

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EMPLOYMENT OF THE MENTALLY
RETARDED

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, since passage of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, we have seen a great deal of progress in the attention being given to the mentally retarded.

One area in which I feel our efforts will yield especially valuable rewards is that of employment of the mentally handicapped.

The President's Commission on Employment of the Handicapped has worked closely with the State mental health departments to promote employment of the retarded, and it is heartening to note that this type of program truly does solve the problem of caring for those persons who only a few years ago were considered destined to permanent institutionalization.

Mr. Speaker, Curtis Lee Smith, with the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, recently called to my attention a warming story of the kind of progress which can be realized if only the effort is made.

At this point in the RECORD, I include Mr. Smith's article:

EMPLOYMENT OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED

The most immediate impression on surveying the activity at Thurman Johnson's ranch near Goldthwaite, Texas, is that nothing appears exceptional; unless you consider an abundance of hard ranch work exceptional.

Johnson raises turkeys and lambs; about 100,000 of each per year. A 1955 graduate of Texas A&M University, he is articulate, but not given to lengthy speeches. He, his wife Jane Ann, and their three daughters live on a ranch that is not pretentiously large. In short, there is nothing superficially impressive about the man or the place.

But it is precisely this unexceptional atmosphere of hard work and unspectacular but noteworthy accomplishment that conceals an exceptional significance. Two years ago, Johnson commenced hesitatingly to staff his ranch operations with some exceptional people.

As the result of a growing volume of complaints about the severe farm labor shortage plaguing the Goldthwaite area, Johnson and other ranchers in the vicinity were visited by John Stowe, Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor from Abilene State School. Johnson, alone, was convinced by Stowe to hire three residents from the school for the mentally retarded. The other ranchers were scornful of the possibility that the idea would succeed. There were stipulations attached regarding provision of room and board. Boarding and dining facilities had to be constructed. And, public feeling toward any kind of mental aberration was especially high at that time. Only a few weeks before, a deranged sniper had created an epic of terror from atop a tower in Austin, only 100 miles away.

So Johnson was bucking the tides of popularity, convenience, and prevailing fear when he made the commitment to employ the retarded. And, the commitment has not been entirely without problems. There have been

mistakes, difficulties in adjusting to a new environment, and minor disciplinary problems.

But, patience, perseverance, and a dogged determination to make it work have paid handsome dividends for Johnson, for the community, and for "the boys" as he fondly calls his employees. "There are no more problems with them than with any other given group; in fact, I suspect there are considerably fewer problems," said Johnson. Today Johnson employs 34 former residents of schools for the mentally retarded and mental hospitals. Besides performing every imaginable chore relevant to the operation of a sizeable turkey and sheep ranch, they have constructed their own quarters and do their own cooking, cleaning and laundry. They also negotiate routine purchases and repairs in Goldthwaite on ranch business, in addition to banking and conducting personal business. They are more confident and happier than they have ever been.

There have been no community incidents involving these workers, who range from 18 to 61 in age. The small community has gained the not insignificant trade from a new payroll. The state of Texas has gained 34 tax-paying citizens in place of an annual tax outlay of \$75,000.

Johnson's ranch operations have not only prospered but, today, pulsate with growing pains. He says the ability of these employees to take on anything I ask of them has given him the confidence to take on ambitious projects, previously beyond the realm of practical consideration. He bestows a lion's-share of credit for the success of the endeavor on his foreman Dan Tyson and his girl-Friday, Mary McClung. "They are just as stubborn as I am," he admits.

On October 26, in Detroit, Michigan, Thurman Johnson was named "Outstanding Employer of the Year" in the U.S. by the National Association for Retarded Children. John Stowe along with Abilene State School Superintendent, L. W. Cain, and enthusiastic supporters of the Texas Association for Retarded Children who gave Johnson the state award and nominated him for the national honor, believe that there could not have been a more appropriate choice.

Johnson regards the award proudly, but he observes, "It has paid off well as a business proposition, which is why I first tried it. But I would be less than truthful if I didn't admit that it has gone deeper than that. Dan, Mary, and my whole family are personally involved with these boys now. They really get under your skin."

Footnote: Robert E. Vassallo, Director of Vocational Rehabilitation for the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, (Box S, Capital Station, Austin 78711) suggests that prospective employers who wish to explore the potential employability of mildly retarded citizens, contact him.

OEO'S FOSTER GRANDPARENTS
PROGRAM HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL—
PROJECT ENRICHES LIVES OF
ELDERLY CITIZENS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the foster grandparents program, initiated and funded by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, has greatly enriched the lives of our underprivileged elderly

citizens. The program provides older persons with part-time employment in caring for institutionalized and physically or mentally handicapped children. A new project in Parkersburg, W. Va., employs 30 foster grandparents who will work through the local boys club and through the boards of education in nearby communities and counties.

A recent article by Martin E. Segal for the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser describes the merits of this and other foster grandparents programs throughout the country. Mr. Segal cites an evaluation of the overall program which was conducted by Greenleigh Associates, Inc., of New York. Their report concludes that the "foster grandparents program has demonstrated great value and should be expanded on a larger scale."

A North Texas State University evaluation reports that "The foster grandparents appear to be proudly involved in meaningful work, which in turn provides them added economic resources for fuller social participation and maintenance of self-respect. The program does enrich the lives of the children it touches, and anyone who is familiar with institutions for retarded children will not judge this to be a minor success."

It is my hope that this worthwhile effort continues and I look forward to the time when all older persons desiring to serve in this program can do so.

Mr. President, I include in the RECORD at this point, Mr. Segal's feature on this meritorious program, with the hope that it will increase the interest of my colleagues in supporting OEO's foster grandparents program.

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

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS HELP

One of the best achievements in the War on Poverty has been the accomplishments of the Foster Grandparents Program. It is a most satisfying program—to those who work in it and to those who benefit from it.

The program recruits, trains and employs persons 60 and over and who fall below an income level of \$1,600 a year. They work with neglected and deprived children in various institutions, such as orphanages, charity institutions and hospitals. The work consists of reading to a child, talking with him and playing with him. Mostly, however, it's giving a deprived, a sick, a deformed, a forgotten child the human contact and human love that every child requires and deserves. For this the Foster Grandparents are paid at the minimum hourly wage for some 20 hours of work a week.

Healthy older persons who have the understanding, maturity and patience which only years can bring are given the feeling of being needed. And the income they earn working with the children helps them maintain a minimum standard of living. More than an opportunity for making money, the Foster Grandparents report that it has been one of the most worthwhile experiences in their lives.

An early evaluation of the program conducted by Greenleigh Associates, Inc., of New York, said the "Foster Grandparents Program has demonstrated great value and should be expanded on a larger scale."

A more recent evaluation by researchers at North Texas State University, reported

"The Foster Grandparents . . . appear to be proudly involved in meaningful work, which in turn provides them added economic resources for fuller social participation and maintenance of self-respect."

On the impact on the children, the North Texas State study said, "no matter how fleeting the contact or how limited the carryover, the program does enrich the lives of the children it touches, and anyone who is familiar with institutions for retarded children will not judge this to be a minor success."

When the Foster Grandparents program began, it operated in only a few cities and used only a few persons. Despite the handicap of lack of funds, the program has grown over the three years of its existence. It now employs some 4,000 elderly persons in 63 projects in 40 states. More projects are on the drawing board.

Six new programs have recently been announced. One of the projects, involving the Prince Georges County (Md.) Community Action Agency, is the first of its kind in the country to serve children with cerebral palsy here. It will employ 30 senior citizens, 10 of whom will work in the College Park United Cerebral Palsy Center serving 35 children, all too handicapped for public schooling. Another 10 of the Grandparents will work in a retarded children's day center, and the others in a school serving such children.

New projects in Rockland County, N.Y., and Helena, Mont., will also make it possible for the retarded child to find a new friend and counselor.

Wayne County, Mich., will employ 25 Foster Grandparents to help children at the Plymouth State Home and Training School and the Ypsilanti Hospital. Children in the pediatric ward of a Detroit hospital will also be helped.

In Parkersburg, W. Va., 30 Foster Grandparents will be put to work through a boys club and through the boards of education of nearby communities.

Despite the great success of these programs, they scratch only the surface. Waiting lines of older people who want to participate in the program are long. Some get discouraged when their requests are tabled or turned down. But further expansion of the Foster Grandparents Program is governed by already tight government funds.

These programs have already blazed a trail which is being followed without federal funding by community and church groups throughout the country. These programs also have as their goal the mutual help that the aged and youth can give each other.

LOUISIANA

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, as you know I represent the First Congressional District of Louisiana, but have always been proud not only of my area in and around New Orleans but of the whole State.

For 28 years during my tenure in Congress, I have exalted the qualities and features of my great State. I have spoken millions of words, no doubt, on this subject.

But now a dear friend of mine has eloquently put all I have been trying to say into a few poetic words in a poem entitled "Louisiana."

Mrs. Clara Flournoy Gay, known to her many friends in New Orleans as

"Bootsie," has captured the atmosphere of the State and the attitude of its people with this most beautiful means of communication, which has captured the heart of the people of Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, you might say I am bragging about my State, but I wanted everyone to read this poem which says so much, in so little, so well.

I am grateful to "Bootsie" for making this work available to me, so I can make it available to you. I insert her poem at this point in the RECORD:

Louisiana

(By Clara Flournoy Gay)

Oh! come to Louisiana,
Where corn and cotton grow,
And sugar cane stands proudly,
Against the man made row.

Oh! come to Louisiana,
Where pine trees touch the sky
And willows line the bayou banks,
As pirogues pass them by.

Oh! come to Louisiana,
Where magnolias caste a light
On colored folk with banjos,
As they sing and dance all night.

Oh! let me live in Louisiana,
Until the day I die.
Then bury me on a hill top
Beneath the Southern Sky.

ELECTORAL REFORM: THE MARTIN PLAN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Wade O. Martin, secretary of state for Louisiana, has authored a plan to reorganize the electoral college system of our Government.

Mr. Martin's plan would be to retain the electoral college—a protective safeguard to small States—and a necessary aspect to permit ratification by the States.

His constitutional revision would, however, discontinue referral of the election to Congress, if no majority is obtained in the electoral college. In lieu of Congress electing a President, the electors in the electoral college would take a subsequent vote between the two nominees for President who received the highest vote.

Mr. Martin's plan is presently under study by the National Association of Secretaries of State headed by Mr. Martin.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a release from the Daily Iberian for December 21, 1968, as follows:

A LOUISIANA PLAN

Louisiana's astute and administratively able secretary of state, Wade O. Martin, Jr., may go down in the history books as the author of the plan which at long last satisfactorily reorganized the electoral college system of the United States.

