and KGB which introduced spying into public life and even into the family, teaching children to report on their parents and destroying the trust among individuals, making impossible any preparation necessary for the liberation movement.

We accuse Lenin and the Communist Party of world aggression having for object World Domination.

We believe that the eulogy of Lenin's "ideas" and "activity" by the United Nations will be misleading and dangerous to the Free World.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

OLGA SVIR.

PERSECUTION OF CHRISTIANS IN THE SOVIET UNION—1969

The year ends. What happened in this year with the Christians in the Soviet Union? Let us give the words of the Soviet press:

"Pravda Vostoka" of March 6, 1969, reports about the second trial of the Orthodox Valentina Wnukowa. Her crime is that she protested against the closing of the church in

her village, and that she changed her home into a church. Together with her, Ekaterina Pochiltschuk also landed in prison.

"Znamia Vostoka" of March 6, 1969, reports from Suchumi that several illegal prayer houses have been discovered. Boris Lukashew, Punk, Reschuk, and other have been condemned because they organized a secret printing press on which the secret Baptist magazine, "The Herald of Salvation," was printed.

Another point of incrimination is religious teaching of children. Zoia Pokrachinskaja, a member of the organization of the Communist youth, was converted and started writing to soldiers of the Red army, asking them, in the name of the love of God, to separate themselves from the world. For this, this girl landed in prison.

"Pravda Vostoka" of May 8, 1969, reports that in the town of Angren, eight Soviet citizens, all of German background, have been condemned to up to five years of prison. They are guilty of organizing prayer meetings with over sixty young people and of spreading contagious diseases to the Soviet population by three means: (1) The holy kiss. (The Russian Christians kiss each other at the end of the church service.) (2) Taking part in the holy sacrament from the same glass. (3) Baptizing in the same water.

Only one month later, in the same town of Angren, another fifteen people were condemned for their religious convictions. Among others are Rabintschuk together with his four sons. ("Pravda Vostoka" of June 12).

We also have reports about twenty-three condemnations for religious reasons within one town, in one month. The Soviet Union has 5,094 towns. The year has twelve months. There is no reason to believe that the Christians in Angren are more persecuted than in other places. How many Christians are there in prison today in the Soviet Union?

"Liudina i Svit," the atheist Ukrainian magazine in its issue of August 1, incriminates B. Zdorowetz, charging him with sending to the West materials about the state of the church in the Soviet Union. In Krivoi Rog, according to this report, Baptists had an open procession. The police tried to disperse them. The Baptist Petrakov, according to the article, slapped a policeman and of course received the natural consequence of his act.

"Pravda" of August 19, 1969, reports about the secret Baptist and underground prayer meetings (why should they be underground?). Tscherwiakowa arrived before the tribunal. She had twelve children reared in the Christian faith. The same with Kondraschow.

"Kommunist Tadzhikistana" of September 30 reminds the Communists that Lenin taught them that the fight against religious ideology and the atheist rearing of children is the main task of the Party.

"Sovietskaia Estonia" of October 5 presents us a picture of the church in Suzadal. The church has been transformed into a museum.

"Kazakstankaia Pravda" of September 20, 1969, reports about the imprisonment of the believers Andreas Dehring, Iokob, and Olga Stadel.

This is only a very short and prosaic presentation of some facts from the Soviet Press. How much pain and torture lies beyond that can be seen from the report of the Underground Church in the Soviet Union concerning Hmara of Kulunda, whose corpse was returned to his family. From the mouth bloody rags have been taken out, revealing that the tongue had been cut out and the teeth kicked out. The soles of the feet were cut and bruised by beatings. Burns appear on his legs. The case of Hmara was reported in 1966. Those who ran the prisons in 1966 in the Soviet Union are still running them

today. The well-known book of Marchenko, my testimony, describes the awful treatment of Christians and others in Soviet prisons.

I have just received an open letter addressed to Kosygin and Brezhnev by families of Christian prisoners. Out of this letter we present new facts.

Lieutenant Arnow, the head of the Kairsch prison camp, one day told the Christian prisoner Petrenko, "Today the Baptist Petrenko is dead. From today on, even the prisoner Petrenko does not exist in the prison camp." Since then, his family has not seen him anymore, and no parcels can be sent to him. It is believed that he is very ill. To the invalid Fiodor Petrakov, Major Schtscheglow said, "Forget your faith and your God. Then you may eat." The Christian refused the deal. Here also, his contact with his family was broken.

In the city of Kopeisk, the Communists and policemen entered the Baptist church during the service. On the altar they placed bottles with alcoholic beverages and photographed the believers with them. Then, they could show in their atheistic propaganda that the Christians were reveling during their church service.

In Nijnaja Tagida, twenty-three Christians were fined 4,945 rubles for illegal prayer meetings. Because they were too poor, they could not pay this fine. Now, their furniture, their sewing machines, and other things are publicly auctioned to pay the fine.

In this letter, new arrests are also announced. Among the condemned is Serghei Golev. He is 74 years old and has already spent nineteen years in prison. In the condemnation, it was stated that the Bibles found in his home were destroyed.

All Christians who have fulfilled their prison term are now under house arrest.

The sentence against N. Sloboda, V. Sloboda and P. Kurasch states that radios have been confiscated from them because they listened to religious broadcasts from the West.

"Visti i Rymu" of June, 1969, says also that the Greek Catholic Bishop Basl Welyczkowskii has died in prison.

This is the state of the Christians in the Soviet Union in 1969.

RICHARD WURMBRAND.

HOW I CAN MAKE A BETTER AMERICA

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year a large number of students in the schools of Erie County, N.Y., engage in an essay contest conducted by the Buffalo Evening News and the Erie County American Legion and Auxiliary.

This year marked the 41st year of the contest and 12 winners were chosen from among the thousands of entrants in the sixth through the 12th grades in some 300 public and private schools.

The prize for the 12 winners, once again, was a long weekend trip by air to our Nation's Capital over the Easter holiday weekend.

In the Capital, the winners received, very appropriately, the real VIP treatment, being provided with a private bus which took them to historic sites on a carefully prearranged and all-inclusive schedule.

Accompanying the winners to Washington were Russell F. Tripi, Legion Americanism chairman; Mrs. Max F. Senn, Auxiliary Americanism leader; Mr. Senn; and David E. Peugeot, promotion editor of the Buffalo Evening News.

The topic for this year's contest was: How I Can Make a Better America.

Following are the texts of the winning essays:

HOW I CAN MAKE A BETTER AMERICA

(By Valerie Dubois)

(Miss Dubois, 17, of 170 Woodlawn Ave., Buffalo, is an East High School junior, winner of Girls Division of the Buffalo High School Classification. Her teacher is Melvin A. Bass.)

America is my homeland, a land that I love. Her founding fathers visualized and sought to establish a nation which would provide life, liberty, and happiness to all her people. But despite all the good aspects of the American way of life, evils also emerge. America is plagued by internal turmoil, crime, social injustice, drug abuse, pornography, and immorality. Yet I, as a citizen, can help make America better. Her ideals have not been attained fully, but her case is not hopeless. Amid America's strife, I must keep a cool, level head. I must assert my individuality and use my own judgment in moral and civil matters.

My contribution to the improvement of my country depends on my love for her. Everyone respects, admires, and protects anything he loves. I can prove my love, and dedication to my country by obeying her laws, guarding her freedom, and being true to the ideals set forth by her forefathers.

I must make full use of the privileges and accept the responsibilities offered to me by my country. I can help America find peace needed so desperately. I can help America return to religion and prayer; to be aware of her moral conduct; to seek good in all men; and to face and live life completely. I must be a personal ambassador in my home, community, and city by exemplifying the American way of life. I must be a symbol to the world of a true American. I must display an understanding attitude toward others, and through education learn more about others and their way of life. I must help others to realize that human beings all over the world have similar desires and aspirations.

It is my individual responsibility as an American to understand her way of life, to help sustain it, to conduct myself at all times as a true American. I have to try to transmit this spirit to others around me and to future generations.

America will be better if I, and all Americans, build upon rather than try to destroy the solid foundations laid by our forefathers.

(By Bruce Markowitz)

(Mr. Markowitz, 15, of 117 Homer Ave., Buffalo, is a Riverside High School sophomore, winner of Boys Division of the Buffalo Public High School Classification. His teacher is Mrs. Ruth P. Zietlow.)

Perching upon a mountain—a cloudy view of the American countryside unfolding before my eyes. Numerous thoughts spin through my mind as I view the glorious scene of splendor and beauty. The land is so beautiful and magnificent; its potential to be a haven of common brotherhood is limitless. Therefore, why are there so many huge problems if the land is so capable of being a glorious place in which to live?

I, as an American youth living in the twentieth century, am faced with the tremendous responsibility and challenge of helping to alleviate the familiar problems of poverty, war, pollution, and prejudice that blight our country. It would be so easy to assume the attitude of many of my fellow

Americans—apathy. I will not because I must meet my responsibility and apathy is fatal to the indefatigable efforts of those Americans who are trying to unite in a mutual understanding.

I firmly believe that before America can fully solve her manifold problems, the citizens of our country, including myself, must undergo a period of self-examination and soul-searching to determine what should be improved in ourselves and afterwards we can all aid in the betterment of America because we have achieved the goal of self-betterment.

Indeed, the challenge is demanding, but I must help meet it by involvement in community affairs. The path to achieving harmony is difficult and obstacles loom in our path. However, if I as an American can undergo a personal self-examination and persuade others to do so, I will have bettered America. American values can, must, and will change through a unified effort. By aiding my fellow Americans financially, physically, mentally, and emotionally I am helping to better America.

As the late Robert F. Kennedy said, "I dream of things that never were and ask why not?" In these troubled times for America, let us all fulfill our individual responsibilities of self-betterment and then unite in a single common brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. I hope that I will be able to play an important role in achieving this ideal situation.

(By Cynthia Lipsius)

(Miss Lipsius, 11, 21 Parkside Ave., Buffalo, is a sixth-grade pupil at School 54, winner of the Girls Division of Buffalo Public Elementary School Classification. Her teacher is Joyce C. Pestell.)

How can I make a better America? There are many ways that come to mind, but the most important of these ways is to improve myself. I can work at breaking down bad habits and building good ones. I can learn to accept helpful criticism without becoming hurt. I can try to think of other people first and myself last. I can learn to understand other people and their way of life, and in many ways show kindness and consideration for others.

How can I make a better America? I can make a better America by showing good conduct and attitudes.

How can I make a better America? I can set a good example for others. I can try to be a good citizen right here where I live.

How can I make a better America? I can take advantage of the education offered to me. I can pass on the benefits of this education to those who are less fortunate than I am.

It is only when I have bettered myself that I can help to improve my surroundings, thus helping my country. How can I make a better America? There are many ways, but the most important of these ways is by improving me.

(By Allan E. Frank)

(Mr. Frank, 13, 544 Highgate Ave., Buffalo, is an eighth-grade pupil at School 80, winner of the Boys Division of the Buffalo Public Elementary School Classification. His teacher is Mrs. Mary A. Lynch.)

America's image today has become blurred at home and abroad, but we know that this picture can be cleared.

To reestablish America's prestige, I have to start improving myself. I will begin by upgrading my speech habits and acquiring a vocabulary that shows culture and maturity. My attitude towards rules, my personal conduct, and my eagerness to learn are impressive examples for the younger people of my generation.

Directly, I can do very little for peace, but to help achieve this goal, I cannot run away from it; I must strive for peace. Respecting others is a start. Although I might not agree with another's opinion, I can let it be proved or disproved before accepting or rejecting

it. I can rate people for what they are, not for their background or color. This respect will spread until races will respect races and nations will respect nations. This will truly be a basis for peace.

I will study the characters and accomplishments of politicians of today so that when I reach voting age, I will be able to better evaluate candidates. It will be my generation that must keep our government from going to the extremes of despotism or anarchy.