His plan would eliminate the "winner-take-all" procedure by which the presidency can be won by a candidate with a minority of the popular vote; or by decision thrown into the House of Representatives, with the attendant public uproar, legalistic wrangles

and other dissatisfactions spawned by the latter eventuality.

(In reminder, the plurality winner in popular vote in each state now gets all of that state's electoral vote, regardless of how close the vote. By various combinations of majorities among the states, a nominee can win the presidency while his opponent has a sizeable majority of popular vote. If nobody wins a majority in the electoral college, the selection of the president is thrown into the U. S. House; the vice presidency into the Senate.)

Martin's plan has been taken under study at a level calculated to afford nationwide attention—by the National Association of Secretaries of State. And Martin heads that study.

In sum, Martin would:

Retain the electoral college with its membership equal to the total composition of Congress.

Elect two at-large electors by the total vote in each state, and one member each from each congressional district. These electors would be morally but not legally bound to cast electoral college votes for the nominees of their respective parties.

Discontinue referral of the election to Congress if no majority is obtained in the electoral college. This would be done by providing that if no candidate received a majority of the electoral votes, then a subsequent vote would be taken in the electoral college between the two nominees for president who received the highest vote. The winners of this second, or runoff, balloting would become president and vice president.

"This," said Martin's memorandum to the NASS convention in Anaheim, Calif., "I believe to be more democratic, more effective and more likely to be accepted than total abolishment of the electoral college as such."

The association has appointed Martin to head an interim committee on election procedure, to function until the 1969 national convention.

His group is charged with compiling recommendations for corrective changes in election laws in general, with particular reference to presidential primaries and the electoral college system.

The nation will be hearing more of this plan, one can be sure, at a level and from a professional source in each state calculated to gain attention and interest. Sensible revision of the electoral college may be on its way at last, and with a Louisianian its author.

NORTH KOREA CAN BE HURT

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following the release of the *Pueblo* crewmen who were held captive by North Korea for 11 months, the entire free world was shocked to learn of the tortures and brutalities inflicted upon these American sailors by their Communist captors.

At that time I proposed that the United States lead the free world in imposing an economic embargo against the North Koreans for this inhuman treatment of prisoners.

The Chicago Sun-Times commented on my suggestion and I take the liberty today to include the Sun-Times editorial in the RECORD.

It is my hope that neither the United States nor the free world is going to permit this outrageous violation of all

international law to go unpunished. I am mindful that the United States is now in a period of transition between administrations, but I am extremely hopeful that President-elect Nixon will, indeed, seriously consider asking our allies to join in an economic embargo of North Korea.

Failure on our part to take appropriate action against this brazen brutality against our American sailors will constitute an invitation to the Communists to engage in further piracy on the high seas.

The Chicago Sun-Times deserves the highest commendation for its reaction to the suggestion that an economic embargo be imposed against North Korea.

The Chicago Sun-Times editorial follows:

NORTH KOREA CAN BE HURT

The United States has said that North Korea's seizure of the USS Pueblo on the high seas last January was piracy, and thus an international crime. The beatings administered to the Pueblo's crew by their captors are a heinous violation of the Hague Convention on the treatment of prisoners and thus also an international crime.

How to administer justice to a renegade nation is, however, difficult. Armed retaliation, once the answer to international brigandage, is now almost unthinkable. The world is too uneasy a place to risk further upset.

Rep. Roman C. Pucinski (D-Ill.) has suggested to President Johnson that the free world impose an economic embargo against North Korea. Pucinski points out that North Korea exports about 3,100,000 tons of goods annually. About one-third of this total is sold to the free world.

The idea of imposing an economic sanction against North Korea is attractive. North Korea buys so little from the free world that it would not upset the free world economy. Nor would the Communist bloc nations be likely to be able to make up for the sanctions; like North Korea they too need capital from the free world.

President Johnson should give Pucinski's suggestion careful consideration. When it is impractical to hit a bully in the mouth it is sometimes as satisfying to kick him in the pocketbook.

WEYMOUTH JAYCEES

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there seems to be a greater and greater demand upon the Federal Government to provide funds to cure a multitude of local problems, it is refreshing to find a community group working diligently to solve a pressing problem without aid of State or Federal moneys.

In 1964, the Weymouth Jaycees, a group of young men between 21 and 35 years of age, undertook a project deemed impossible by many citizens of Weymouth. These young men felt there was a need to build a school for the training of preschool retarded youngsters. They began work to raise \$60,000 for this project.

At this time, with barely one-third of the funds raised, two-thirds of the building has been constructed. This

amazing progress has been made possible through the use of donated materials and labor with most of the volunteer work done on Saturdays after the laborers had completed a regular week's work on their own jobs.

The project was originally proposed to the town with a question: "Doesn't anyone care . . .". Since 1964, the Weymouth Jaycees have indeed found that many people care. The group is now nearing the end of its goal—a nonprofit school for retarded youngsters which is badly needed in the area.

IN DEFENSE OF ISRAEL

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following article from Time magazine, January 10, 1969:

IN DEFENSE OF ISRAEL

Israel's most articulate advocate is Abba S. Eban, who as Foreign Minister has the task of explaining his country's actions to the world. Last week, in an exclusive interview with Time Correspondent John Shaw, Eban reflected on the reasons and possible solutions for Israel's present plight:

Will the adverse international reaction to the Beirut raid affect Israel's policy of retaliation?

We have no policy of retaliation. We have a policy of survival. If retaliation helps survival, we are for it. If someone could prove we could survive by giving Arab violence a free rein, then we would do so. But nobody has proved this.

The Israeli press has been invoking the history of the persecution of Jews in claiming that there is international discrimination against Israel. Do you think this attitude is justified?

The international attitude toward Israel cannot be entirely detached from traditional relationships between Jews and non-Jews. There is a stereotype of the Jews as passive victims of others' violence. Israel gives another picture, the picture of the Jews suffering but also resisting. World consciousness has not fully absorbed this change. I have no other explanation for the fact that the Soviet Union, which invaded Czechoslovakia, can condemn alleged Israeli "aggression" at the U.N. without the public gallery bursting into laughter.

Does Israel still believe in international order, or have you decided to go it alone?

The concept of international order is a Jewish idea we have been trying for 4,000 years to transmit to the rest of the world. It is an idea that works with great strength on the Jewish imagination. It is, however, an idea, not a reality. The U.N. does not express that idea with any effectiveness in its present composition. My view after 20 years of U.N. experience is not far different from that of General Assembly President Emilio Arenales of Guatemala: he recently referred to the "frivolity" and "irresponsibility" of certain majority decisions at the U.N.

There is talk of the big powers imposing a settlement. What do you consider are the prospects for such a solution?

A settlement can only grow from within the region, we believe. Powers outside this region have surprisingly little capacity to make the states here act against what they consider to be their interests. But the big powers can do two things here. They can

force Israel and the Arabs to turn to each other by excluding the possibility of an imposed settlement. And if the adversaries make an agreement, the big powers can support such a settlement.

Some of the reaction to the Beirut raid was caused by fear that it might lead to another war. How dangerous is the situation here now?

If the danger of war has increased, it is because of what happened in Athens, not in Beirut. World War II was not caused by Anglo-French reaction, but by Hitler's initial violence. I do not think the sequence of Arab violence and Israeli reaction, however drastic, necessarily means general war. Nations do not get drawn into war; they make general war only by cold decision. In May 1967, President Nasser decided to have a war. I don't think he has made that decision again yet.

What does Israel want or expect from the new U.S. Administration, whose Middle East policy, it is speculated, may be more "even-handed"?

American policy in the past has never shown bias toward Israel. Thus, if it is even-handed, it will remain the same, not change. Israel hopes for three things from the U.S. First, that the Administration will see to it that war is not invited by an imbalance of forces here. This means that Israel's defenses should be maintained in the face of the massive Soviet rearming of Egypt. Second, Israel wishes the U.S. to deter the Soviet Union from intervention or intimidation here. And third, we want the new Administration to maintain President Johnson's principle that there can be no Israeli withdrawal from the ceasefire lines except to secure and agreed borders. This principle has been restated to us in Washington recently, and has also been stated by Mr. Nixon on many occasions. We do not expect the Nixon Administration to depart from these three fundamentals, even if the application of them is appraised from time to time.

THE BICYCLE POLICE: LONG BEACH, CALIF.

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the thought of a policeman patrolling on a bicycle evicts images of the London bobby pedaling through fog-shrouded streets. But the city of Long Beach, Calif., has come up with an imaginative new application for the bicycle in modern American police work.

In a recent issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Chief William J. Mooney, of the Long Beach Police Department, explains how his department is using plainclothes officers on bicycle to combat purse snatching, burglary, and automobile theft.

The bicycle is an ideal vehicle for these specialized patrolmen. It is quiet, easy to maneuver, economical to maintain, and sufficiently fast to overtake suspects fleeing on foot without tiring the officer.

I am including Chief Mooney's article in the RECORD:

OPERATION OF A BICYCLE PATROL

(By William J. Mooney, Chief of Police, Long Beach, Calif.)

In November 1964, street crimes, particularly purse-snatching, in downtown Long Beach, Calif. (population 385,000), were extremely high.

In order to combat these crimes, we made a study to pinpoint the problem areas. In previous months strong-arm robberies, including attempts, were charted as follows: location; day of week; time of day; loss in actual dollars; victim's age group; and age group and ethnic group of suspects.

Our study clearly indicated that a sizable number of these offenses were committed on Friday and Saturday nights between the hours of 6 p.m. and 10 p.m. in the downtown area of our city. The city was divided into sections, and a pin map of the locations of these crimes by sector was kept. The map showed that a large number of the crimes were committed in a relatively small area of the downtown section. With this information we planned to reduce crime on the streets, particularly purse-snatching, by apprehending offenders at the scene.

METHOD USED

The purse-snatcher usually follows an elderly victim from a shopping area to a dimly lighted street, perhaps a block from the main thoroughfare, approaches from the rear, grabs the purse, sometimes knocking the victim down, and flees. The perpetrator is young and fleetfooted and wears tennis shoes.

Identification of purse-snatchers is rarely possible after they have made a getaway because they approach from the rear in dimly lighted locations, and their elderly victims (most are over 60 years) often have poor eyesight.

After studying purse-snatcher MOs and reports on previous crimes, we next had to determine what transportation our officers would use.

Patrol cars were out of the question, as even unmarked police cars are easily detected, and the appearance of a vehicle on the scene of a planned purse-snatching would only delay the action until the vehicle left. Even if not detected, should the officers in the unmarked police vehicle be lucky enough to see the crime committed, they would still have to run a footrace with the suspect. In all probability the suspect would have an ample headstart. A foot patrolman would be in no better situation. If he did observe the crime at the time it was committed, he would likely lose the suspect in a chase.