Since I am a young American, I have to prepare myself for an occupation that will benefit America. I could consider the Peace Corps, Vista and other social services. But not everybody has to be a social worker. America needs private enterprise for its economy. Who else will pay taxes? Who else will grow food? Who will make necessities and luxuries? Who will distribute these?

It's about time I stopped putting the blame on some one else for how this country looks, and stopped complaining about what "They" should do. I have to start working—Now!

(By James P. Speciale)

(Mr. Speciale, 16, 31 Avery St., Lackawanna, is a Lackawanna Senior High junior, winner of the Boys Division of the Erie County Public High School Classification. His teacher is Julius Boda.)

Perfection is an endless struggle, but the very striving for perfection brings about a change for the better. Since the time of colonial America, countless changes have taken place in this country, most of which were initiated by individuals attempting to improve America.

In America today, the pendulum of ideas is winging toward dissent. But when the pendulum swings far to one extreme, it soon swings the other way. It is the responsibility of America's youth to push the pendulum toward peaceful patriotism and constructive amelioration instead of destructive malefaction.

I am a young American with a whole life yet to be molded. My turn will come to take up the battle begun by my predecessors to work for the betterment of America. I will have to take part in pushing the pendulum toward peace and improvement. And I must begin now by improving myself.

I must take advantage of the knowledge offered by education. Through this knowledge I may understand my country's successes and short comings, and possibly find a method of helping to make a better America.

I must also utilize the freedom already granted me. If the people who call themselves "freedom fighters" would lay aside their weapons and think, they would discover that they are barring their own freedom. For freedom lies in the attitude of the people.

As an individual, I cannot change all of America. But perhaps I can change a small part. And that part may become a small victory in the continuing battle to make a better America.

(By Debra Jean Ekberg)

(Miss Ekberg, 13, 16 Burdette Drive, Cheektowaga, is an eighth-grade pupil at Maryvale Junior High School, Cheektowaga, winner of the Girls Division of the Erie County Public Junior High School Classification. Her teacher is Helen M. Stelrecht.)

As an individual walks the streets of our nation, many scenes confront him. He observes the young Negro in the ghetto, the teen-ager from a wealthy family, and then he sees me.

I am an average young American who recognizes a condition of restlessness and uncertainty in my country, but I believe I can envision a brighter future for America.

If I try to know people and understand their feelings before I judge them, maybe I can set an example for others, and thus ease some of the prejudice in my environment.

If I try to respect the experience and opinions of those older than I, maybe today's parents will not lose hope for the future. This communication between generations would make it easier for us to understand our own children in years to come.

If I try to comprehend the feelings and motives of the drug abuser and the rioter, maybe others will see a young teenager trying to understand, and feel that they can also try. Such actions might also contribute toward bringing about a type of change acceptable to the generations of our society.

If I encourage my friends to improve conditions in school, at home, and in their neighborhoods, maybe each word or action of mine will send out its own small ray of hope for our nation's future.

I believe that great accomplishments grow from small beginnings. A great number of individual efforts are needed to solve our nation's problems. I am one of thousands of students who have entered this contest. If each of us is sincere in what he has written, we have the strong foundation so necessary in building a better America.

(By Christine Turner)

(Miss Turner, 17, 100 Toelsin Rd., Buffalo, is a Cheektowaga Central High School senior, winner of the Girls Division of the Erie County Public High School Classification. Her teacher is Mrs. Elvira W. Hammond.)

I, as an American, must evaluate my country, review its purposes and goals, and then compare them to its reality. I can achieve this objective, day by day, by being aware of how the United States is acting domestically and on foreign fronts, and by keeping abreast of current events. Only then am I qualified to criticize, for only when I know all the facts am I able to view the situation objectively. Criticize I must, as must all Americans concerned with the health and welfare of our country and people. Without this criticism our country might deteriorate into complacency or crumble into apathy and oblivion.

This criticism, to be useful, however, must be more than impressive words. It must be full of purpose and meaning. It must be constructive in that it has been the result of deliberation and reflects enthusiastic and optimistic hope for the future. I must express my views, not only to those who nod their heads in agreement, but also those who vehemently disagree. In return, I must be willing to listen with the ultimate objective of understanding. I must not hesitate to express my views, even in the face of oppressive opposition.

I must communicate my awareness to others, expecting their awareness and concern in return. In this way I am building attitudes and engendering interest and a deep involvement which may eventually lead to action.

One of the vital responsibilities of an American is to be concerned about his country. I feel that I can improve America with my interest and awareness, both contagious factors, and by communication and exchange of my ideas with others. In an effort to counteract futility and resignation, I must attempt to make each individual realize what an important part, modest and humble though it may be, he plays in his country. Both you and I must be held accountable for our country's actions. For does not each one of us make up a minute part of the whole—America, without which the whole could not exist?

(By Donald Enzinna)

(Mr. Enzinna, 13, 72 Santin Drive, Cheektowaga, is an eighth-grade pupil at Maryvale Junior High School, Cheektowaga, winner of the Boys Division of the Erie County Public Junior High School Classification. His teacher is Helen M. Stelrecht.)

How can I make a better America? This is a difficult question to answer, for I cannot

change the world by myself. I am one of many, however, and through influencing others, I hope that all of us, working together, will bring about improvements.

I can make a more economically-conscious America by influencing my generation to work and earn their own money! That way, as future leaders, we will know and respect its value.

I can make a more beautiful and lasting America by my example in the discontinuance of littering and the support of anti-pollution measures.

I can make a more positive America, as well as insuring the health of future generations, by setting an example in refusing to experiment with dangerous drugs.

I can make a more peaceful America by showing respect for law and order, and by striving, with endurance and openmindedness, to help my fellow Americans, regardless of their color or creed.

I can make a more loyal America by reminding other teen-agers of the debt we owe to our heritage. If we should then be called into service we will defend our nation on foreign battlegrounds, rather than destroying it on campus battlegrounds.

I can set an example for a more educated America by striving to the best of my ability to make the most of my schooling. I can best help America by first improving myself.

If everyone possesses these ideals, considers it a God-given privilege to live in a free country, and works toward its improvement, this goal can be reached. It will then be a truly better America, and I will have contributed to it.

(By Mary E. Margerum)

(Miss Margerum, 17, 59 Ashton Place, Buffalo, is a Victory Academy senior, winner of the Private and Parochial High School Classification. Her teacher is Sister M. Sylvia Reimondo.)

John Stuart Mill once said "freedom of speech provides a means of searching for the truth and is effective antidote for error." Alexander Hamilton, in "The Federalist," stated that trial by jury is a security against corruption. These men were concerned with basic principles of our land. However, time has elapsed and problems have demanded solutions for improving our country, and I ask myself: "What can I, as an individual, do?"

First, I can be active in my community by becoming involved politically. By encouraging people to register and vote, I can help America to become better.

Then, too, by writing to my congressmen and expressing my views on current problems facing our government, I might in some small way encourage others to do so.

In addition to the above, I can support my country through the right kind of education. A good basic education will help materially to keep safe the spirit of "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Offering my services to such youth organizations as the Peace Corps and VISTA, where I can teach people to read and write and to "help themselves," is another way of helping America. Often, a smile, a pleasant handshake, or an encouraging word are what these underprivileged people need most.

For what my country has given me, I shall show a deep devotion and loyalty to her interests. Of course, as a citizen, I have the freedom to agree or to disagree, but I must remember that the freedom to disagree does not mean the freedom to destroy. It is my country; I am its citizen; it is my duty to do everything I can to uphold law and order. Doing this will strengthen America.

America is still young; it is only two centuries old, with plenty of time to do some better living. I, as a young adult, have a wonderful opportunity to help. The United

States was appropriately named; I want to keep the states and the people united, for disunited we are nothing; together we are one. This means a better America.

(By Victor J. Patnella)

(Mr. Patnella, 17, 254 Stockbridge Ave., Buffalo, is a Bishop Turner High School junior, winner of the Private and Parochial High School Classification. His teacher is Rev. Francis Braun.)

As a young American of 16, my role as a fully matured person, who takes part in the great issues of our day, has yet to begin. At the present time, the only way that I can make a better America is to make a better "me." In developing my knowledge, my talents, my potential, I am preparing myself for my future as an active American.

The main question for me now, in a world where battle lines are constantly being drawn, is: "Where is the greatest work that I can do with the talent that I have?" I must answer this soon and by myself. The 20th Century is my time and I must seek my place in it.

At the present time, the answer and the challenge is in earning the letters. "M.D.", after my name. As a physician, as one who sacrifices himself for the welfare of many, I must accept the ugly as well as the beautiful. To answer this challenge is my privilege and my responsibility.

The problems of today's America are my problems and they demand deeds. As a physician I will try to utilize, along with my physical talents, the powers of my spirit and mind. I hope this will help to support the fragile peace existing among men.

Today demands a deeper emphasis on the brotherhood of man. All people and professions must seek this. Brotherhood is the force that should unite men. Patriotism is not enough. Tomorrow's nations must belong to a larger world with a greater goal than any one country. Countries must work together, each giving something to each other. This is my dream.

Only by fulfilling myself can I hope to fulfill this dream. I must achieve my highest possible level of self improvement and become a total American. Then I can take the privilege of my American freedom which I have received from the past and project it into the future for other men.

(By Marlene Ann Zolnowski)

(Miss Zolnowski, 13, 94 Nash Ave., Buffalo, is an Eighth-grade pupil of Our Lady of Czestochowa School, Cheektowaga, winner of the Girls' Division of the Private and Parochial Elementary School Classification. Her teacher is Sister Mary Adelbert.)

The youth of America faces the serious problem of building tomorrow's better America. It is a great task and a challenge, but I accept it and willingly perform my part.

I am continuously striving to obtain a good education, developing sound values and using my abilities to their fullest potential. I must become all that I can be, for a "Better America" begins with better men and women. I must acquire an education to comprehend tomorrow's new ideas and put them into daily use. Therefore, there is a need of more competent teachers to instruct tomorrow's leaders. As I begin to think of my career, I realize that a teaching career will greatly shape tomorrow's America.

In an age marked by disorder and riots, I face greater responsibility to respect and obey laws. I must serve my nation with determination, courage and honor and work zealously to brighten reality. There is racial tension alienating many from their fellow Americans, but I must learn to live and work with others prudently and thus, through mutual understanding and cooperation, tear down the barriers which separate one individual from another and make a "Better America." I shall help to overcome the prejudices that

exist for America was built on the principle that all men were created equal. It must remain that way and we must become all that we can, for a better and stronger America.

As leaders and citizens of tomorrow, today's youth will be faced with the task of helping to solve the numerous problems which confront our nation. It is my right and duty to get involved expressing my opinions and sound judgments and help keep America become better and remain forever great and free!

(By Samuel J. J. Merritt III)

(Mr. Merritt, 14, 258 East Utica St., Buffalo, is an eight-grade pupil of St. Nicholas School, winner of the Boys Division of the Private and Parochial Elementary School Classification. His teacher is Sister M. Trinita.)

The future of our country depends on me as a youth of today. The most important thing my country asks of me is to be loyal.

There are many ways for me as a dedicated young American to show my loyalty. While I am in school I can do nothing better than to prepare for a useful and worthwhile life. This shows loyalty towards your country. If I do not take advantage of every opportunity now to know my government, I will not be ready to serve it when I take my place in the community in which I will live. I will have to establish a stable foundation in society so I can survive.

As a loyal American youth I will strive to know everything about my government. I will endeavor to understand its history, its growth and the problems it faces, such as drugs, pollution, racism, etc.

I must learn to stand up for what is right. And the only way I can achieve this is to strengthen my character and my personality.

A good American must be an intelligent American. If I would love and be loyal to my country, I must know it and know what it stands for.