We decided that for this special enforcement task bicycles would be the best means of transportation for the following reasons: They are quiet in operation; they have sufficient speed to easily overtake fleeing suspects without tiring the officer; they are easy to maneuver and can be ridden in areas inaccessible to larger vehicles; they can be secured and maintained at a low cost. Three special bicycles were selected over other types because of their speed and ease of operation.

Having decided on the transportation to be used in our program, we next directed our efforts toward the selection of officers. Those we chose were experienced, aggressive men capable of strenuous physical exertion. Because of the additional hazards involved in the operation of this detail, they were selected from a list of volunteers.

POLICE PROCEDURE

The officers were briefed concerning the MO of purse-snatchers and the use of bicycles for transportation. They were instructed to wear light-weight (preferably dark-colored) clothing and tennis shoes. (Light-weight clothing was selected, as the exertion in operating the bicycles aids in keeping the men warm.) Officers were further instructed that the bicycles would not be equipped with lights, as part of the success of this program would be based on their not being seen by the suspects. Officers were cautioned to keep out of regular vehicular traffic for their own safety.

AREAS COVERED

Much of the riding was to be on sidewalks and in alleys. The officers were instructed to

stay in the shadows and off the main thoroughfares whenever possible. They were reminded that purse-snatchers might have concealed weapons. Because the suspects are usually young and consequently do not tire easily, the officers were advised to ride their bicycles whenever possible when giving chase.

Our officers work in pairs. Each carries his badge, a small flashlight, handcuffs, black-jack, a gun in a holster, and a small transistor radio equipped with a converter for monitoring police calls. If the officers monitor a strong-arm dispatch for their patrol area, they may be able to apprehend the suspects.

METHOD OF PATROL

The two officers patrol their area by riding at an easy pace on separate north-south or east-west streets one block apart. Each will ride two blocks, then crisscross and meet his partner. In the event a partner does not show up, the other officer goes back on his street to assist his partner if necessary.

While patrolling in this manner, each officer is advised to make his approach to alleys and intersections slowly and to check pedestrian movements. The most productive time of operation proved to be in the late evening hours.

Another method of operation is to follow possible suspects. If they appear to have a set destination and pass up potential victims without looking them over, officers should continue their regular patrol. Most suspects, prior to attempting a purse-snatching, generally give some indication of their intention just prior to their grabbing the victim's purse. This indication will generally go unnoticed by the victim or a casual observer, but not by the trained police officer. Aside from the fact that the officer can spot possible suspects by their youthful appearance and dress, our officers have spotted them by some of the following methods: No set destination in their travel; loitering around a high crime area; following women on foot with an obvious intent to overtake them at a particular location, usually near a corner or alley; closely watching their intended victims or other pedestrians and vehicular traffic on the street, including a quick glance just prior to the taking of the purse; and movement in adjusting a gun or other weapon.

SUSPECTS ARRESTED

We have not attempted to enumerate the actual number of purse-snatching suspects arrested during our use of the bicycle patrol because such figures would be meaningless without other pertinent information.

Arrests, of course, have not been limited to strong-arm robbery, but also include homicide (committed on the street during a robbery), burglary, assault, malicious mischief, and numerous other offenses.

This department has widened the scope of the bicycle patrol. Now, in addition to the night patrol, we have two officers riding bicycles during the daytime in the downtown business district and through the large public parking lots. They have been successful in reducing thefts from parked automobiles and in arresting thieves at the scene.

PHARMACIST PHILANTHROPIST

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Willis Fankhauser, a small businessman who operates a pharmacy in Lyons, Kans., recently received the good news that he was winner of nearly \$5,000 in stocks in

a contest sponsored by a drug firm. Mr. Fankhauser is deeply committed to higher educational opportunities for our young men and women, and to further this personal commitment he has decided to use the proceeds from the stocks to provide a scholarship fund for deserving students.

In these times when we are striving as a nation to improve education and assist young people who might not otherwise attend college, it is essential that private giving be encouraged. Mr. Fankhauser has set a fine example.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hutchinson, Kans., News which pays tribute to the philanthropy of Willis Fankhauser:

PHARMACIST PHILANTHROPIST

Willis Fankhauser is proprietor of his own pharmacy in Lyons. He has learned that he has won common stocks with a value of just under \$5,000 in a contest sponsored by an eastern drug firm that is one of his suppliers.

Fankhauser well could have used his prize money in covering the cost of the education of his two daughters who are now undergraduates. He could have spent it on a long winter vacation trip for him and his wife and he would only have proven a typical man had he done so.

But Fankhauser is an unusual sort of person. For him his prize money will not be a demonstration of easy come and easy go. Rather than using the \$5,000 for himself, he will set up a fund with it to help deserving college students.

True it is that with present educational costs the sum he has set aside will provide only token help for deserving students. But the token is important because it represents an act of humanitarianism.

The world would be better off if there were more Willis Fankhausers.

ISRAEL AND THE ARABS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following are excerpts from two editorials on the current Middle East crisis, which appeared last week in, respectively, the British weekly the New Statesman, and the conservative London Daily Telegraph.

I should like particularly to call attention to the London Daily Telegraph editorial which quite properly states that while the Arabs, with full Soviet support, are preparing for the next war of revenge, they have made the various guerrilla organizations their main offensive weapon against Israel.

The excerpts from the two editorials follow:

ISRAEL AND THE ARABS THE NEW STATESMAN

Israel exists and is entitled to preserve herself from extinction—the avowed aim of the Arabs. Three times they have tried with their regular forces to destroy her, and have failed. Now, unwilling for the present to risk further state-to-state conflict, they permit, in some cases encourage, terrorism. Israel can get no redress at the U.N., which she understandably regards as a hothouse of hypocrisy. . . .

[The raid on the Beirut Airport] unleashed a torrent of international abuse and moralizing on the heads of the Israelis—notably from such countries as Britain, which bears the brunt of the insurance, and America and France, which have large financial holdings in the battered airlines.

It is significant that no such indignation was voiced after the Athens incident, in which an Israeli was killed.

THE LONDON DAILY TELEGRAPH

Given the customary double-dealing at the United Nations, it was a tactical mistake on Israel's part to lash out on quite such a scale against Beirut Airport. As for the bias against her, a comparison between last August's Security Council vote on the abortive resolution against Russia's unprovoked aggression on Czechoslovakia and the present prompt and unanimous condemnation of Israel's reprisal tells its own tale.

The democracies judge each case either in a lofty moral ivory tower or on the basis of their own immediate special interests; the Communist states vote solidly together, supported except on the rarest occasions by the great majority of the Afro-Asian countries.

It is disgraceful that the British and American delegates did not insist on some condemnation in the resolution of systematic Arab terrorism and of the attacks on Israeli aircraft.

The fact is that during the interim period while the Arabs, with Russian help, are preparing for the next war of revenge they have made the various guerrilla organizations their main offensive weapon against Israel.

It should not be necessary to quote Sarajevo as a reminder that governments have always been held responsible for such activities conducted from their territories—or of the dangers of overplaying this particular gimmick. In this case the Lebanese Prime Minister has himself accepted responsibility. Allowance must be made for the strain imposed on Israel.

ALWAYS ON MONDAY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor to sponsor the legislation that became the Uniform Monday Holiday Act of 1968.

By providing that four nonreligious holidays will fall on the same specified Mondays in every year beginning in 1971, this popular law will afford our citizens more leisure and opportunity to visit historic shrines and will benefit schools and businesses.

The merit and wide support of the bill were indicated by the final vote of 212 to 83 for its passage in the House of Representatives and by its passage by voice vote in the Senate. And the President voiced high praise for the bill in signing it into law on June 28, 1968.

However, the Congress deliberately wrote this law, Public Law 90-363, to apply only to Federal employees and the District of Columbia. So—as Pennsylvania did just last month—each of the 49 other States must pass companion enabling legislation to make the same holiday schedule apply to its residents. Hopefully, they will do so before 1971, when the four new 3-day holidays will be observed in most of the country.

These and other important points about

this new law are thoroughly spelled out in a brief brochure, "Always on Monday," that has been made available by the National Association of Travel Organizations for distribution in the States. I include the text of that brochure at this point in my remarks:

ALWAYS ON MONDAY: FIVE AUTOMATIC 3-DAY WEEKENDS A YEAR

No more disruptive and disappointing Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday single-day holidays when Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Veterans Day and Columbus Day haphazardly fall in midweek and provide no time for meaningful observance.

Three-day weekend holidays will become a reality for federal employees and residents of the District of Columbia starting in 1971 under provisions of the Uniform Monday Holiday Act which Congress overwhelmingly and bipartisanly passed after thorough hearings and which the President signed on June 28, 1968. However, if residents of your State are to be guaranteed the benefits of Monday Holidays, your State Legislature must now enact a holiday law paralleling the federal legislation.

WHY MONDAY HOLIDAYS?

Creating these automatic three-day holidays will make these non-religious holidays work for people instead of the other way around. Consider just some of the benefits:

Developing a sense of patriotism in America's younger generation by providing additional time for families to take their children to national shrines and historic sites, and time for communities to hold patriotic pageants commemorating these holidays. (Recognition of this benefit led many Congressmen with distinguished military records to strongly support this legislation.)

Providing additional leisure time so people can enjoy fuller participation in hobbies as well as educational and cultural activities.

Encourage family cohesiveness by providing time for families to be together with sons in the service, children at college. Today, school, job, military and social obligations pull family members apart. They need these family get-together breathers.

Reducing industry and school absenteeism which now surround one-day, midweek holidays.

Permitting business and school operation over four consecutive weekdays, thus avoiding costly mid-week shutdowns and startups.

Providing substantial sums of extra tax money in towns and cities throughout the United States, in the form of local taxes paid by tourists and travelers on gasoline, cigarettes and other purchases.

At the White House on June 28, President Johnson summed up benefits of Monday Holidays when he said, "The Bill that we sign today will help Americans to enjoy more fully the country that is their magnificent heritage. It will also aid the work of government and bring new efficiency to our economy."

WHAT THE 1971 CHANGE WILL BE

Here's what the federal holiday calendar will look like when the law goes into effect in 1971:

Washington's Birthday on the Third Monday every February.

Memorial Day the last Monday in May.

Columbus Day the second Monday in October.

Veterans' Day the fourth Monday in October.

In addition, Labor Day will continue to be the first Monday in September, making a total of five long weekends each year.

WHAT WON'T BE CHANGED

Such religious holidays as Christmas, Easter, and Thanksgiving, plus Independence Day are not affected. They stay as is.

IS THIS CALENDAR TAMPERING?

Not at all. Already, because of the vagaries of history and the two calendars used during the Christian era, many holidays are celebrated on "wrong" or arbitrary dates having little or no connection with the events they commemorate.

For instance, Washington's Birthday, going by the Julian calendar in use at the first President's time, was actually February 11, not February 22.

Memorial Day was originally set for eulogizing the dead of the Civil War, but since World War I it also has commemorated the dead of other wars. So May 30 is not fully significant to the now broader purpose of the observance.

Veterans' Day was first Armistice Day, marking the end of World War I. But in 1954, it was changed to Veterans' Day to salute veterans of all our wars. So the November 11 date might just as well be May 7 (the German surrender in World War II), September 1 (Japanese surrender) or July 27 (Korean armistice). Moving observance of these events to regularly fall on Mondays represents no lessening of historical significance.

As a case in point, since Canada moved observance of the Queen's birthday and all other holidays except Christmas and New Year's Day to fall on Monday, awareness there of the importance of these commemorative days has increased.

NEVER ON MONDAY FOR YOU?

Remember, this highly popular new law applies only to federal government employees, wherever they work or are stationed, and to the District of Columbia. In other words, federal agencies, their regional and field offices, Federal Reserve banks, military posts, post offices and many other facilities will be closed on these five Monday Holidays every year.

WIDESPREAD ENDORSEMENT

In the comprehensive hearings Congress conducted, support for Monday holidays was voiced by such diverse organizations as: Air Transport Association, Amalgamated Transit Union, American Federation of Government Employees, American Hotel & Motel Association, American Petroleum Institute, American Retail Federation, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Government Employees Council, AFL-CIO, National Association of Food Chains, National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, National Association of Travel Organizations, National Recreation and Park Association, U.S. Civil Service Commission, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Department of Labor.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

In a spirit of state-federal cooperation, Congress deliberately wrote the law to leave conforming action up to the individual States. Encourage your State Legislature to act now to make your State holiday calendar conform to the new national holiday schedule and the schedule which other States are adopting. Prompt passage of your State law is essential so that all of us will share the same national holidays—and benefits—starting in 1971.

MARIHUANA—A CALLING CARD TO ADDICTION

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Law Enforcement Bulletin

of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, always an authoritative and informative publication, carried an article in its November issue of extreme importance to all Americans, not just law-enforcement officers. The article, written by the Honorable Henry L. Giordano, Associate Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the Justice Department, is entitled "Marihuana—A Calling Card to Addiction." It dispels, with finality and authority, the canard that marihuana is harmless, and that its open sale should therefore be legal.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the article at this point:

MARIHUANA: A CALLING CARD TO NARCOTIC ADDICTION

(By Henry L. Giordano, Associate Director, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs)

Today, America may be "sleeping" while antisocial activity grows in intensity. Certainly this is true concerning the increasing problem of marihuana abuse.

Dozens of news clippings, editorials, and magazine articles in recent months have proclaimed the virtues of marihuana. But most writers fail to present a full and objective discussion of the other side of the coin—the side indicating marihuana abuse is harmful to the health, safety, and welfare of our society. If such writers give a complete distortion, they are indulging our communities in a very dangerous gamble. By presenting only the pro-marihuana arguments, which sell copy, the public has been deprived of the real, vital and objective facts necessary to make an intelligent choice about marihuana.

Law enforcement officers appear to be the sole voice in the wilderness warning that today's growing permissive attitude about marihuana leads to an increase of all types of drug abuse rather than to its control. Law enforcement officers who defend society from the deprecations of drug dependence have a responsibility to show to the people what is happening and correct errors and misconceptions about drug abuse.

There is nothing to prevent acceptance of this challenge, and this article will highlight points against marihuana. Marihuana is not only an extremely dangerous drug—it is a menace to public health, safety, and welfare.

When discussing marihuana, it is imperative to define the sometimes confusing terminology. The term "marihuana" embraces all the fancy and vernacular names you hear—the so-called "American type," the so-called "Mexican type," "hashish," "bhang," "ganja," "charas," "cannabis," "cannabis resins," "cannabinol," "cannabinol," "tetrahydrocannabinol," "pot," "tea," or "weed."

The potency of the drugs ranges from the limited effects of poorly harvested marihuana to the severe effects of "hashish" or "charas." Most of the marihuana consumed in the United States is made up of the leaves and flowering tops of the marihuana plant. To a lesser extent, "hashish" is also being consumed by the users in the United States. But whether a person is using the so-called "Mexican-type" marihuana or the more potent "hashish," the potential for abuse is ever present. The only difference is that a user of "hashish" need not smoke as much to reach the desired result.

Marihuana differs significantly from the drugs in the opium family in that it does not produce addiction of the morphine type. Abstinence does not produce a physiological withdrawal syndrome in the user. However, its use does result in a psychological dependence and, according to Dr. David P. Ausubel, chronic users go to great lengths to insure that they will not be without the drug. Deprivation may also result in "anxiety, restlessness, irritability, or even a state

of depression with suicidal fantasies, sometimes self-mutilating actions or actual suicidal attempts," which are all symptoms of a psychological withdrawal syndrome. For these reasons, marihuana is more often said to be habituating than addicting, although a recent investigator claims there is little difference from a psychiatric point of view.

NO MEDICAL USE

In the past, efforts to find a proper medical use for marihuana were not successful. As the American Medical Association's Committee on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence indicated, "marihuana has no known use in medical practice in most countries of the world, including the United States."

It is also interesting and significant that the United Nations 1961 single convention on narcotic drugs placed marihuana in a special category with narcotic drugs particularly liable to abuse and to produce ill effects and lacking offsetting therapeutic advantages possessed by less harmful drugs. The decision to include marihuana among other exceedingly dangerous substances was based upon the judgment of drug experts. This same convention established requirements whereby the United States maintains special measures of control over marihuana and prohibits "the production, manufacture, export and import of, trade in, possession or use of the drug except for amounts which may be necessary for medical and scientific research only."

The immediate physiological effects of marihuana intoxication include some loss in coordination of the limbs; an increase in pulse rate; an abnormal lowering of body temperature; an insatiable hunger; and inflammation of the mucous membranes and the bronchial tubes. Other effects include fantasy; exhilaration of mood; the feeling of being above reality; loss of spatial sense; a loss of timing; and an often uncontrollable hilarity over something which is not particularly amusing to a normal person. When larger doses are used, extremely vivid hallucinations often occur; there may be panic and an inordinate fear of death, illusions, and periods of paranoia. A high enough dose can result in a condition resembling toxic psychosis.

PSYCHOTIC REACTION

Marihuana's effects upon the operation of the central nervous system are most profound but have been the least explored by research. Little is known about the psychopharmacological aspects of marihuana, even though it has been one of the most widely used drugs in the world. However, there is still considerable literature revealing its effects are detrimental to the central nervous system. For example, Dr. Donald Louria, in his book *Nightmare Drugs*, states that marihuana may produce all of the hallucinogenic effects of which LSD is capable. Research conducted by Dr. Harris Isbell and associates on human beings using a natural occurring tetrahydro-cannabinol of marihuana has led to the conclusion that a sufficient dosage of marihuana "can cause psychotic reaction in almost any individual."

As a result of these findings, marihuana has earned a reputation for inducing criminal behavior. Yet the manner in which marihuana causes or induces criminal behavior is not clear. It seems to vary with the individual, the dosage, and the circumstances, but a general survey of the literature indicates that marihuana may stimulate criminal conduct in any of the following ways: (1) Fortifying the courage of criminals prior to committing crimes; (2) causing general derangement and demoralization with chronic use; (3) lowering inhibitions and bringing out suppressed criminal tendencies; and (4) inducing panic, confusion, or anger in otherwise normal persons.

There are many studies which link criminal behavior with marihuana. One prominent

team of researchers in India, where there has been long and widespread abuse of marihuana in all of its potent forms, concluded that "excessive indulgence in cannabis is apt to produce in healthy individuals, and more so in susceptible individuals, mental confusion which may lead to delusions with restlessness and disordered movements. Intellectual impairment as well as disorientation may show itself in various ways, such as weakening of moral sense, habit of telling lies, prostitution, theft, pilfering, sex perversion, and other degrading practices. Sometimes indulgence may release subconscious impulses and lead to violent crimes."

CONDUCTIVE TO VIOLENCE

Earlier studies during 1939 in New Orleans disclosed that the number of marihuana users among major criminals was unusually high. Even the LaGuardia report of 1944, which is often cited in support of the harmlessness of marihuana, found that in a number of test subjects "... there were alterations in behavior giving rise to antisocial expression. This was shown by unconventional acts not permitted in public, anxiety reactions, oppositions, antagonism and eroticism. Effects such as these would be considered conducive to acts of violence." The conclusion of this study indicated that with "... the potential make-up and the right time and environment, marihuana may bring on a true psychotic state."

Another significant investigation conducted by Professor C. G. Gardikas, chief of Greece's Criminal Services, analyzed a group of 379 hashish-smoking criminals. He found that 117 of these became criminally inclined only after their habituation to hashish. Within the group there were more than 420 sentences for assaults, woundings, threats, robberies, manslaughters, and sex offenses.

MARIHUANA AND CRIME

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs recently conducted its own study. It revealed a definite pattern between marihuana usage and crime. City and State police agencies were surveyed to gather and assemble a volume of well-documented instances where criminal behavior was directly related to the use of marihuana. Several of the more poignant examples from this study are:

Seattle, Wash.—A man accidentally bumped into and spilled coffee on another at the old World's Fair grounds. The jostled person began swearing at the man who had bumped into him. He pulled out a piece of log chain and began to beat the man. Officers found the suspect in possession of and under the influence of marihuana when he was arrested for assault.

Detroit, Mich.—A 19-year-old man was arrested for murdering his 3-month-old daughter. His wife told homicide detectives her husband was a constant marihuana user and had been under its influence when he beat their infant daughter to death using his hands.

San Antonio, Tex.—After smoking marihuana for several hours, two defendants decided to settle an argument with a mutual acquaintance. They pistol whipped, beat, stabbed, and finally shot and killed the other man. Police later learned the two murderers smoked marihuana until they became "violent" and then, immediately, went to "beat" the man.

San Jose, Calif.—During an armed robbery two teenagers, aged 15 and 17, shot the owner of a beverage shop to death. After they were arrested, the two juveniles admitted they had used marihuana before committing the robbery.