Loyalty implies courage. It is the courage of citizens who love and vote so that their country can get the right man in office and rid the government of weak or unscrupulous men. I, as a youth of America, cannot do this today but in the future I shall. Considering myself as a future citizen I should strive to improve the law of the future America for the betterment of all citizens. To show supreme courage for my country I must be willing to lay down my life for it, even in the face of the enemy.

My country depends on me! America stands for freedom, courage, decent education, opportunity for all, and a respect for every individual. At present this is being done but not on a large scale. I must try to achieve freedom, courage, education, opportunity for everyone and this will have to be on a large scale. America must be a nation endowed by God to be a beacon light for all mankind.

THE SINCERITY OF YOUTH

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, a challenging exposition of personal conviction has been eloquently stated by Mr. Richard Chaput a former national outstanding Jaycee in the United States from New Hampshire in the March 11, 1970, issue of the New Hampshire Broadcaster. It helps cast light on the confusion that attends much of the conduct of some young people today and I consider it a construc-

tive message worthy of national attention.

Members of Congress share Mr. Chaput's declaration of sincere interest and concern with the problems of our youth. Somehow they must be constructively persuaded not to throw away their lives or cast themselves adrift on seas of nihilism or allow their bodies to be consumed by drugs.

There is no need for them to feel they are not being heard—or understood, for that matter—for they are both. Resort to violence or criminal conduct can only destroy avenues of communication and invite reaction.

The abiding principles that are the strength of our people are still faith, hope and charity. Young Americans will profit greatly from increased understanding that on these rest the sound foundations of true progress for themselves and their generation.

An article by Mr. Chaput follows:

WE UNDERSTAND SINCERITY

(By Richard Chaput)

It is said that teen-agers and young adults do not trust anyone over thirty. I'm afraid that my longevity of two extra years beyond the tolerable three decades of life classifies me "Establishment." But whether or not my age endangers my credibility, I am still a man who must express his opinion.

I am deeply in love with my country, and I'm going to say so to anyone who will listen or half listen. It disturbs me to see young people so easily intimidated by radical groups who are principally anti-American, such as S.D.S., Black Panthers and the rest. Already I have turned off many a reader with the above statement, but permit me to go on and fully express what I want to say.

Granted, most of us may be disturbed at young radicals who shout obscenities and cause near riots in our courts of law, such as what Judge Julius Hoffman was subjected to in Chicago recently. We who like order in our country get "up tight" over such irrational behavior. In fairness to most young people, I must turn the coin over and recognize the majority of youngsters who are changing the face of society, quietly but effectively.

I am with many of these young people, and in partnership with them. I wish to ask a few questions of the hell-raisers and endeavor to explore their thinking.

What is running off to Cuba to cut cane with Castro going to accomplish?

If the reasons are purely humanitarian, why have you come back advocating revolution? Why are the Black Panthers armed like a militia and encouraging the overthrow of this system wherever they go? Why does the S.D.S. and other groups take over university buildings and incarcerate their very administrators?

Now, without going any further, I know what you, who are doing these things are asking of me. Why have we, the silent majority, allowed our government to entangle itself in a ten-year war in South East Asia resulting in over 40,000 American deaths? Why have we, who claim to be Christians, allowed racism denying the rights of minority groups? How can we regard poverty with so much apathy and indifference?

Admittedly, these questions must also be asked. The difference is, I am not afraid to face all of these issues squarely. I will not, however, face them with militancy, bitterness and inflamed hatred. No, I will cope with these problems with love, understanding and sincerity. Chaos tends to divert one from the real work at hand. Love and sincerity are the implements.

Recently, two people, dear to me, found themselves in a large West Coast Air Terminal—it was midnight and all was darkened. This couple, in their fifties, were on a brief holiday waiting for a late flight.

A young man, appearing like a hippie, politely asked if they would sign a petition seeking to legalize marijuana in that state. The wife first gently refused, commenting that she could not, in conscience, sign the paper, as she believed marijuana to be harmful.

Notice, this couple were not turned off by this young man wearing long hair, fringed vest and sandals. They took the time to listen.

He then asked them, if alcohol was legal, why not marijuana? The man and wife explained quietly that alcohol was used socially and in brief periods by most people and that most users did not abuse it. Marijuana, on the other hand, was a mind-bending drug which seriously affects the mind and its thinking.

The young man admitted his hatred for alcohol because of his father's addiction. The husband asked, "would you run the risk of a similar addiction with the possibility of going on to harder drugs? The boy began to waver in his cause—"No one ever took the time to talk to me this way before, why do you?" The woman answered, "because we care about our young people, because we love you!"

The boy's face softened. He was shown a picture of a man 3,000 miles away, who lives his life flat on his back but does writing, lecturing, counseling, all without a "crutch"—he is making it on his own.

Tears began to trickle down the boy's cheek. The husband asked, "do you pray?" "No, not much" was the answer. "I've abandoned my christianity." The couple assured him that they would pray for him and they trusted that he would keep his mind clear and receptive to the wonder and beauty around him. A voice suddenly called the flight number, with warmth and emotion, they parted.

From a distance, the couple turned and saw a young man, eyes still wet with tears, waving farewell, the petition paper nowhere in sight.

I give you this vignette to assure young people that many adults do care. We too, hate the Vietnam war, we too, seek a solution. We too, want to abolish unfair practices against minority groups. The difference is in approach. We understand much of what University and high school students are saying.

For the most part we are happy that you are saying it. We admire your zeal, your hatred for hypocrisy and injustice. But, as we are learning from you, you must also learn from us. We can give you judgment, moderation and whatever faith and love we have.

How about if we, hand in hand experiment with a new approach. Let us trample down the mongers of hate, the peddlers of dissent and destruction, and champion and raise up the students for change without malice, the students who can openly pray, admitting to the need for Divine guidance in their search for a perfect America!

YOUTH AS A CONSTRUCTIVE FORCE

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, a few extremists among the youth of our Nation have cast an unfavorable light on the rest of our youth. Too often the Na-

tion's news media give too much consideration to rebellious acts by a minority group.

I have been pleased to see the fine efforts of some of the news media to present the more positive side of youth as a constructive force. Therefore, I wish to submit the following editorial that recently appeared in the Los Angeles Times. It is an excellent example of the positive efforts of the young people of our Nation:

YOUTH AS A CONSTRUCTIVE FORCE

In these days of bank burnings, campus disorder and drug abuse, we must not mistakenly conclude that all youth are bent on the destruction of society—or themselves.

This we have noted before. But we think it wise to reflect on the possibility of such a misconception in light of constructive efforts by students at several Orange County campuses.

How many people, we wonder, balanced the news of youthful violence with the stories of the responsible and heart-warming efforts of other young adults?

In Costa Mesa, when 16-year-old Justin Ogata was paralyzed in a wrestling practice, his classmates and students from a nearby campus launched a community effort to help offset the mounting medical bills that now total nearly \$16,000.

They staged a banquet and a ball game, a concert and a paper drive, a wrestling match and a fishing trip.

In just a few months they have raised more than \$5,000. But more important, they rallied a community and gave faith and courage to their stricken friend and his family.

"After the accident we were depressed. After all, we are a little different so we didn't know what to expect," said Hitomi Ogata, father of the Japanese-born youth.

It will be a long road back for Justin and his family, but they found they are not traveling it alone.

There is another example of what we are talking about at Chapman College. There more than 400 students decided to change their environment.

Classes were suspended as students staged Operation Facelift—a three-day assault with soap, water, paint and teamwork to beautify the campus. Students, faculty and administrators, led by President John L. Davis, joined forces in the painting, landscaping and remodeling project.

The students had often talked of ecology in class. And they were aware of the disorder and destruction taking place on other campuses across the country. But they chose to build.

These efforts were demonstrations, too. They are reminders, lest we forget, that this generation—which is one of the best informed in history—is as responsible as any before it.

The young should not be measured by the aimless or lawless few among them.

FREEDOM HIGH SCHOOL IN BETHLEHEM, PA., STIRS ART INTERESTS IN TALKING GALLERY

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a high school in my congressional district which ranks among the finest new secondary school facilities in the country is offering its students and

visitors a unique experience in art appreciation.

Freedom High School in Bethlehem, Pa., which was dedicated by Hubert H. Humphrey while he served as Vice President of the United States, has developed a talking art gallery.

With the aid of the school's multi-media communications system, a second floor art gallery offers taped commentaries on student art works. The comments are the artists' own views of their art.

Similar talking exhibits were pioneered by the National Gallery and the Smithsonian Institution in Washington and several other prominent art museums around the country.

Freedom High School's experiment in talking art is gaining favorable reaction from students and adults alike. It is a fine example of how learning opportunities can be improved by modern technology and I am pleased to include in the RECORD a description of the Freedom High Talking Art Gallery which appeared in the Bethlehem Globe-Times:

TALKING GALLERY COMES TO FREEDOM (By Steve Day)

Freedom High School is the first school in the country to have a talking art gallery.

But, as impressive as this might sound, the fact is that the gallery is just another facet of the long awaited multi-media communications system at the ultra-modern school. Most people know it as the dial access system.

The magic number to dial at Freedom is 150. The gallery visitor then hears the artist discuss his work from a speaker hung on a wall of the second-floor gallery.

Dr. Frederick Gilmartin, art supervisor for the Bethlehem School District, says that "today's youngsters have been weaned on the mass media.

"And practically from birth they have been confronted by 'talking pictures,' namely 'television.'" Gilmartin has taken hold of this point and pushed it "into the mute world of the art gallery."

The inaugural exhibit is 20 pieces by students from the Easton Area High School. The students taped their responses to their own work as they viewed it in Easton. The comments were completely spontaneous.

The student's thoughts were candid and refreshing. The tape was not. Gilmartin had to decide whether to use this poor tape as the initial example of the "talking gallery" or have a better tape made by speech students.

A new tape was made by a Freedom drama class who familiarized themselves with the work.

Mrs. Louise Roberts, chairman of Freedom's art department, said that "one of the joys of this talking gallery is that it is communication between students. I saw how students here would become cold toward art because they wanted to know 'what is he trying to do in that painting?' and no one was around to explain."

She said that many students who would ordinarily brush by the art work will now stop and listen, or ask her to dial the tape. "And a group of parents who visited was absolutely fascinated."

The National Gallery in Washington, D.C. set precedent for audio galleries in 1958 and since then the Smithsonian Institution; Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York; Chicago Institute of Art, and San Francisco Museum of Art have followed suit.

The variety of subject matters and media by the young Easton artists enhances this innovation in school art galleries. Among the

pieces are metal work; mask and beer can assemblages, a vibrant tissue paper illustration of a polluted city, and a number of pencil and pen and ink sketches.

Well-known Bethlehem painter Will Behler is scheduled for a one-man show at Freedom High School beginning next week.

Perhaps one of the prerequisites for exhibiting in galleries of the future will be that the artist be a proficient speaker.

ANSWERING ABA COMMITTEE REPORT ON CONSUMER LEGISLATION

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, again a small segment of the bar of the United States purports to speak for American lawyers in a manner in which I think is against both the interests of the lawyers and the interests of the people. A committee of nine men of the American Bar Association's Section of Antitrust Law has come out against consumer class actions as a means of revitalizing American law for the protection of the consumer and in favor of relegating this important subject matter to the old, tired processes of the Federal Trade Commission. All the consumer bills dealing with this subject—my bill in the House, Senator TYDINGS' bill in the Senate, and the administration's proposals—call for consumer class actions, yet this small defense lawyer-oriented splinter of the whole body of the bar proposes altogether bureaucratic processes for protecting consumers. Belatedly the counsel for many corporations that deal with consumers come out for stronger Federal Trade Commission processes.

They are saying, "Please throw us in the briar patch," the briar patch of the Federal Trade Commission. Indeed, this is exactly where they want to be thrown.