It is perfectly clear that the more people experimenting with marihuana, the greater the danger that many will not be able to handle the habit. They will associate with subcultures involved in all types of drug abuse, barbiturates, amphetamines, LSD, and

even heroin. Thus, if the apparent increase in marihuana abuse continues unabated, there will be a sharp rise in the incidence of narcotic addiction.

Of course, not everyone who smokes a marihuana cigarette will become a heroin addict. But actual experience leaves little room for doubt that a large majority of addicts first began with marihuana. This pattern of graduation has been observed in the United States, the Near East and Africa, though admittedly the exact causal connection is unknown.

ADDICTS STUDIED

A recent review of this subject was made by a noted psychiatrist, who studied 80 English heroin addicts. He found that all 80 had first used marihuana and apparently considered its effects second only to those of heroin. In studying these patients, the doctor was led to the conclusion that the connection between marihuana and heroin could not be accounted for simply on the basis of the "mutual influence of availability in illegal society. . . ." In an intensive research project conducted by Dr. John C. Ball, chief sociologist of the United States Clinical Research Center in Lexington, Ky., it was found that of 1,759 narcotic addicts examined, 80 percent had used marihuana prior to their addiction.

To many people, the thought of a large portion of our younger generation "turning on," "tuning in," and, finally, "dropping out" is a frightening one. There is no doubt that marihuana can offer some individuals transitory pleasures. But in a world beset with problems, we need the contribution of all because the United States cannot afford to have its greatest resource—youth—dropping into a state of oblivion.

The American Medical Association adroitly summarized the position responsible citizens must take in this crisis. In its August 1968 publication, a commonsense statement about the dangers of marihuana concluded: "Only an aroused and concerned public can create, mobilize, and implement resources to deal adequately with a problem of drug dependence in all its forms. The proper stimulus must come from citizens who are community leaders aware of those needs and from professionals who apply themselves to those needs."

"Frank and forceful public discussions, focusing on the futility and inherent dangers in experimenting with drugs such as marihuana and the consequence of any subsequent psychological dependence, can act as deterrents."

"Marihuana is centuries old, but it represents a constant danger. The responsibilities of the citizen, including the physician, are clearly defined. The time to begin is now."

The challenge referred to must be met by all law enforcement officers.

STATUS OF THE CORONER

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a significant address before the National Association of Coroners, August 20, 1968, by Dr. Samuel R. Gerber, coroner of Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Dr. Gerber who is serving as both the elected official of a county of nearly 2 million persons, which includes the city of Cleveland, and as the executive secretary-treasurer of

the National Association of Coroners, addressed the 1968 convention on the topic, "Status of the Coroner."

Dr. Gerber has long been one of the most respected elected officials of the Cleveland metropolitan area. In addition—as this paper demonstrates—he is one of the Nation's most knowledgeable and concerned coroners.

Dr. Gerber makes an eloquent plea for a strong National Coroners Association:

We must face the fact that we are challenged to prove the worth of the coroner as a public official.

His idea of the role of the coroner stretches far beyond the traditional idea of a specialized medical officer. The coroner can and should be concerned with more than the individual case. The whole field of public health should be his concern. He should deal with problems such as the cause and prevention of baby deaths, suicide, and accidental deaths. As Dr. Gerber states:

The limited concept of Forensic Medicine as merely a subspecialty of Pathology applicable only to investigations into deaths from violence or obscure causes has obscured the need for development of other subspecialties concerned with forensic aspects of every area of medical practice.

Dr. Gerber's speech is as follows. I hope that everyone will have the chance to look at this significant statement on the role of these officials who are so important in our system of justice and health:

STATUS OF THE CORONER

(Presentation for National Association of Coroners, Tuesday, August 20, by S. R. Gerber, M.D., LL.B., coroner, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, executive secretary-treasurer, National Association of Coroners)

INTRODUCTION

As we view the status of the coroner I trust that we can acknowledge the weaknesses as well as the virtues. No institution or business can progress without objective analyses of liabilities and assets. On this occasion it is appropriate that we direct our attention to the frailties as well as the achievements of the National Association of Coroners and honestly appraise the status of this organization, its relationship to coroners and evaluate the potentials for improvement of the coroners' functions throughout the United States and Canada.

Some of you are attending your first meeting of the National Association of Coroners. We welcome you to this twenty-seventh meeting held since 1937. (Although the idea for this organization originated at a meeting of physicians and attorneys in Chicago in 1925 and the National Association of Coroners was incorporated in Wisconsin in 1927, no convention was held until 1937. Due to World War II and attendant problems, no meetings were held during the period of 1942 thru 1945. A meeting was held in 1946 but not in 1947. Since that time there have been meetings annually.)

It is hoped that this presentation will provide some background for an open discussion and frank appraisal of the status of coroners and of the National Association of Coroners. We do sincerely solicit suggestions for making the National Association of Coroners more effective and representative of the consensus of coroners in areas of common experience.

There seems to be no reliable index to determine what proportion of coroners are performing their duties with a proficiency appropriate for life and death in the final third of the twentieth century.

During the past 25 years that I have been

secretary of this Association I have made several attempts to ascertain some facts that could provide some basis for evaluating the general status of coroners in the United States. For the lack of staff I have not been able to keep up with all of the legislative actions affecting coroners in various states. Very few coroners have volunteered information concerning pending legislation and scarcely any have informed us of legislative actions or of influences affecting the operation of coroner's offices in individual states. This fact plus the vast diversity in laws and practices have made it increasingly difficult to develop and maintain comprehensive files that would provide currently competent information. Compilations published by the National Municipal League and the American Medical Association are affected by the same difficulties and, in addition, are influenced by the viewpoints of the compilers. Therefore, I was pleased when Mr. Ivor Wayne of the Bureau of Social Science Research approached me last December for assistance in conducting a survey of coroners' offices as a step in a study of suicide statistics in the United States.

Objective consideration of the oft expressed opinion that suicide data understate the actual frequency of its occurrence led Mr. Wayne to the recognition that a number of steps occur in the sequence from the event of the individual death until the event is entered in the U.S. mortality statistics and in this sequence, several persons make decisions subject to potential error. Obviously, the first question is: Who decides, and how, whether a given death will be recorded as suicide or nonsuicide? Consideration of the national problem brought recognition that there are generally three categories of decision-makers: Coroners, medical examiners and those physicians entitled to sign death certificates on their own behalf.

A nationwide survey of coroners was proposed to furnish information pertinent to the frame of reference or the approach employed by the coroner in these decisions. In the research proposal accompanying the application for a grant, he explained: "We have placed the survey of coroners ahead of the other two groups because we believe that their responses will yield a greater degree of relevant information given the marked heterogeneity of this group. Therefore, data so obtained should be very useful in future planning of similar surveys with the other two groups. The working agreement we have reached with the Executive Secretary of the National Association of Coroners, which will facilitate our approach to this usually inaccessible body of respondents, was a practical factor in assigning priorities."

Three steps were outlined for the method of procedure: (1) A small number of intensive interviews with coroners of relatively small jurisdictions. The intent of such interviews was to assess the extent to which social norms and values in the community influence the decision for or against a ruling of suicide. (2) Pretest of Mail Questionnaire with a relatively small sample (N=50-100) to explore those demographic parameters which might be related to types of reactions to individual questions and the respondent characteristics that might influence the probability of speedy response or stubborn resistance. (3) The National Survey—Quoting directly from the Research Proposal: "As for the mechanics of the survey, we anticipate that several waves of followups will be needed to reach a satisfactory level of response. Only one-sixth of approximately 2500 coroners in the Association's card file are currently paid-up members; in past mailings by the Association, response rates of paid up members would usually run at 65-75% without additional reminders, but was very low among those who had not kept up their dues in the preceding two years. Also, one might expect a higher proportion of addresses to be

out of date in this latter group. A projection based on experiences with analogous groups as to probable response might be as follows: "... As far as the paid-up group is concerned, we would expect a 90% return after two followup mailings; we are less optimistic about the remaining group ..."

After a personal interview and telephone consultations with Mr. Wayne, we supplied him with the general mailing list of approximately 2200 coroners, lists of active and inactive members selected to represent a variety of states, and also recommended for personal interviews certain active members who were experienced coroners in rural and urban areas.

On July 25th I received a discouraging report from Mr. Wayne which prompted me to include in the paper I was preparing for this meeting the results of his efforts and experiences since they are relevant to the topic.

The personal interviews were conducted in the second half of March. Following the interviews it was concluded that suitable topics for the questionnaires would be: "cooperation of key individuals, budgetary matters and limitations, satisfaction with salary, the non-reporting of Coroners cases, case load and facilities, opinions about the death certificate and recent changes in it. How decisions are made, where difficulties arise in the decision-making process, what coroners can tell us about community attitudes toward suicide—these areas would be less appealing questionnaire subjects."

In concluding the report of these interviews, it was stated: "In preparation of the pretest questionnaire we spent the better part of an afternoon with a coroner going over the proposed draft, item by item. He supplied the respective responses and, ... indicated how readily a given bit of information would be available to most coroners of his acquaintance. Several changes were made on the basis of our conversation. This respondent seemed convinced that the revised questionnaire would be a very successful data gathering instrument. Time and pretest showed up his optimistic expectations as somewhat exaggerated."

In a summary of the results of the Pretest questionnaires the following comments were made in Mr. Wayne's report to the Center for the Study of Suicide Prevention, National Institute of Mental Health: "The pretest questionnaires were sent to 51 coroners during the first week in April; by the end of May after one followup reminder and one set of telephone calls, we had in hand 35 returns. ... The returns came from 19 states covering the full range of jurisdictions, as far as population was concerned; 18 from counties under 100,000, 16 from larger jurisdictions. Only three respondents were full-time coroners; most of the part-timers had a private medical practice (N=18) or fulfilled the function of a funeral director (N=8); three persons combined coronership, practice of medicine and public health activities. Their experience as coroners ranged from 4 to 32 years. "The following numerical findings while not generalizable to the U.S. are suggestive:

"a. Referral rate, i.e., number of cases referred to coroner related to total deaths in county, ranged from 14%-44% with the median being 30%.

"b. On the average (median) coroners admitted 81% of cases referred.

"c. The preceding two statistics were not reported by many respondents, since they did not understand the distinction between referral and admission. But all except one gave the number of coroners cases for 1966 and 1967: one-fifth of all deaths were coroners cases (median): the range of 9%-58% indicates the vast variability on local practice.

"d. The autopsy rate, reported by 31 respondents, showed the almost maximal range of 2%-92% with a median of 17%;

this is the proportion of autopsies among coroners cases.

"e. Another impressive variability is found in the relative numbers of suicides; they ran from 19 to 210 per 1000 coroners cases with a median number of 57.