As Ralph Nader has pointed out, administrative agencies have fallen down in their duty to protect the public interest. They have become the hospitable briar patch into which malefactors against consumers wish to be thrown, and the lawyers for these interests do not even have the subtlety of Brer Rabbit but plead directly their preference for the briar patch of the Federal Trade Commission. What a comfortable and sound hedge against effective action this has become. It is a familiar ground of the Washington lawyer who can speak directly to the Commissioners and other administrative personnel of the agencies. He cannot speak directly to the judge who is trying the case in which he is involved about the merits of that case. He has come to be more comfortable with those before whom he may plead over lunch than before those he must address at the bar.

Naturally the typical defendant lawyer who wants to isolate his client from the risk of a large and successful class action does not want to put this effective instrument in the hands of the consumer.

The bar committee's report quite audaciously says:

Experience indicates that class actions do not achieve their goal and in fact militate against effective relief.

Yet the class action has been perfected and has been effective in the consumer-type drug antitrust case. It is good enough for big plaintiffs who own stock in corporations whose directors have allegedly cheated them. Why is it not good enough for little people who have been massively bilked for defectively manufactured products? Why, merely because the amount in controversy is something less than \$10,000, should consumers go without an effective remedy?

The Bar committee belatedly supports the proposition that "effective relief for unconscionable practices aimed at the consumer are both timely and generally warranted." But at the close of the hearings held on the consumer class action bills, on February 24, 1970, my colleague, the Honorable HASTINGS KEITH, remarked to Mr. Herbert H. Schiff, representing the American Retail Federation:

I am somewhat intrigued by the fact that you have suggested that we ought to hear from the Bar Association and the American Bankers Association. I don't believe that they have requested to appear.

It was after this suggestion that the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY, acting chairman of the committee, requested an opinion of the Bar Association and it was not until March 27, 1970, that the request was answered.

I believe it is interesting to note Mr. Schiff's objections in contemplating why the committee was so slow and what activated this small, special interest subcommittee to respond as it did to the request. Mr. Schiff said:

In answer to the first part of your question, they may not look upon this as seriously as we do and they may not work as fast as we do. The American Bar Association, its people, do a lot of business with our people as they do with a lot of other people and the American Bankers Association are financiers and they finance us in business as well as the small loan people when it comes to things like major appliances where they will be carrying the paper and they are going to be definitely affected.

It may be presumed that Mr. Schiff and other industry witnesses did spur those who "do a lot of business with our people" to get interested in the consumer class action bill. Though the incident is not of major importance in itself, these direct contacts can be traced through such specific language as some contained in the testimony of Edward Dunkelberger, a member of the firm of Covington and Burling, counsel for the National Canners Association, whose partner is one of the nine members of the committee that was responsible for the ABA report. He recommended the use of the word "unused" in place of the word "new" in section 201(a)(6) of H.R. 14931, the administration bill—transcript of hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, page 294, February 19, 1970. This exact recommendation appears in the Bar committee's report.

Some of the committee's objections to court relief are most puzzling unless considered in light of the interest of Washington lawyers in controlling the process. For instance, on page 30 of the report the committee shows a preference for the use of the Federal Trade Commission hearing examiner over the use of what the committee calls "an often distant Federal Court." It is true, of course, that a "hearing examiner" can ride circuit for the distant commission. But for myself I would rather entrust my rights to courts and juries located in my State, usually my town, than to the tender mercies of the FTC in Washington, D.C., particularly when members of this committee of the Bar are in Washington with much closer access to them than I am.

With all its shortcomings our system of using judges and juries to determine private rights is far better, far less corruptible than any other system of determining private rights and remedies. I submit that it is better than the so-called "prompt and uncomplicated" procedure for "recovery of actual damages by consumers" proposed by the committee. Listen to this uncomplicated and prompt procedure:

As soon as final determination of liability in a proceeding commenced by the Justice Department or the FTC either through a final court judgment or a final Commission order, the Commission will designate a hearing examiner to see that injured consumers are accorded relief. The hearing examiner will immediately enact a process by which consumers who have suffered from the practice will be made aware that they can obtain monetary recovery and any other appropriate relief.

Now, what does this mean? It means that if Betsy Smith has bought a deceptively advertised and faulty dishwasher, she first hires a Washington law firm to lobby with the FTC or the Justice Department to bring a general action against the Dixie Belle Washing Machine Co. After the case has wended its way through the FTC and the Justice Department processes, an order will be issued. Of course, she has no way of influencing the nature of that order, though her rights may depend on its terms. She then must present her case before the hearing examiner.

Peculiarly, the Bar committee suggests that she may not need a lawyer in this process. Presumably the Dixie Belle Washing Machine Co. will be represented by counsel. Her case is not decided by a jury or persons living in her community but by a hearing examiner sent down from Washington.

If Betsy Smith gets a favorable determination from the hearing examiner, the Dixie Belle Washing Machine Co. will probably want to appeal the case and the "simple and prompt proceeding" may lose such character as it wends its way through the Federal court system.

It should be understood here that I am not arguing against reform of the FTC processes, but I reiterate what I said to the committee upon the opening of the hearing:

Congress has the means of making (a vehicle for justice for consumers) one that is

self-induced and self-propelling, not one that depends for its impetus upon the good motivations and energetic administration of a commission. Commissions are not always well motivated. Many exemplify the principle of the possum guarding the chicken coop.

The Commission processes are necessary for the protection of many very small consumers. Many reprehensible practices should be curbed by cease-and-desist orders as they are now. It may be desirable to provide a system of fines and of some degree of restitution in a proper case.

But I still insist that the following principles of law and justice are paramount:

Just as the fear of criminal prosecution goes a long way toward making men honest, the threat of an effective civil suit goes a long way toward making them scrupulous. Though lawsuits are sometimes complicated and protracted, the fact that they are available induces people dealing with each other to deal fairly. Unless there is an effective process for individuals, acting either alone or in concert, to obtain redress, without the prior intervention of a governmental agency, honesty and fair dealing rest solely upon the consciences of the dealers and the bureaucrats and the sensitivity of these consciences I am not willing to trust.

The report, in outlining its proposed process, requires that the consumer await the go-ahead sign from the Commission. It says on page 31:

The Commission will then ask the consumer to complete a form setting forth the basis of his claim.

His claim is then to be serviced "at Government expense." The report says that he is thus relieved of certain burdens and that he need not hire a lawyer. I have no objection to administrative processes which permit certain relief short of law courts. Indeed, the hearings indicated that they were called for. But I have vigorous objection to providing such bureaucratic nursemaid as a substitute for the individual's right to process, in an effective way and through a practically available procedure, his legal rights. He should have the right to counsel and he should have the right to the courts without first filing with the bureaucracy a "form setting forth the basis for his claim."

And, in passing, I must say that I am always suspicious of those who advise me that the proceeding I am engaged in is "so uncomplicated that no lawyer may be required."

Following is the list of members of the committee:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER LEGISLATION OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Edgar E. Barton, partner in White and Case, a large Wall Street firm in New York City, with many of the largest companies as its clients.

Donald McSweeney, partner in Schiff, Harden, Waite, Dorschel and Britton, a prominent Chicago firm, which has represented U.S. Steel, major book publishers, and many other very large commercial and industrial plants.

James Rill, partner in Collier, Shannon, Rill and Edwards, a Washington, D.C. firm,

who does government administrative work and antitrust work. Names of clients not known.

Edwin Rockefeller recently formed his own law firm. Until about six months ago he was a partner of Wald, Harkrader & Rockefeller, a prominent firm doing a lot of administrative agency practice. This firm has been on both sides of antitrust matters.

William Simon, partner in Houghrey, Simon, Baker & Murchison, a Washington, D.C. firm engaged primarily in government and administrative practice.

H. Thomas Austern, partner in Covington & Burling. He is the law partner of Edward Dunkelberger, representing the National Canners Association. This firm has an international reputation for having the largest corporate clients.

Allen C. Holmes, partner in Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, Cleveland, Ohio, representing the Chrysler Corporation, Firestone Tire & Rubber Company, General Motors Corporation, Westinghouse Electric Company, Cleveland Trust Company, Timken Roller Bearing Company, and many others.

William T. Liffand of Cahill, Gordon, Sonnett, Reindel & Ohl, a prominent New York City firm representing many of the largest companies in the country and are involved currently in defending several of the antitrust class actions.

Marcus Mattson of Lawler, Felix and Paul, a prominent Los Angeles, California firm that represents Standard Oil of California, Pacific T&T, General Motors Corporation, Western Union, May Department Stores, Bank of America, Reliance Steel Corporation and many others.

THE 15TH ANNUAL DEUTSCHER SPRACH UND SCHULVEREIN—GERMAN LANGUAGE AND SCHOOL SOCIETY—ESSAY CONTEST

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the German Language and School Society—Deutscher Sprach und Schulverein—founded in Milwaukee in 1956, recently held its 15th annual German essay contest in Wisconsin.

A description of this yearly event, and of the German Language and School Society, follows:

THE GERMAN LANGUAGE AND SCHOOL SOCIETY
(By Gerhard Rohr, president)

The German Language and School Society was founded in Milwaukee in 1956. One year later it was chartered as a nonprofit educational corporation under the laws of the State of Wisconsin.

Membership in this organization is open to all persons who have reached the age of eighteen (18) and who are interested in the objectives of this organization.

The purpose of the society is educational: promoting interest in and understanding of the German culture and language of a non-political, non-religious nature by means of an annual essay contest for students of the German language, lectures and social affairs for adults.

The most notable event sponsored by this society is the annual German Essay contest. This contest is open to all students of public and private high schools in Wisconsin presently enrolled in a German course. All participants take the objective part of the test. This section is designed to test the students' listening and reading comprehension of the German language. It also tests

their knowledge of German history and culture. In addition to this test students at the fourth year level are required to write an essay in German on an assigned topic.

These tests are held annually, in 1970 for the fifteenth time. They are simultaneously held at eleven centers: Milwaukee, Madison, Waukesha, Eau Claire, Sheboygan, West Bend, Racine, Appleton, La Crosse, Superior, Wausau. At these centers the contest is supervised by members of the German departments of the various universities and colleges.

The eight top ranking students in the contest are invited for an oral interview before an independent jury. It is the responsibility of this jury to select the two top prize winners. These two prizes are a four week study and vacation trip to Germany where the students will live with German families. We feel that these students will become representatives of our youth and of the best education available in the United States, and that they are ambassadors of good will and must be able to exercise tact, good judgment and courtesy.

The jury chooses the two top prize winners on the basis of their academic records and personality. Members of the German faculties, representatives of our local government and civic organizations as well as outstanding citizens have served on the jury.

The members of this society raised the funds to sponsor the two grand prizes, many cash and valuable book prizes which will be awarded to other students who have shown outstanding achievement in this contest.

The representative of the Department of Public Instruction of the State of Wisconsin, Dr. Frank Grittner, stated at the last prize award ceremony:

"For years, we at the Department for Public Instruction, have followed the important and successful work of the German Language and School Society with greatest interest. We cannot evaluate highly enough the effect which the activities of this society have upon the success of our teaching efforts. The fact that the achievements of the students are also recognized by an organization other than the school undoubtedly acts as a stimulus which leads to increased efforts and accomplishments on the part of the students."

The contest developed from a local affair with 53 participants in 1956 to a statewide event with 675 participants in 1969.

The members of the German Language and School Society have dedicated this organization to the task of promoting interest in foreign language instruction. As Americans of German descent we believe that our efforts contribute to the great work of rebuilding and maintaining a better understanding between the nations.

THOMAS JEFFERSON TODAY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the birth date of Thomas Jefferson. Although the views of our third President are not as enlightened in certain aspects as we might prefer—such as his ideas regarding relations between the races—there is much that he said nearly two centuries ago that remains appropriate today.

When we are embroiled in a costly Asian war let us recall Thomas Jefferson's advice in his First Inaugural Address to pursue "honest friendship with

all nations, entangling alliances with none."

In that First Inaugural Address, he also provided some thoughts that our present Vice-President might do well to dwell upon.

If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

We should also heed his advice to maintain—

The supremacy of the civil over the military authority.

When we are burdened with a bureaucratic government that frequently is unresponsive to the desires of the people, let us not put aside suggestions to alter the government as being radical in nature. If placed in the scheme of American history such suggestions may actually be conservative. Nearly 200 years have passed since Thomas Jefferson stated in the document that is the birth certificate of our Nation:

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government.

TRIBUTE TO BROTHER THOMAS S. FARRELL

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my fellow citizens of Canton and Stark County, Ohio, will pay tribute this weekend to Brother Thomas S. Farrell who retires this year as president of Malone College. I cannot be present in person, but I wish to add my word of praise for Brother Farrell and call attention to the remarkable work he has done in our area.

Brother Farrell came to Canton about 15 years ago in the course of a search for a new site for La Mennais College of Alfred, Maine, a task he was assigned by the Brothers of Christian Instruction who desired to relocate and enlarge the institution. He liked what he saw in Canton and the people of Canton welcomed the possibility of a new liberal arts college. As a result, Malone College was established by Brother Farrell in Canton in 1959 and he has served as its president since that date.

Canton and Stark County people hold him in warm regard and affection for his personal qualities as well as his success with the college and his willing participation in such diverse community activities as the United Fund, the Red Cross, mental health, and other civic programs. We will be sorry to see him go.

Brother Farrell welcomed his first class at Malone on November 17, 1960. There were 66 freshmen students and seven faculty members. Since then the enrollment has grown to over 1,000 and the faculty to over 75, 15 of whom are brothers of the order.

Additional details of the growth of the institution are set forth in the Canton Repository article which I will include with my remarks.

The college will remain in Canton as a living memorial to the work of this dedicated man. On a more personal note, I am one of hundreds who will always recall with pleasure our association with Brother Farrell and who wish him well in whatever new assignment he may undertake. We are grateful for the fact that our community is a better place because he spent so many years among us.

The article follows:

WALSH'S BROTHER FARRELL RETIRING

Brother Thomas S. Farrell, the man who founded Walsh College on a rolling Plain Township meadow 11 years ago and has been its only president, is retiring.

The 58-year-old Canadian-born educator will finish out this school year as head of the institution he has seen grow from a single class of 66 freshmen to a four-year degree-granting college with an enrollment of 1,023.

Brother Farrell cited his long tenure as president of the college as his primary consideration in requesting retirement. Only Glenn L. Clayton, president of Ashland College since 1948, has served longer as head of a private college in Ohio.

What Brother Farrell does after his retirement June 30 "is up to my superiors in the Brothers of Christian Instruction," he said. "Where they want to send me and in what capacity is up to them and I will follow their wishes."

Walsh trustees will pick a new president before June 30. They have not yet made a selection.

Brother Henry G. Vanasse, trustees' chairman, said Brother Farrell's retirement request was granted "with regret."

"The board of trustees also join me in an expression of heartfelt gratitude for your decade of leadership at Walsh College and the trustees want you to know of their gratitude for your courage, your prudence and diligence in making our hopes a reality, in making Walsh College a respected member of the educational community and a valuable asset to the people of northeastern Ohio.

Brother Farrell came to the Canton area in the mid-1950s looking for a place to relocate La Mennais College of Alfred, Maine. While in the area, he made a courtesy call on the late Most Rev. Emmet M. Walsh, Bishop of the Youngstown Diocese.

It was Bishop Walsh who suggested that the college be established in the Canton area and in 1959 consented to have it named for him.

"The late bishop's deep interest in education, his warmth, his enthusiasm and grandeur of vision convinced the brothers that they should establish the college in this diocese," Brother Farrell later recalled.

"Bishop Walsh promoted the venture with his complete approval and moral and financial support."

That financial support was a \$304,000 gift from the diocese to build a residence hall for the teaching brothers who attend Walsh as students.

The original 50 acres of campus on the south side of Easton Street NW just west of Market Avenue was purchased by the

brothers in 1958. Ground for the first building was broken late the next year.

On Nov. 17, 1960 Brother Farrell welcomed his first freshman class of 66 students. In the early days, he also took time from his administrative duties to teach.

One class was added each year and in 1964 the first graduation was held.

Growth, under Brother Farrell's leadership, has been steady. The college now has 115 acres, five buildings, including two residence halls for a total of 400 students, a physical education center in the works, faculty numbering over 75 and student body totaling 1,023, including 670 day students and 263 in evening courses.

Since its founding, Walsh College has been synonymous with the robust, friendly brother at its helm.

His relationship with his adopted community has gone beyond the limits of the Walsh campus. He has been active in the United Fund and is chairman of the Canton chapter of the American Red Cross and a member of the Stark County Mental Health and Retardation Board.

He is a member of the National Education Association, National Catholic Education Association, Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges and Epsilon Delta Sigma and Phi Delta Kappa fraternities.

Brother Farrell was born in Montreal, Quebec and attended public schools and then Sacred Heart Normal School.

He earned his Bachelor and Master of Arts degrees from St. Michael's College in Winookski, Vt., and did graduate work at Ottawa, Montreal and Catholic universities.

His teaching career started in 1930 at Mt. Assumption Institute in Plattsburg, N.Y. He later taught at his order's school in Biddeford and Sanford, Maine and Fall River, Mass.

At various times he served as athletic director, dean of boys, acting principal and principal at Mt. Assumption.

He spent 1947-48 on a sabbatical at Highland College on the Isle of Jersey in the English Channel, headquarters for the 2,300 member Brothers of Christian Instruction.

He was a member of the board of trustees of the order from 1950 to 1961 and was president of La Mennais College from 1955 to 1958 before founding Walsh.

PRESIDENTIAL ACTION URGED TO RELIEVE NEW ENGLAND CONSUMERS FROM EXCESSIVE FUEL OIL COSTS

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as you well know the increasingly high cost of fuel oil has been, for too long, visiting extreme economic hardships upon all consumers in Massachusetts and throughout the New England region.

As you are also aware, early this year, a Cabinet task force appointed by the President completed a 12-month-long examination of the restrictive oil import quota system and issued a comprehensive report. In the report the task force recommended that quota limitations be scrapped and replaced by a flexible tariff arrangement. Unfortunately, for some unexplained reasons, the President, thus far, has not seen fit to implement his own task force's recommendations.

Last week the Small Business Subcom-

mittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Commerce, chaired by the distinguished Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, of New Hampshire, held 2 days of hearings on the inflationary and anticompetitive aspects of the oil import program, as it applies to home heating oil in the Northeast. The purpose of the hearings was to develop testimony and information for presentation to the President with the hope that it may serve to expedite his action in granting the economic relief to the New England oil consumer that is so desperately needed and so long overdue.

In preserving cooperation with my Massachusetts and New England colleagues here, in seeking executive approval of such relief for our regional consumers, I presented a statement to Senator MCINTYRE's subcommittee which I include here:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE TO SMALL BUSINESS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1970

Mr. Chairman: First, I would like to thank this distinguished subcommittee for affording me this opportunity to express my convictions concerning the mandatory oil import program.

Others who have appeared before you have documented the extra cost that this program imposes on the American consumer. During the eleven year history of the quota system, direct costs to the consumer have risen until, at present, it is costing us a total of over \$5 billion each year. Most of this money goes directly into the pockets of certain oil refiners, who are permitted to buy specified amounts of oil at the world market price and sell that oil in the United States at the artificially high domestic price. And the burden of paying that higher price falls heavily—disproportionately so—on oil consumers in New England, where some eight of ten homes are heated by oil. In Massachusetts, for example, it is estimated that the mandatory import quotas cost every family of four about \$140 in increased oil price in 1969.

And why is this injustice permitted to continue?

According to law, the only justification for the imposed quota system is that it protects our national security, that is, that it prevents us from relying too heavily on foreign sources of supply, which might be severed in a time of national emergency.

This committee is well aware, Mr. Chairman, of what the President's Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control, reporting in February after a year-long study, thought of the quota system's effect on national security:

"[The fixed quota limitations] bear no reasonable relation to current requirements for protection either of the national security of essential oil consumption."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the only legally allowable justification for the import quota system was found inappropriate by the President's Task Force.

Unhappily, the President has not seen fit to implement his own Task Force's recommendations, phasing out the oil import quotas over three to five years, and substituting a system of flexible tariffs. What he has done, even more unhappily, is to impose a quota where there previously was none; on oil piped in from our good neighbor Canada. I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, that a national emergency would cut off our Canadian sources of oil in the most extreme set of foreseeable circumstances.

When a man buys insurance, he pays no more than necessary for the amount of protection he has judged advisable. If the United

States must buy insurance against interruptions in our supply of oil by protecting the domestic oil industry, we should be insuring against emergencies that are reasonable to anticipate, and we should pay no more than necessary for that insurance.

I feel strongly, Mr. Chairman, that the recommendation of the President's Cabinet Task Force should be implemented without further delay. I urge this distinguished committee to take whatever action it deems appropriate to accomplish that objective.

EUROPEANIZATION—A STEP TOWARD THE VOLUNTARY ARMY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit to the White House of German Chancellor Willy Brandt has resulted in renewed and interesting discussion in the press about the future of the American forces in Europe.

It is no secret that these forces are not now and never have been of sufficient strength to do the job assigned them. Unless Europe will defend herself from an attack by the Soviet and its satellites, she cannot be again defended by Americans.

This means that Americans in Europe are nothing more than pledges of good faith—hostages, if you please—to our NATO commitment. When we find the Soviet complacently sailing its warships through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles—within the territory of our NATO Eastern Anchor, Turkey—it is high time to wonder about the present validity of these NATO commitments.

Perhaps a giant step forward in the direction of ending the draft and returning to an all-volunteer army would be a Europeanization of Europe and the recalling of our forces from that continent. These U.S. units could be disbanded, the size of our Army reduced, and the size of the draft correspondingly reduced. By returning the enlistment standards to their peacetime normal, there would be no fear of a deterioration in the quality of our forces when they return to a voluntary basis.

Reduction in the size of the Army would automatically reduce the expenditures for defense, both long-term and short-term. If we can avoid using these moneys to buy votes in the upcoming elections, we can even reduce the burden on our taxpayers. Such an idea as that might be welcome news to our people.

I include in my remarks pertinent newspaper clippings relating to the American presence in Europe:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 11, 1970]

NIXON, BRANDT PUT OFF TALKS ON U.S. FORCE
(By George Sherman)

President Nixon and visiting German Chancellor Willy Brandt have decided to defer discussion of future American military presence in Europe.

According to informed sources, the two leaders agreed yesterday in their first talk at the White House that detailed examination of American troop levels must wait both West-

ern alliance and Nixon administration reviews. The President's National Security Council machinery has already launched such a study on future European strategy.

Nixon saw Brandt off today after their second meeting, lasting 50 minutes, this morning at the White House. Contrary to usual practice the two leaders did not make public statements summing up their conversations before the departure.

But officials on both sides stressed that the omission did not reflect any hitch in the talks. Rather, they said, neither Brandt nor Nixon wanted to endanger the delicate German negotiating position in East Europe by any appearance that the United States is sponsoring the West German dialogue with the Communists.

Brandt, accompanied by Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, is flying to Florida for the Apollo 13 moon launching before returning to Germany.

So far Nixon and his chief aides, fighting mounting congressional pressure, have promised publicly that no substantial changes in the 310,000-level of forces in Europe will be made before June 30, 1971. Throughout yesterday Brandt repeatedly urged publicly that the U.S. maintain a "continued and adequate military presence" in Europe.