"f. A statistic on which apparently no information is available is of some interest: the relative number of non-residents among cases investigated by coroners varied from 0-36%. The median being 14%. ... Unfortunately many jurisdictions do not maintain the pertinent data.

"How many cases are not reported to the coroner when the law requires that they should be? ... Four persons wrote 0 or negligible, 14 rated them below 5%, but the other half stretched out to 25%. The mean was 8 for every 100 cases reported. ..."

"In how many cases did the coroner find the decision between suicide and non-suicide difficult to make? ... Five did not answer, eight reported no difficult decision cases, the man in the smallest jurisdiction of the group had five such cases in an annual load of 11 coroners cases. Omitting the last cited as unusual but including the zeroes, we get a mean of 1.7% of all coroners cases. (This is remarkably similar to the 2% of Medical Examiners cases considered equivocal but potentially involving suicide, as mentioned by Dr. Mann in my Richmond, Virginia interview.)

"In answering the question whether U.S. statistics understate the frequency of suicide, one-third of the respondents expressed no opinion or believe the figures to be "about right"; three simply checked "should be higher" while twenty coroners rated the official underestimates from 5%-100%; the mean of those who quantified amounted to an underestimate of 19.4% (even if the zeroes are included we get 13.5%). The main point here is that two-thirds of the coroners said that official figures understate the frequency of suicide and not one that they overstate it."

Regrettably, the National Institute of Mental Health grant for the continuation of this project was not renewed and apparently it will be terminated by October unless Mr. Wayne has been successful in his efforts to interest the Health Resources Division of the National Center for Health Statistics in continuing at least that part which he has conducted into updating addresses in 28 states. It seems that the Health Manpower Branch of the Health Resources Division were slightly embarrassed to have it brought to their attention that neither coroner nor medical examiner (in the medicolegal sense) appear in their catalogue or publications concerning professionals in the health field. With the approaching election there will surely be a number of changes in the coroners offices and Mr. Wayne is bemoaning the fact that his tediously checked names and addresses may become obsolete but worse, the newly elected coroners will not be knowledgeable concerning past experience in office.

Our general mailing list is compiled from replies to our requests addressed to the Secretary of State of each individual state. Such requests are sent following general elections quadriennially to all states except where appointed medical examiners function throughout the state and to specific states at periods consistent with designated time for election of coroners as we have been informed of the appropriate time. It should be noted that our membership and general mailing lists do include names of several persons whose official title is Medical Examiner.

Names and addresses of active and inactive members selected at Mr. Wayne's request for the Pretest questionnaire mailing list were chosen to represent the general mailing list and to provide representative sampling in respect to regions and population density of

jurisdictions. Reviewing the list of persons to whom the questionnaires were sent we find that it included 33 active coroners whose addresses were known to be correct and 18 who had not paid dues or responded to any recent correspondence. Eight of these had paid dues for only one year—joining when the NAC meeting was held in their own or a nearby state. It is interesting that three of these eight, and one-half of all of the delinquents who were contacted, responded to the questionnaire; this would seem to justify our policy of retaining these names in the file. It was disturbing to learn that two of the addressees in Louisiana and Mississippi were not serving as coroners. We had not been notified of these changes; one had joined the association and had paid dues fairly consistently until 1963 and we had no indication that he was not coroner of the parish. Two others, one in Colorado and one in New York could not be located and one in Illinois did not respond and could not be contacted by telephone.

These factors might provide some insight into the problems of attempting to keep our mailing lists current, particularly when this work must be sandwiched between other pressing duties in a crowded schedule and coroners themselves fail to notify us of changes. This is one of many areas in which state organizations of coroners could assist in strengthening the National Association.

At the annual meeting in 1950 I presented a tentative draft of model legislation drafted by the National Municipal League following a symposium on *proposing a model law concerning state medical examiners* held as part of their national conference on government in St. Paul in 1949. Having attended that meeting I was acutely aware that it would require concerted action of a representative number of coroners to call the attention of zealous reformers to the legal as well as medical aspects of the coroners' duties and to point out some of the practical problems. Accordingly I suggested that the National Association of Coroners should be brought to maturity. At that time I said (quoting from the published proceedings):

"If we would keep abreast of the other influences or hope to lead in any changes, we need intelligent effort on the part of every qualified coroner. We must strive to fulfill ... the purpose of the National Association of Coroners as stated in the charter: 'that there may be the best standard of uniform practice developed in the field of legal medicine; to maintain a central office through which aid, assistance, and expert advice, legal, scientific and otherwise, pertaining to the duties of the office of Coroner may be available; to issue, edit, publish and otherwise circulate a manual or digest containing the abstracts of the Statute law, common law, decisions and interpretations of the law in general pertaining to the office of Coroner and also containing articles in general of value and interest to Coroners.'

"The time has come when we must have a strong national association. The source of strength of any national group rests on the vitality of the units which represent the various sections of the country, therefore we need active state organizations. Coroners must unite to seek legislative reforms and provisions for formal education and training in the specialty of legal medicine, to offset the unfavorable impressions already implanted, and to achieve recognition by the press, the bar associations, medical societies and other molders of public opinions. ...

"We must face the fact that we are challenged to prove the worth of the coroner as a public official. If we do not accept the challenge, others with less practical knowledge and experience on the subject but with greater resources in personnel, finances and contacts will influence the opinions and institute only those changes which they desire. Therefore, if we would have our in-

fluence felt, we must have an office organized on a full time basis with a budget which will provide for a paid secretary and traveling expenses for representatives to consult with, advise, and otherwise assist the state groups in legislative reforms."

Obviously, no action was taken on my suggestions. Further attempts on my part at that meeting to stimulate interest in some arrangement for a salaried secretary merely induced a rising vote of thanks for our secretarial work.

The fact that those remarks are equally appropriate today—eighteen years later—and that the conclusions and recommendations contained in a 1944 report of the AMA Committee appointed to Study Relationship of Medicine and Law were essentially unchanged in a 1967 report of the AMA Committee on Medicolegal Problems might be misinterpreted as indications that the status of the coroner has remained unchanged. Most of you attending this meeting are acutely aware that many changes have taken place. Some of those changes were effected by legislation passed, as I predicted, without benefit of practical advice. Statewide medical examiners were designated by law to take over all functions of coroners in some states without any consideration of whether or not physicians were available, trained, inclined or interested in assuming these responsibilities.

Experiences in Oklahoma provide several pragmatic lessons. Legislation passed in 1962 was not implemented until 1967 following the appointment of Dr. James Luke as the first State Medical Examiner for Oklahoma. Speaking before the Academy of Forensic Sciences in February 1968, Dr. Luke after experience of about one year questioned the wisdom of requiring that the administrator of such a program should be a pathologist. His very practical observations disturbed some of the biased advocates of medical examiner "system" to the extent that they requested that he should not submit his remarks for publication. I do not know whether or not he complied with that request but he did write a letter to the Editor of the *New England Journal of Medicine* which was published in the May 23rd issue. In that letter he pointed out the critical shortage of personnel to implement legislation already adopted to provide for medical examinations to be conducted in cases of death from violence or obscure causes. He estimated that approximately 200 pathologists have been certified in Forensic Pathology by the American Board of Pathology and that 75% of those either did not work in the field of legal medicine or are engaged only part time in performance of such duties. (An editorial in the same issue of that journal stated that actually only 133 have been certified as Forensic Pathologists.)

The conclusion of Dr. Luke's letter should be given consideration by this audience; he wrote:

"The solution to the problem clearly lies in the education of the public concerning the enormous benefits immediately available to the community in a functional medicolegal system coupled with federal and private support for training stipends. Virtually no such support is at present available. The current situation is appalling and must be rectified immediately. The human worth of doing so would certainly justify any effort and modest expense required."

An editorial commenting on Dr. Luke's letter presented the reason given for abolishing the Department of Legal Medicine at Harvard in 1967 and Dean Ebert's concept of the future of Legal Medicine:

"Dean Ebert gave as the primary reason for the discontinuance the fact that the training of medical examiners should be on a post-graduate level in the teaching hospitals with a close link to the medical schools but not on a separate departmental basis. Dr. Ebert also indicated that as part of the

current re-examination of medical education at Harvard, the Medical School was looking broadly at the complexities of modern society and the new demands on physicians in the delivery of medical care on a community basis, the establishment of group practices, federal programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, in research and in the control of our environment. He pointed to new medicolegal problems in such areas as human rights, rights of research subjects, population control and drug abuse. Dr. Ebert indicated that the Medical School intended to deal with these subjects in the curriculum in an interdisciplinary manner, examining co-operatively the interfaces between medicine and law at Harvard." The author of the editorial commented: "Perhaps this is the future for forensic pathology as well: to be united more effectively with its basic discipline, pathology, but also to become more a part of complete examination of the interfaces of the two professions it serves, medicine and law. To continue as a narrow specialty, as Dr. Luke points out, seems a dying cause. The great public importance of the work being done by forensic pathologists cannot be denied. The need for research and for renewed interest in this interdisciplinary field is clear and commands support."

In a subsequent issue (July 4th) Dr. Gilbert E. Corrigan, Assistant Professor Department of Pathology, University of Texas Medical Branch, in a letter to the Editor commented on the editorial reply to Dr. Luke and presented his concept of forensic pathology (quoting from his letter):

"... My own personal approach to forensic pathology is that it is the *pathology of public health*... The matter extends beyond the individual and finds further meaning in its role in the study of society. What better way to assess a society is there than to know how many of its children are dying at home without medical attention, how many of its mothers are dying of septic abortions, and how many of its fathers are dying at work in hazardous environments? Forensic pathology, then, is the study of ecology and nature of human death. It is the study of public deaths and those of concern to the public at large. It is meant to aid the living..."

Dr. Corrigan's concept, broader than that of many pathologists, implies that forensic pathology is a specialized application of pathology to the broader field of public health which is served by a variety of disciplines. Dean Ebert's perspective is more extensive and directs attention to forensic aspects areas of medical service for the live patients.

The limited concept of Forensic Medicine as merely a subspecialty of Pathology applicable only to investigations into deaths from violence or obscure causes has obscured the need for development of other subspecialties concerned with forensic aspects of every area of medical practice. Every aspect of living—physical, social, cultural and economic—evokes legal problems. Every branch of Medicine has legal implications and every specialty can assist in effectual administration of justice.

It seems ludicrous that neither medical schools nor law schools, neither the American Medical Association nor the American Bar Association nor any other organization in this country has recognized Forensic Medicine as the concordance of principles and philosophies of Law and expertise of all branches of Medicine. The definition of Forensic or Legal Medicine as the application of medical skills and knowledge to legal problems tends to imply that the discipline of Medicine is servant of Law and frustrates development of Forensic Medicine as a recognized specialty. Coining the word medicolegal did little to foster union of the interests and probably hindered recognition of

the utilization of other areas of specialized knowledge and skill.

Neither Medical Schools nor Law Schools are interested in, nor generally do they have access to expertise for, the requisite courses of study and training. There are students seeking such courses. Periodically I receive inquiries from students or graduates of Law Schools or Medical Schools who want advice on pursuit of training for careers in Legal Medicine.

It seems to me that coroners in general and this group in particular should recognize the obvious challenge and accept their responsibilities as persons uniquely qualified to broaden understanding of, and stimulate interesting, the wide variety of skills and knowledge that must be utilized, correlated and converged in coroners' duties. The public, and some coroners, have been more confused than enlightened by emphasis on the medical and legal aspects of coroners' investigations.

Perhaps what is needed is the recognition and development of a multidisciplinary-interdisciplinary supra-specialty in which the common bond would be acceptance and practice of the doctrine of proof established by the standards of Logic and applied by Law and Science; it might be called *Forensology*. Coroners have the opportunity to recognize this need and to foster the development of such a supra-specialty. We have some evidence of this in the American Academy of Forensic Sciences. Members of the Academy are associated according to their specialized interests and experiences in seven sections. The constitution provides for other sections to be formed as sufficient numbers of persons with other specialized interest and experience group together to organize and conduct programs. The seven sections now functioning are: Criminalistics, Jurisprudence, Pathology & Biology, Psychiatry, Questioned Documents, Toxicology, General. Members are free to attend any sectional program meeting. Several of the coroners who are members, regardless of whether or not they are physicians, tend to take advantage of the opportunity to listen to papers and discussions on subjects other than pathology because they know the need to be familiar with developments relevant to a wide variety of non-medical as well as medical evidence.

The August 3rd issue of Saturday Review contains five articles relating to *Science, Technology, and the Law*. In the first of these, entitled *Drawing the Indictment*, Arthur Selwyn Miller, Professor of Law at the National Law Center, George Washington University, proposes that:

"... The law schools should be brought screaming and bucking into the twentieth century. . . ." And he concludes: "No one is entitled to be optimistic that the legal profession will make the effort necessary to become relevant to the modern age. Ever increasingly, lawyers seem to be in process of being shunted aside, replaced by those with skills more attuned to the times. What is needed is for the lawyers and the technologists to work together to meet the manifold problems of our day. The challenge is clear, but the response is weak."

It seems apparent that the same recommendations and conclusions apply equally well to coroners in general—present company excepted, of course.

Coroners throughout the United States must utilize the skills and knowledge of medicine and relevant sciences including behavioral sciences. Coroners should be the major force in stimulating interest and fostering development of forensic sciences. Obviously, the fundamental prerequisite is that the coroners themselves as individuals and in organized groups must have a sincere interest in their duties and have a broad concept of the significance of their performances. The challenge is clear, but the response has been minimal.

Let's face it: Too many coroners have been too complacent; too many coroners have been blindly reactionary in attempting to resist changes necessary to adapt to twentieth century life and death; too many coroners resenting the unilateral approach of persons who accentuate the significance of medical examinations fail to direct attention to other aspects of coroners' duties. Too few coroners have directed attention to the proper utilization of medical and technological skills; too few have spoken out before appropriate influential groups concerning the need for specialized training; too few coroners have participated in the training of forensic pathologists; too few coroners have urged recognition of the true scope of forensic medicine. Too few coroners have made serious attempts to overcome lethargy and antipathy in their communities.

Considering the non-recognition of Forensic Medicine as a specialty, the insufficient number of Forensic Pathologists trained or being trained, the inadequate or unreliable sources of information about the vast diversity in laws and practices affecting coroners' offices throughout the United States, is it possible to make any general statements concerning the status of coroners? The fact that the Health Manpower Branch of the Health Resources Division of the National Center for Health Statistics has no listing for coroners and medical examiners typifies the general public attitude of avoidance of facing the problems of death. The fact that the President's Crime Commission Report does not mention Forensic Pathology or the contributions of the coroners investigations reflects the abysmal ignorance of the significance of coroner's duties. Those of us involved in this public service find it difficult to understand why there is so little recognition of its importance to the health, safety, and welfare of the community. Perhaps some insight can be provided by frankly assessing the response to this National Association of Coroners.

Consider the fact that more than 2200 coroners have been notified of each of these annual meetings for more than 20 years and in spite of an outstanding program this year less than 10% are in attendance. It leaves one wondering to what extent this organization has practical significance for the coroners throughout the nation.

As I said before, the challenge and opportunity is presented for this organization to improve the status of the office of coroner and advance the development of Forensic Medicine. Certainly, no one can deny that medical examination is a fundamental factor in the coroner's investigation. The point of contention is the recognition of the need for specialized training. Coroners are the only ones who can direct that training in the broad field of Forensic Medicine and other Forensic Sciences be encouraged and used for the benefit of the health and welfare of the nation. To this end I urge everyone here to activate strong state organizations of coroners.

THE JOHNSON BUDGET

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman, I feel compelled to speak on the proposal to increase the salaries of our President, Members of Congress, and other governmental officials. It is my contention that we should do "first things first," and I place balancing the budget high on the list of priorities.

Leading Republicans have labeled

President Johnson's farewell budget misleading and meaningless. For instance, Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, has said that the budget surplus was a "manipulation of figures." A top Republican on the Senate Banking Committee, Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, called the document misleading. Senator JACK MILLER, another Senate Finance Committee member, has said that the Johnson budgets have become "meaningless documents."

So it looks like we will arrive at the end of the fiscal year before we will know if we have a balanced budget or not, or if all the estimates of economic growth and tax revenues are going to total out to a balanced budget.

While I do not believe we should ever permit the salaries of our Government officials to reach such a low that only millionaires can afford to serve our Government—and I think this would be the very worst thing that could possibly happen to us—I think we should make every effort to get our economy back on a sound footing, operate from a balanced budget, and remove the surtax as soon as possible. Then we could consider raising the salaries of our governmental officials.

I hope it will be long remembered that this administration with its fiscal irresponsibility brought about the necessity for a surtax, imposed the surtax, and recommended increasing these salaries while the people are still burdened with the 10-percent surtax.

I feel very strongly that we should not increase salaries until we at least have sound economy, a balanced budget, and the removal of the surtax. If I handled my personal finances in such a manner as this administration has handled these, I am certain I would face bankruptcy immediately.

SENATOR HART'S DETERMINED INQUIRY INTO AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE PROFITS

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the issue of automobile insurance profitability is central to necessary legislative reform of the insurance industry and its regulatory system. The following article by Harry F. Rosenthal examines claims of the automobile insurance industry that it is losing money, and the diametrically opposed testimony recently presented before Senator PHILIP HART's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee by knowledgeable Government officials and academic scholars. This testimony indicates that automobile insurance profits and returns on investment are far greater than those of comparable industries. Mr. Rosenthal's article, in effect, summarizes 8 days of the subcommittee's hearings which were recorded in over 1,500 pages of testimony. I would commend Senator HART's continuing and determined efforts to protect the pub-

lic's interest and would urge that the Members closely consider Mr. Rosenthal's summary of the subcommittee's hearings on profitability. The article follows:

[From the Utica (N.Y.) Daily Press,
Dec. 26, 1968]

PROFIT OR LOSS, IT'S ALL IN THE ACCOUNTING:
"AUTO INSURERS CRYING TO THE BANK,"
HART SAYS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Whether the auto insurance business is crying all the way to the bank, or headed for the poorhouse, depends on which of two sets of figures you look at. This report examines both sets.)

(By Harry F. Rosenthal)

WASHINGTON.—In petitioning state regulatory agencies for rate increases, the auto insurance industry invariably reports it is losing money. At the same time, it consistently assures stockholders that it is earning substantial profits.

Which claim is true? From the industry point of view both are. It's all a matter of bookkeeping procedures. By using methods which the industry frankly concedes "differ in some respects from generally accepted accounting principles," auto insurers can legally show both a profit and a loss.

"There is indeed a great deal of discussion on whether or not the auto insurance business is profitable," says Sen. Philip A. Hart, D-Mich., whose antitrust and monopoly subcommittee has scheduled new hearings on the industry next month. "Sometimes the argument turns more on accounting methods than the actual state of health of the companies."

Last year, for example, the 10 largest stock property and casualty companies, using what the industry calls the "statutory method" of accounting, reported an underwriting loss of \$273 million. When adjusted to generally accepted accounting methods, Hart said, the figure came out as a \$55 million profit. And, he added, neither figure included the net income on investments for the same 10 companies, a total of \$1.7 billion.

Hart claims the hearings, begun this year, already have shown a need for major reforms in the business of insuring the nation's 103 million drivers. The industry freely concedes this and has offered its help to the Hart subcommittee and to the Department of Transportation which is just beginning a 2-year study.

Among other things the time-honored liability system itself may be on its way out, to be replaced eventually with a no-fault system resembling that of health insurance.

Abuses in auto insurance—discriminatory rates, unwarranted cancellations, racial discrimination, and pick-and-choose underwriting—have been examined in the hearings.

But it is in the area of profitability a question that arises every time a state is asked to approve rate increases, that the auto insurance business is most controversial and complicated.

In a recent decision upholding a \$25-million automobile insurance rate increase, Justice Henry X. O'Brien of the Pennsylvania State Supreme Court commented that "we will not substitute our judgment for that of the (insurance) commissioner . . . even though we have grave doubts that the (accounting) system now used accurately reflects underwriting profits or losses . . ."

Insurance companies claim they lose money on underwriting automobile liability—and frequently they do. But the loss is far overshadowed by profits the companies make investing the premiums they collect from policyholders.

"What bothers me most is a plea of poverty based on underwriting results only," says Hart.

The industry insists that only its under-

writing experience should be taken into account in the rate-making process, contending that income from investments is of concern only to stockholders.

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co., replying to a questionnaire from the Hart subcommittee, put it this way:

"One buys a policy—a contract for protection—and has no rights other than to receive the services contracted for in the policy. Thus neither investment income nor capital gains or losses are properly allocable to any business. They belong to the stockholder who risks his funds to guarantee performance of the policy contracts."

Dr. Richard Norgaard of the University of Southern California testified before the subcommittee that casualty insurance companies are earning greater rates of profit than 90 per cent of 641 major American corporations.

He said the average 15-year rate of return on investment for Allstate Insurance Co., the country's largest automobile underwriter, was 24.6 per cent; for State Farm Mutual 14.6; for Hartford Accident and Indemnity 10.4; Nationwide 13.6; Safeco 41.5; Southern Farm Bureau 39.4 and Geico (Government Employees Insurance Company) 24.3.