Yesterday, in an atmosphere which both sides agreed was extraordinarily friendly, Brandt won the first full personal endorsement by Nixon for the new German initiatives toward Soviet Europe.

HINTED BY TOAST

German government spokesman Conrad Ahlers said that Nixon, in the private talks, had expressed "full confidence" in Brandt and assured the chancellor that German initiatives in Europe also had the "full confidence" of the Nixon administration.

Nixon's toast to Brandt at the formal White House dinner last night hinted at this endorsement. He praised Brandt for maintaining "the strength that is necessary, to preserve freedom," while still pursuing "a policy of negotiation which we hope will eventually take the place of confrontation in the very heart of Europe."

In response Brandt repeated that the "painful partition" of Germany could only be cured by healing the split dividing Europe. He was striving, Brandt said, for a structure of peace under which countries on both sides of the line could achieve "a higher degree of security through a higher degree of cooperation."

Earlier in the question-and-answer period at a National Press Club luncheon, the chancellor explained that West German efforts toward "coexistence" with the East German state would not yield quick results. He had said in his speech that this intra-German dialogue, no less than that with the Soviet Union and Poland, was "free from illusion and nervous haste."

"FREE FROM HASTE"

The main problem, he then told a questioner, was not "formal treaty" commitments between two German states. It was how to heal the real problems of a divided people.

At some future time, he said, West Germany might well agree to join the United Nations along with the East German state—but only if that regime began tearing down the "walls" preventing Germans from meeting one another.

Brandt made clear during the day that negotiating success in East Europe depended upon continued military and political strength of the Western alliance. And that strength, in turn, he said, depended upon keeping American forces in Europe.

"BURDEN-SHARING" ACCEPTED

To this end the German government has indicated here that it is willing to accept "burden-sharing" in the cost of those forces.

The present offset agreement, by which West Germany pays back 80 percent of the \$950 million annual foreign exchange costs of American troops in Germany, runs until June 30, 1971.

According to informed sources, Brandt has told Nixon that he would like to have the principle of burden-sharing discussed and formulated formally by NATO. Then, under that NATO umbrella, the United States and West Germany could enter early discussions for continuing the offset costs agreement.

MUST KEEP U.S. FORCE IN EUROPE, RESOR SAYS
(By Orr Kelly)

The continued presence of large American forces in Europe is even more important now than it has been in the past, according to Army Secretary Stanley R. Resor.

Speaking to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council yesterday, Resor made the strongest appeal so far by a high administration official to keep substantial numbers of American troops in Europe.

His speech apparently was intended to counter increasing pressure in the Senate for a sharp reduction in the number of men still in Europe a quarter of a century after the end of World War II.

WARNS OF VACUUM

Resor said it would undoubtedly be possible to make relatively minor reductions in headquarters staff and backup support for the more than 300,000 men in Europe.

But he warned that, if large numbers are withdrawn, they would probably leave a power vacuum on the continent.

"Soviet military forces could dominate Europe without ever being used, if there were no substantial forces to oppose them," he said. "No doubt the Soviets would prefer this."

The only country potentially capable of being able to replace American forces would be West Germany, he said. Such a change, he warned, could be dangerous to the peace of Europe.

CAUTIONS ON SAVINGS

Resor also argued strongly against those who say the United States can save money by bringing its troops home.

"The savings from withdrawing our troops from Western Europe would not be great," he said. "In fact, there might be no savings at all."

The only way substantial amounts of money can be saved, he said, is by not only bringing the troops home but by disbanding them.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 12, 1970]

BRANDT ASSURED ON U.S. TROOPS
(By George Sherman)

President Nixon has reassured visiting German Chancellor Willy Brandt that there will be no precipitate withdrawal of American troops from Europe.

American officials explained that Nixon, during two days of talks ending yesterday, sought to correct the "wrong impression" that the United States will begin reducing its 310,000 troops in Western Europe after June 30, 1971.

The President already has pledged publicly that there will be no substantial changes before that date.

White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said yesterday that "it does not necessarily follow that there will be a revision" after June 1971.

SURVEY AWAITED

He reported that the President has no plans for cutting back troop strength in Europe, having only said that the strength should be reviewed "from time to time."

Other officials admitted that Brandt and his defense minister, Helmut Schmidt, had

made an extremely strong case here against substantial reductions. But they added that the final decision would await an across-the-board study now under way in the President's National Security Council machinery.

Ziegler's remarks followed closely on a strong assertion by Army Secretary Stanley R. Resor on Friday in Los Angeles that large American forces in Europe are essential. He warned against a large withdrawal which, he said, would leave a power vacuum on the continent.

The administration campaign is aimed at mounting pressure in Congress, led by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana, for sharp and immediate force cutbacks in Europe.

German officials made no secret of their worry and indicated that a major aim of Brandt here was to bolster Nixon resistance to the pressure.

Ziegler yesterday said Nixon's comments were "totally consistent" with Secretary of State William P. Rogers' recent press conference remarks that a reduction would be given "serious consideration" during 1971. But officials said they feared Rogers' remarks may have fed expectations of a cutback.

ASKS "ADEQUATE" PRESSURE

Brandt publicly argued here that a "continued and adequate" American military presence in Europe is essential to the delicate negotiations now going on to heal the East-West division in Europe.

Unilateral American cutbacks would remove any incentive for the Russians and their allies to negotiate, he said, and it would leave gaps in NATO defenses and cause psychological havoc in West Europe.

On Friday, Brandt told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that it would be "premature" to make substantial American troop reductions before any progress is registered in the Soviet-American talks on limiting strategic arms. Those talks enter their second stage in Vienna on Thursday.

After the final 50-minute talk with Nixon at the White House yesterday, Brandt flew to Florida with Vice President Spiro T. Agnew to watch the Apollo 13 launch. Afterward he was returning to Germany.

NO PUBLIC REMARKS

Nixon and Brandt parted company outside the White House Rose Garden with a smile and handshake, but without the customary public remarks on their talks. The omission had been agreed to previously, and Ziegler explained that there were "no outstanding bilateral problems" between the two.

But he carefully hedged on how involved Nixon is in the current West Germany initiatives to open genuine dialogues with the Soviet Union, Poland and East Germany. Ziegler said that in the State of the World report Feb. 18, Nixon had taken a "positive attitude" toward these delicate negotiations.

Officials later said that neither Nixon nor Brandt saw much advantage in a dramatic U.S. embrace of the West German policy. Neither side wants to feed natural Soviet suspicions that the United States is in fact running the show. Therefore, Nixon said as little as possible in public about it.

MOVE TOWARD WARSAW PACT

Ziegler said that the talks had been "very worthwhile, very constructive, very complete." Other officials later added that the two leaders agreed that there would be no "quick sold" results from the East-West negotiations in Europe.

It also was agreed, these officials said, that the Western alliance should take the initiative toward the Warsaw Pact for a balanced reduction of troops in Europe.

The initiative is expected to come out of the semi-annual May meeting of NATO ministers in Rome. According to German sources, the British and German defense ministers already have outlined the proposal and Sec-

retary of Defense Melvin R. Laird accepted the idea "in principle" during his talks with Schmidt here.

But, according to these sources, Nixon wanted more details before giving final agreement.

TESTING TIME HAS COME FOR PRESIDENT'S WAR POLICY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the former Vice President, Mr. Humphrey, has written a column on our Southeast Asian involvement. It appeared in the Sunday, April 5, 1970, Minneapolis Tribune. I include it in the RECORD at this point:

TESTING TIME HAS COME FOR PRESIDENT'S WAR POLICY

(By Hubert H. Humphrey)

Once again we are being tempted and tested. Pressures are mounting from Hanoi, Peking and Moscow. The war of nerves has been added to the war of men and weapons. The fighting in Laos and the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk in Cambodia raise the danger of a bigger and more dangerous war in Southeast Asia and threaten to halt the President's program of disengagement from Vietnam.

There is considerable pressure from Saigon for the President to slow down his program of troop withdrawals. This pressure must be resisted, and the President's schedule of troop reductions must be maintained. The American people are once again on edge about Laos and Cambodia. The President has informed the nation of whatever involvement we have in Laos, and at present it seems there will not be any direct involvement of American forces in Cambodia.

The real test of President Nixon's Guam doctrine is now underway. We are frankly confronted with whether or not we wish to pursue a course that relies primarily on military power or to turn our attention to a peace offensive of diplomacy and negotiation.

MORE ACTIVE DIPLOMACY NEEDED

With the developments in Laos and Cambodia and the danger of the fires of war spreading throughout all of Indochina, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the policy of Vietnamization is but one part of a peace program. Vietnamization is essentially a military policy of disengagement. To end the war and to bring any kind of security or neutralization to Vietnam requires not only troop withdrawals but also a political settlement. And this necessitates a much more active diplomacy than has taken place these last six months.

The closer we come to a political settlement through the channels of diplomacy, the greater the chances for a neutralization of all Southeast Asia and an end to the fighting.

At a time when we have needed political and diplomatic direction, we have experienced a period of diplomatic drift and delay. This lack of initiative cannot continue without serious consequences in view of the increased danger of a wider war involving Cambodia, Laos and Thailand.

Action is needed in these areas:

1. The negotiations at Paris must be upgraded. The Lodge vacancy has existed for over four months, which has lowered the level of negotiations all around. President Nixon should send his own personal ambassador to the Paris peace talks. He must be a man of recognized national stature. He must be instructed that the United States is not tied to the past; that we are not committed to

a military solution; that we have the right and the obligation to advocate in Paris and elsewhere, without the veto of the Thieu-Ky government, a political settlement.

NLF MUST BE INCLUDED

The National Liberation Front should be brought into the legitimate political processes of South Vietnam, and the Thieu-Ky government must accept elections, internationally supervised, with all parties taking part. We can best exert diplomatic pressure and exercise diplomatic initiative while our military presence in South Vietnam allows negotiations for the formation of a broadened and more representative government in Saigon. The administration should not hesitate to speak out publicly as well as privately against any police-state actions by the Saigon authorities such as the recent arrest of the elected delegate, Chau.

This has been a difficult, costly and ugly war, and at best it will be a difficult peace. But if we do not use every political and diplomatic means at our disposal now, we will find our efforts to bring about a political settlement weakened by our Vietnamization policy and the Thieu-Ky government's commitment to a military solution.

2. President Nixon should launch a full-scale diplomatic offensive to bring to bear the full weight of the international community on Southeast Asia if a wider war is to be prevented. This diplomatic initiative would include the reconvening of the Geneva Conference, to consider all aspects of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

3. The United Nations peacekeeping machinery should be used immediately. The new and dangerous situation in Southeast Asia involving the security of Thailand, Cambodia and Laos as well as Vietnam demands U.N. action.

4. The time is at hand to lay the groundwork for a regional security organization in Southeast Asia. The SEATO treaty is as out of date as colonialism itself. We must look forward to the day when a regional mutual security treaty of the nations involved in Southeast Asia takes the place of SEATO. In the meantime we should encourage and assist friendly nations in the area for self defense.

5. One sure way to limit our commitments in Southeast Asia is for the President to make clear that no more draftees will be sent to fight in Southeast Asia.

Surely we have learned that the primary responsibility for security and development in Asia rests with the Asian nations themselves. They must take the lead. It is they who best understand themselves—their past and their hopes for the future. We should be prepared to cooperate—to be a helpful partner, not a dominating force. We do have an interest in Asia—but we are not an Asian power. We are a Pacific power.

We should continue, particularly during this period of transition, to be concerned with Asian affairs. We cannot ignore the real problems that will continue in Southeast Asia once we are gone from Vietnam. Without becoming an Asian power, deeply enmeshed in the politics and problems of that continent, we can and should support hopeful efforts by local peoples to work out their own destiny.

THESE GUIDELINES REQUIRED

But whatever role we play in Southeast Asia should carefully follow three guidelines: Self-help, regional and multilateral assistance, and selective American involvement.

First, local countries must manifest a willingness to help themselves, both to provide security and to undertake economic and social development; and they must have the courage to organize their own affairs in

ways that will provide them with a stable basis for governing.

Second, primary responsibility for helping individual nations provide for their security and economic development should rest with the nations in the area and with multilateral and regional organizations.

Third, American help should be selective and carefully measured. Our efforts must be justified by our own interests and responsibilities; and they should be concentrated on economic development through multilateral means.

We are no longer the only source of help against threats to the security of Southeast Asia, or against poverty. Constructive developments there will be lasting only if they spring from efforts by local countries, and if they command broad popular support.

It is around these guidelines that we can develop a bipartisan policy for Asia. It must have the active cooperation and support of Congress—implemented by periodic and consistent consultation by the President.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Humphrey has outlined five areas in which he believes immediate action is needed. I am convinced that the emphasis on increased diplomatic efforts is vital.

The Vice President also establishes three guidelines which should govern our future in Asia. He points out that the United States is a Pacific power, not an Asian power. I think this is a real distinction and that we must recognize, once free of our Southeast Asian involvement, that our vital interests are not at stake in Southeast Asia.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to note that while I am less sanguine about the possibility of a political settlement in Vietnam than Mr. Humphrey seems to be, I agree with him that Vietnamization, even if successful, "is but one part of a peace program." A policy which downgrades the peace negotiations in Paris and does not actively pursue an international peace offensive is not a policy I can support.

CALIFORNIA STUDENTS VIEW POLLUTION, NATIONAL PRIORITIES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, in an effort to determine how citizens see as key priorities for future governmental action, I asked many Californians their opinions on a number of environmental issues and their rating of national priorities.

Over a half million concerned Californians responded to my questions, and the overall impact was that of tremendous emphasis on the need for stronger Government action to maintain environmental quality.

But, in addition, I am pleased that the questionnaire I used in this poll has been employed by a number of schools and school districts throughout the State for similar opinion-taking efforts.

In the past month, I have inserted in

the RECORD a series of letters from young Californians who are quite worried about the environment they will inherit from our generation. I have received many comments about the depth and degree of sophistication shown by these students in their grasp of the issues which comprise the real controversies over environmental quality.

Today, I want to insert what more young California students—from all education levels—feel about pollution and priorities. In each case, teachers and students from the five schools circulated copies of my prototype questionnaire among their peers, and then sent the results to me.

I congratulate them—Julie Burgess of Murial Wright School in Coyote, Calif.; Gerald J. Casey of the 12th grade geography class at Berkeley High School; James C. Chance, counselor at Tulelake High School on behalf of the senior problems classes; Michel R. Janicot, the language arts instructor of the Pleasant Ridge Union School, Grass Valley, Calif., for the seventh and eighth grade English class; Victor Eugene Jozens for the seniors at Fontana Unified School District—and I agree with them that the voice of our young people is a critical guide for those of us who must make the policies which shape the future for all of us.

In addition to just making choices, some of these students and teachers sent along some interesting comments on the questionnaire as such, on the role of students in our society, and on the relationship of national priorities. Here are some of those comments:

COMMENTS ON POLLUTION

These results, as you can see, do show that our future generation does care about its future. Even though these students live in a rural area that is as of now still quite unspoiled but that does show signs of man's rapas, they are concerned and are aware of the problems.

As high school students the group whose views I cite below are not eligible to vote, but as you know, there are serious efforts being made to extend the franchise to 18 year olds. In any case, these students will be voters within three to four years and so it is important that their views be considered on these issues—not to mention that questions on environmental quality are perhaps more pertinent to the young than to the older citizens.

The questions in this questionnaire are certainly worded to elicit a yes answer—which I'm sure you were wanting. However, in ranking priorities it seems almost impossible to put each subject in a neat little cubbyhole of its own. Certainly one cannot help but get greater tax revenues when a greater number of people are well educated and therefore earn greater salaries. Certainly we could be pouring a fraction of the tremendous military budget into improving our world: the environment, living conditions, job opportunities, quality and quantity of food for all people, peaceful international relations and intra-national. How can urban crisis be separated from crime and from education. It would seem that improving the opportunity for all our people to realize their individual potentials should be our priority. Can this be done in a poisoned environment? Can this be done within a welfare system that soaks the taxpayer and

discourages the recipient from getting a better education to eventually become a productive individual? Can this be done in a political system that listens to and bends to the pressures of those interests which worship only the almighty dollar and which care little about the long run consequences? How can our society expect its young citizens to accept responsibilities when its political system is so often more concerned with propagating itself than listening and responding to the needs of the people today, and tomorrow? I do sincerely hope that this questionnaire was prompted by genuine concern, and not because the political bandwagon today is the environment.

Thank you for sending this questionnaire to me. I relish the opportunity to express my interests and opinions. As you can see by my answers I strongly believe the environment questions are all very urgent problems.

Seven out of the nine questions dealt with environment crisis, problems which each citizen should be aware of and doing something to alter it out of his own need for survival. Yet it (seems) a necessity to have someone else force him to do this. Overpopulation of our land is very frightening to me. As a mother and knowing my love of children I shudder at the thought of having people told they can not have babies.

The number 8 question lumped together

6 problems other than pollution. Each item could fill 3 or 4 pages of questions in themselves. I feel I cannot choose a priority among these items they are all very connected.

I feel there is an irony in your questionnaire. The items in question number 8 are the things that should be worked on at a legislative level. All the other problems on environment should be handled by each citizen. It seems that the human species doesn't always do what's best for him. What I am trying to point out is that although I want a good environment again I don't like the idea of "written laws" to govern everything in our life.

STUDENTS RATE NATIONAL PRIORITIES

1. Vietnam.
 2. Pollution.
 3. Education.
 4. Inflation.
 5. Crime.
 6. Taxes.
 7. Urban Crisis.
 8. Other.
- I am impressed by the views of these students and teachers.

At this point, I shall give the tabulation of answers from these five schools and how they rated national priorities:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

	Murial Wright School		Tulelake High School		Berkeley High School		Pleasant Ridge Union School		Fontana Unified	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you favor proposals to ban the internal combustion gasoline engine unless it meets stringent exhaust emission standards?.....	21	2	16	38	10	0	67	8	41	25
Do you feel the oil companies and automobile manufacturers should be required to act more quickly to solve the problems of air pollution?.....	22	1	36	20	9	0	77	1	58	7
Do you favor a Federal Regulatory Commission on Environmental Quality?.....	13	8	29	27	9	0	52	22	43	19
Do you favor stronger Government efforts to regulate shoreline use in order to substantially increase the amount of beach property available for public use?.....	16	8	51	9	11	0	55	19	53	9
Would you support stronger Government efforts to regulate use of undeveloped open spaces, including advance acquisition of land for public use?.....	17	3	48	12	10	1	46	24	52	7
Would you support a complete ban on all Federal offshore oil drilling except in national emergency?.....	22	1	33	27	3	0	43	28	33	26
Do you favor much stronger governmental efforts to educate the public as to the problems of overpopulation?.....	18	5	48	10	10	1	65	11	46	9

IN RECOGNITION OF CITY NEWS, A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER SERVING CO-OP CITY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in this era of rapidly shifting emphasis on the forms and functions of the communication media in America, it makes me glow with pride to give special recognition to a relatively small but effective and efficient weekly newspaper operating in my congressional district.

The City News is a young and vigorous independent weekly, serving the residents of Co-Op City, a tremendous co-

operative housing development in an enormous city. It is one of 450 weeklies operating in all parts of New York State.

Long thought to be the "little brothers" of syndicated newspapers serving only the small towns and hamlets of the Nation, the independent weeklies have developed to a point of high journalistic sophistication that their role in disseminating news to the public has vastly changed.

Thriving in all parts of the country—the hinterlands, suburban areas and in the midst of our large metropolitan centers—the weekly papers have become a significant segment of the communications media of America. For this reason we ought to take particular note of weekly newspapers selected by their peers as exemplars of their trade.

Therefore, when the New York Press

Association, composed of 450 weeklies in the State, convenes to consider those among them who best represent the strict criteria of professional news reporting and newspaper management, the industry and the public should take particular note.

I would like to publicly commend the City News for the recognition it received at just such a convention.

Several weeks ago, this 1-year-old weekly newspaper was awarded first place for general excellence in news reporting—the highest award in the category made by the New York Press Association in a convention held at Syracuse, N.Y. To add to its laurels, the City News also garnered a third place award for its excellence in photography.

Composed of leading journalists in the United States, the board of judges acclaimed the City News for its "outstanding achievement in the field of journalism," a distinction deservedly made and proudly accepted.

Managed by a young but quick-learning executive staff headed by Editor Henry Hurt, the City News epitomizes a new breed in an old and seasoned profession. It speaks forthrightly, unequivocally, and courageously. It concerns itself with the truth by addressing itself to all issues, both large and small, that affect its readers.

Such is the making of a newspaper that could have survived the early era of radio and motion picture newscasting and has, indeed, prospered in the present era of fierce competition from television, magazines, and other forms of direct mass communication media.

It is a tribute to a reading public that demands and recognizes these qualities in one of its news services and allows it to prosper. The people of Co-Op City, to whom City News is exclusively devoted, deserve a share in the coveted awards. For, after all, City News has raised its standards to these high levels in direct response to the requirements of its readers. That it was capable of doing so adds to its achievement.

I commend the management and editorial staff of City News for its excellence in craftsmanship. I congratulate the people of Co-Op City for insisting on nothing less than a giant among weeklies—the City News of Hagedorn Communications.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

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

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

How long?

TITLE IX: THE DYNAMICS OF GROWTH IN DEVELOPING NATIONS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, my Foreign Affairs Committee colleague (Mr. FRASER) has authored an article in the March 1970 "Foreign Service Journal," which issue is devoted entirely to title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act. Mr. FRASER is one of the fathers of title IX, which seeks to incorporate political and social development in our aid programs. Mr. FRASER's comments are worthy of our attention.

For anyone interested in the title IX concept, and it is an important one, I recommend highly the entire issue. Title IX seeks, in Mr. FRASER's words: "to broaden AID's mandate from an unquestioning reliance upon the conventional wisdom—that developing nations most urgently need economic assistance, which promotes a better standard of living, which in turn eases social tension and fosters the growth of democratic institutions—to a more searching, critical appraisal of the interaction between our external aid and the dynamics of change and growth in a developing nation."

From personal knowledge I know that DON FRASER has spent many long hours probing, questioning, reading, speaking and writing about title IX.

This latest effort is a synthesis of many of his ideas. I commend it to you.

The article follows:

TITLE IX: THE DYNAMICS OF GROWTH IN DEVELOPING NATIONS

(By Congressman DONALD M. FRASER)

My conviction in 1966 when I sponsored the Title IX legislation of the Foreign Assistance Act was that our foreign aid programs depended too much on a faulty bit of conventional wisdom; the hypothesis was that developing nations most urgently need economic assistance, which promotes a better standard of living, which in turn eases social tension and fosters the growth of democratic institutions.

The assumption that economic aid actually does enhance living conditions for the peoples of emerging nations is challengeable on two grounds: first, that the total amount of U.S. economic aid to emerging nations is often too small to accomplish any general miracles, and second, that economic assistance seldom has any very direct or massive effect on the most impoverished citizens of the third world.

The first point can be substantiated by comparing the amount of our economic aid with the Gross National Product in Latin America, where we have expended more than in most sections of the world. The amount of our assistance has not equalled one and one half per cent of their GNP. Economic transfusions at that rate might keep the patient alive, but they can hardly be expected to send him quickly on his way to full recovery. The second point simply suggests the process of diffusion that occurs whenever aid is disseminated through a central government. In such cases the benefits tend to remain in a country's urban areas, where they too often accrue to an already economically advantaged class of citizens. This

process of diffusion, therefore, limits the potential of economic assistance to enrich the living standards of the general population.

But faulty diffusion is not the only difficulty. Economic assistance to a society which is badly organized does not automatically lead to better organization through necessary changes in institutions, skills and attitudes. Sometimes such aid merely adds to the inertia of the status quo. Occasionally the changes may be in the wrong direction.

The question of how a society is organized and functions is our primary concern, because the internal workings of a society profoundly influence its international behavior.

Thus Title IX seeks to broaden AID's mandate from an unquestioning reliance upon the conventional wisdom to a more searching, critical appraisal of the interaction between our external aid and the dynamics of change and growth in a developing nation.

This effort to broaden the perspective on our aid programs embraces the dimension of political development which the Title IX legislation seeks to isolate for special consideration.

New nations need to develop skills for self management if they are to become stable and responsible members of the international community. Yet too much of our foreign assistance has proceeded on the myth that if only we sufficiently bolster the material resources of the emerging nations, they will discover within themselves the innate capacity to manage their own affairs. The zeal with which we follow changes in the per capita GNP suggests a single-minded devotion to the purely material side of nation building. But as Edgar Owens rightly asserts in his recent paper on political development in Southeast Asia, "physical progress, without a change in the role of man in society, is government by benevolence. But benevolence is not, and never has been throughout history, a big enough idea to guide the organization of societies and governments."

Genuine development means change, and change is often disruptive and destabilizing. Economic development usually requires social and political changes in a political environment strained by the tensions inherent in the disjunction between rising expectations and the capacity of the new nations to meet them.

In our own country we have experienced in recent years the painful and disruptive lesions of change, and who knows yet how they will ultimately affect our national political character? What we cannot well predict from our own experience in our own land, we cannot reasonably expect to predict accurately in foreign lands subject to different social, cultural, and historical forces under conditions of especially aggravated disparity.

A second and closely related myth is that whenever Communism threatens, economic aid will provide an effective answer. This myth is nowhere more effectively denied than in Vietnam, where our hundreds of millions of dollars in economic aid have had only negligible effect on the political views of those fighting the war. Political ideology is the result of a combination of many factors, some of them emotional, some of them philosophical. Ideology emerges from a complex tangle of various personal and institutional commitments, convictions, and loyalties. One factor in this complex is, of course, the level of economic well-being, but it is no more than a single factor, and it is not necessarily a major one.

The broader perspective we seek through Title IX does not contemplate the transfer to other nations of our own sophisticated political system, nor does it seek the transfer to other nations of our own cul-

tural and value systems. Rather, we intend to lend our technical, social and material resources to the emerging nations for whatever usefulness they may have in support of the efforts of the nations themselves to shape their own future. In the process we are bound to pinch some sensitive nerves, and for that reason we must be especially vigilant in avoiding any direct interference in the internal political decision-making of the countries receiving our aid.

Title IX legislation does contain an explicit hypothesis to be followed in our conventional aid programs: the enhancement of socio-economic pluralism. In part this pluralism aims at the problem of creating tolerance for democratic governmental institutions in social situations complicated by the pressures of rising expectations—situations in which popular demands expressed through democratic decision-making encounter limited resources and the need for economic discipline. This kind of tolerance is not likely to be promoted best by dissemination from a central government on down; it is a change in attitudes which will be effectively promoted by creating first a tolerance for the limitations under which local democratic governmental institutions must function as demands and the resources to meet those demands are more easily comprehended. As democratic government is understood at decentralized levels, tolerance for the limitations of national governments will increase. Out of this growth in attitudes perhaps we can move toward a genuinely cooperative pluralism in the international community.

Economic institutions—trade unions, cooperatives, associations and some corporate endeavors for example—can be useful in promoting the idea of democratic government because they provide the idea with concreteness. They also center decision-making among the people affected by the results of the decision.

The principal injunction of Title IX, however, is to analyze and to be sensitive to the political, institutional, and attitudinal changes we promote by our aid. In this sense there are no such things as Title IX projects. What is involved is not necessarily any new course of action but rather a new way of looking at an old problem.

Professional perspectives tend to be narrow; poets have always noticed different things about roses than have botanists, women have always regarded them differently than have florists. It is hardly because of any physical or spiritual agility in the rose that it can at once evoke wisdom, scientific principle, romance and money; it is all a matter of one's point of view. Nor is any one response to a rose necessarily more legitimate than any other. And it is perhaps not outrageously overtaxing an analogy to suggest that it is rather the same with emerging nations: how one perceives the complex, intricate changes implicit in development is at least in one respect simply dependent upon who is looking at the process. Economists have one perspective, but political and social observers have other perspectives that demand attention, too, if the whole of a developing nation is to be fully perceived.

Our ultimate interest is in a functioning international community. The success of this international community will depend upon the power of the idea of cooperative pluralism among nations, an idea which cannot be expected to grow up in a thicket of non-pluralistic national ideologies. So, while recognizing that actual growth in the productivity of a nation may be much more difficult without external aid, we know that we cannot afford to proceed in our programs of foreign assistance without some much broader understanding of the effects of our involve-

ment. It is even possible that, through a better understanding of what we are now doing, we might conclude that we should do nothing in preference to continuing. But in any case that understanding is imperative.

A more comprehensive look at our foreign assistance programs under Title IX would suggest these kinds of non-economic questions:

1. How does one promote the national integration of often traditionally disparate cultural and tribal groups? By what process is local loyalty transcribed into national loyalty? How does a long neglected and impoverished mass of people, who have always felt themselves to be apart from the business of a distant ruling aristocracy, begin to relate to the business of building a nation? As the internally unifying effects of the quest for independence or the struggle against external threats subside, disintegrative forces within nations may well become the prevailing problem of the 1970s. This problem is not one the world community can wisely neglect, and it is not one which comes first to the mind of an economist. This is an especially important inquiry because it is one in which outside assistance might be particularly useful. Outside observers can sometimes develop perspectives denied to the parties to the conflict.

2. What role do internal communications play in development? How can we encourage the growth of competence in communications? What combination of communications techniques will work best to bring about the common set of ideas and attitudes that will enhance democratic pluralism within the framework of a national government? How can a competent communications system support the technical and economic goals of a national development program?

3. How are economic and technical programs best administered so as to leave a residue of local skills sufficient to carry on and increase the fruits of the undertaking? For example, how does one conduct a program of community development so that the community retains the institutional capacity to carry on? Community development has always been a major thrust of our aid programs, but this development often has not been effectively institutionalized.

4. How essential is a strong legal system? How does it affect a nation's capacity to work out its internal difficulties in an orderly fashion?

5. How are the new laws and institutions encouraged that will make the effective utilization of new technology possible? As Edgar Owens has pointed out, our monetary and banking systems, the law of contracts, corporations, the law of property, our savings and credit systems, trade unions, professional associations—all these and others have been as instrumental as the great advancements in technology in carrying our own society to its present level of development. Under situations of relatively rapid technological advance, will these supporting laws and institutions be developed at an equally rapid rate?

6. What role do political parties and political ideologies play in national development? To what extent do disparities in access to political power reinforce those disparities, as in the contest between urban and rural interests in governmental decisions?

These are illustrative of the questions which Title IX legislation urges us to consider.

One phrase in Title IX deserves a further comment. This phrase refers to civic and political skills in the developing nations.

Understandably this language was not embraced by AID with either enthusiasm or a program. The reference to political and civic skills is based on the conviction that "poli-

tics is the name of the game" in most countries, including our own. It is often rightly argued that political skills in the United States are no more advanced than those in the developing nations. If this is so, what role has the United States to play in this area, assuming that it could surmount its spine-tingling apprehensions about interfering in another nation's politics?

The answer must be found in the developing nations themselves. Any involvement by the United States must reflect ideas or proposals from political leadership in other nations—leadership which shares with us a commitment to encourage the growth of societies in which political activity is a right of the people. Unfortunately, our own major political parties in the United States are inward looking. They have no international ties and little knowledge of, or interest in, political movements in other countries. Thus our political parties cannot presently contribute much in this area.

In contrast, one might look at the role of the Christian Democratic movement. The growth of the Christian Democratic movement in most of the Latin American countries has been stimulated and encouraged by political work supported by the European Christian Democrats.

Communist parties have been even more aggressive in their efforts to provide training and ideological indoctrination. Moreover, their work often goes on in hostile environments. A conference at Havana brings together political activists from left and communist parties. But where are the conferences for political activists (not government officials) who are committed to democratic values?

Ideas for activities which could be supported or sponsored by AID in the purely political field could come from gatherings of political leaders from various nations. AID may find that a non-governmental institution could more easily carry on this kind of activity, preferably one in which both of our major political parties shared responsibility.

Any activities of this kind would carry reciprocal benefits—enabling everyone involved to gain a deeper understanding of the democratic political process. These activities should not be aimed at parliamentarians, but at other layers of political activists.

A common American myth is that politics must be kept out of our international dialogue. The legitimate concern about interference in another nation's political decision-making is generalized to create a sterility in our relationship with others that hardly does us any good. The truth is that political dialogue—the exchange of ideas—is the least sensitive of all the ways in which people of different nations can relate to one another. To discuss an idea is to assume, implicitly, a mutuality of status which is conducive to openness and frankness.

Despite its lack of response to the purely political concepts, AID has moved ahead with some skill and understanding in the other areas of Title IX concern. Title IX ideas cannot be mandated through airgrams sent to overseas missions. The problem is to create through training the deeper understanding of nation-building which Title IX seeks to encourage. AID through its Title IX division is moving toward such training, through its regional seminars for AID personnel, its contract with the Fletcher School of Diplomacy and in other ways. It will be a long process which will ultimately involve all our institutions of higher education. Broadly enough conceived, Title IX insights should influence our more traditional foreign policy approaches to other nations.

The justification for foreign aid expenditures must, in the end, be that they are in

the national interest, but we must take care to define "national interest" within the broader context of the present historical situation. As the Pearson Commission on International Development recently argued, "... the acceleration of history, which is largely the result of the bewildering impact of modern technology, has changed the whole concept of national interest. Who can ask where his country will be in a few decades without asking where the world will be? If we wish that world to be secure and prosperous, we must show a common concern for the common problems of all peoples."

It is my continuing belief that we can effectively demonstrate our common concern, but only insofar as we work within the total economic and political dynamics of emerging nationhood, and that is, in the end, the point of the Title IX legislation.

GRAND CHAMPION STEER TO GO ON DISPLAY AT EXPO 70

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 13, 1970

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend a ceremony at the Department of Agriculture April 7 at which the 1969 grand champion steer of the Chicago International Livestock Exposition was presented to the Government of Japan by the Government of the United States for display at Expo 70.

This goodwill gesture was made possible by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, which bought the champion at the international and presented it to the U.S. Government.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that Chicago's was not the only Illinois contribution to this presentation: That prize animal was fed to championship proportions by Brad Linskog of Prophetstown, Ill. Brad is an 11-year-old 4-H'er from my district who turned a 4-H calf project into an international championship, and I think you will agree that is quite an achievement. Brad is the youngest person to win this honor.

So I want the RECORD to show that while we in Illinois are proud of our efficient livestock feeding industry we are even more so of boys like Brad Linskog. Secretary of Agriculture Hardin summed it up well when he made the presentation to Ambassador Shimoda of Japan. He said:

I think you will all agree with me that what we have here is more than a fine steer. It is a symbol of youthful achievement and a promise for the future. With boys like Brad Linskog, boys who are doing the very best they can in whatever they attempt, boys in America, in Japan—all over the world—the decades ahead shine brighter for us all.

In accepting the gift, the Ambassador congratulated Brad and pointed out that Japan expects more than 3 million foreign visitors to Expo 70—"people from all over the world who will admire this splendid steer raised by an 11-year-old American citizen."