The industry countered with a study, which it commissioned, by Arthur D. Little Co. Whereas Norgaard had examined only casualty insurance companies, the Little study covered the entire industry, and concluded that over a 10-year period the companies had an average rate of return of 4.4 per cent.

T. Lawrence Jones, president of the American Insurance Association, asserted the Little study presented a fairer picture than did Norgaard's, which centered on one part of the industry. "To say that auto insurance is special and not like the rest of the property and liability insurance industry," Jones said, "is like saying that a Volkswagen isn't an automobile because it looks so different from all the other cars."

The disagreement between two analysts, studying similar data for the same purpose, points up the difficulty in finding out just how much money auto insurers make or lose.

"One set of figures at our hearings indicated this was a highly profitable business, another that it was dismal," said Hart. "The real truth is probably somewhere in between."

The business can seem to be in the red when actually turning a profit, said Hart, even without taking profits from investments into account.

One way to do this is through so-called "statutory underwriting profit or loss"—the accounting method prescribed by law.

It works something like this:

On Dec. 1 you give your agent \$240 for one year's auto insurance. On December 31st, the company closes its books for the year but takes credit only for the premium actually earned—in this case one-twelfth year, or \$20. Then the company deducts its expenses in selling you that policy, about 35 per cent—\$84 in your case. Thus, while the company actually received \$240 from you, it lists a loss on your business of \$64.

Best's Insurance Reports, the statistical Boswell of the industry, says "This statutory figure does not completely disclose the underwriting results." But when the insurance companies go before state regulatory agencies to justify a rate increase, the figures presented are the statutory ones.

The Hart subcommittee brought out that more conventional accounting methods are used by the companies to arrive at an "adjusted underwriting profit or loss."

Thus, for example, Continental Insurance Companies of New York reported installments to stockholders that in 1966 and 1967 it lost 28 cents per share, based on the statutory accounting, but had an under-

writing profit of \$1.61 on an adjusted per-share basis.

Add to that a per-share investment income of \$11.29 and total adjusted earnings before taxes is \$12.90 per share for the two years. Shareholders were paid \$5.85 per share in cash dividends.

Hart says stockholder-owned property and casualty companies showed a statutory underwriting loss of more than \$731 million for the years 1958 to 1967—but when this figure is adjusted it becomes a \$413-million profit. During the same 10-year period, Hart says, the industry's income from investments was more than \$7 billion.

"Except for the policyholder's premium dollar, insurance companies would not be realizing these billions in investment returns," said Dean Sharp, assistant counsel for Hart's subcommittee. "The money set aside for possible claims and return of unused premiums) is financed solely from policyholder premiums. The nub of all this, according to our figures, is that the average return on investment is around 13 per cent for the industry since 1948."

"When someone turns one pocket inside out to show you how empty it is but has over \$7 billion in the other pocket," said Hart, "it is difficult to take their claim of poverty too seriously."

Nonetheless, state agencies do take them seriously. Forty states granted auto rate increases in 1965, 23 states in 1966 and 25 states last year. A half dozen states lowered rates last year, but by December the national average cost of auto insurance had risen 45.1 per cent over that for the 1957-to-1959 period.

George H. Kline, vice president and general counsel of Allstate Insurance Co.—largest auto insurer in the country with more than 6½ million policyholders, told the Hart subcommittee:

"I must point out that we do not plan and build highways; we do not train drivers; we do not license them or renew their licenses; we do not arrest them or convict them when they drive 100 miles an hour, or drag race, or tailgate or become the instrument of violence that causes the death of a fellow human."

Barring dangerous drivers from the highways would substantially reduce traffic violence and bring down the cost of automobile insurance, said Kline.

He cited increases in "costs which automobile insurance pays" such as doctors' fees, up 100 per cent in 10 years; hospital care up 92 per cent in 10 years, 354 per cent in 20 years; higher costs of repairs and replacements of such things as wrap-around windshields.

The subcommittee countered with figures showing that since 1948, the rate of disabling injury and death per 10,000 registered motor vehicles and 100 million miles driven has decreased by nearly one-third. During that same period, said the subcommittee, insurance company premiums have increased 44 per cent more than medical care costs, 36 per cent more than auto repair, and 30 per cent more than the private average weekly earnings in current dollars.

In the 20-year period, the total amount of auto premiums written was \$113.4 billion, but the companies paid out losses of only \$57 billion.

It is statistics like these that caused the American Insurance Association to propose in October a no-fault plan: one under which a driver's own company would pay his losses no matter who was at fault.

"The present system is a grotesque sham which forces everyone involved—the insurance company, the agent, the insured and the courts—to act out a string of illogical and ludicrous charades in an attempt to show themselves or their insured blameless and the other party totally at fault," Rhode Island's insurance commissioner, Ralph A.

Petrarca, told a hearing held by Sen. Warren Magnuson, D-Wash., last March.

Critics of the current system argue that auto insurance came into being to protect negligent drivers from losing assets because of lawsuits. But through the advent of compulsory insurance and financial responsibility laws, now in effect in all states, emphasis has shifted from protecting the negligent driver to compensating accident victims.

That makes the driver financially responsible for his accidents and gives the insurance companies a captive market of more than 103 million drivers, from which they collected more than \$10 billion in premium last year, the critics contend.

Since 1948, when antitrust limitations were lifted from the insurers, the companies' surplus accounts have grown 13 times as fast as their capital.

"This is what that means," said Sharp, the subcommittee counsel. "The companies capital has grown by \$750 million while their surpluses have grown \$9.7 billion. The significance is that the industry's capacity to insure has expanded by constantly pushing for rate increases and thus slowly building surpluses through retained earnings."

"In short, they (the companies) are achieving their wealth and power with other people's money—like any financial intermediary. They are not risking very much of their own."

RICKOVER SEES \$2 BILLION ARMS SAVING POSSIBLE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have watched the wonderful career of Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover over the years. He has been the father of the development of our nuclear submarine fleet. He is one of our most highly intelligent, hard working and effective naval officers.

I wish to include at this point in the RECORD a statement concerning how money might well be saved in the Department of Defense:

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), Jan. 16, 1969]

RICKOVER SEES \$2 BILLION ARMS SAVING POSSIBLE

(By Orr Kelly)

The Defense Department could save more than \$2 billion by tightening up its "toothless" laws governing defense contracts. Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover told a congressional subcommittee in testimony made public today.

He testified before the subcommittee on economy in government, headed by Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., on Nov. 14.

A frequent and caustic critic of the way the Pentagon is run, Rickover told of one case in which the Navy rejected a contract he favored.

Even though the contract carried a profit of more than \$1.1 million, it was rejected "because the profit was too low," Rickover, head of the Navy's nuclear propulsion program, testified. When he got that order, Rickover said, he raised the profit by five cents.

"I thought it was worth a nickel of government funds to avoid delaying the contract any further," he said.

The contract, he added, was finally awarded on the terms he originally proposed.

Defense contractors are receiving increasingly higher profits, Rickover said.

He cited examples of a 20 to 25 percent profit on propulsion turbines, 15 to 20 percent profit on nuclear equipment and a 33 percent profit on a piece of equipment recently offered for sale to a Navy shipbuilder.

Because of the increase in profits, he said, prices of military equipment have been rising much faster than items in the civilian economy.

Recent Pentagon officials have expressed concern that if profits are not held at a proper level, important elements of the defense industry may slip into an unhealthy condition.

The biggest loophole in government contracting is the lack of uniform accounting standards for government contracts, Rickover said. Uniform standards could save at least 5 percent—more than \$2 billion at the present rate of government spending, he estimated.

Rickover said he supported Proxmire's proposal for a comprehensive study of defense contracting by the General Accounting Office.

Proxmire's committee is scheduled to hold another hearing this afternoon on the increase in price of the C5A supertransport plane which was brought to public attention in hearings by his committee on November 13.

The testimony of Rickover and Air Force officials on the C5A is part of an investigation by the Senator of defense spending.

RICHARD BUELL OGILVIE: 37TH
GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, January 13, Richard Buell Ogilvie was inaugurated as the 37th Governor of Illinois. I have known Governor Ogilvie for a number of years. He is highly qualified for the position to which the people of Illinois elected him in November. He is one of the new breed of men who is alert to the problems of America and especially to the problems of Illinois. He is progressive and forward looking.

I append herewith his inaugural address, which is a memorable one, in order that my colleagues in the House may know the kind of a man that Illinois will have guiding its destiny in the next 4-year period:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF RICHARD BUELL OGILVIE, 39TH GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS, SPRINGFIELD, ILL., JANUARY 13, 1969

Governor Shapiro, fellow citizens of Illinois.

We are gathered here today in the city of Lincoln in a time of paradox, a time that embraces the best and the worst.

We are plagued by a war, by poverty and ignorance, and by increasing violence and crimes against our people.

Yet the words of Theodore Roosevelt still ring true that "no people on earth have more cause to be thankful than ours. We are the heirs of the ages."

For it is true that more Americans than ever before are sharing an unparalleled material prosperity. We are sharing freedom under a unique government which has survived nobly while kingdoms and dictatorships and even other republics have toppled.

And, as seldom before, Americans are exercising a right vital to our way of life—

the right to criticize ourselves and our conduct of our government.

Voices are raised in dissent and protest, and there is a crisis of alienation among us.

Within the boundaries which respect the rights of others, the voices must be heard. For there is much to learn to build a better land for all.

But lawless conduct beyond these bounds tears down; it does not build. And it strikes at the foundation of this unique government which is part of our spiritual heritage.

The black man, the youth and the philosopher who protest are demanding change, and they confront our conscience the way slavery, the sweatshops and other hypocrisy of earlier times stirred Americans.

Change of all kinds envelops us, and change itself seems to be the only certainty we have. The challenge of change is to harness it to bring man into harmony and balance with himself and his world.

Because of scientific change, we can defy age and disease and the heavens. We can fly into space, yet often it takes longer to cross our cities. We can build miraculous computing machines, yet we are balked in our attempt to bring education to all our children. Our minds form concepts of limitless extent, yet we must grope to find solutions to crime.

We should recognize that there is another certainty besides change—the unchanging basis of our unity, our institutions and our common beliefs: And that is our commitment to an America which Judge Learned Hand said may never be "except as the conscience and courage of Americans create it."

This unchanging belief and hope is the root of the present crisis of dissent and alienation.

We can't stand prosperity—when too many are still poor. We cannot fully accept the explosion of knowledge—when it pushes some ever higher and others into deepening ignorance. We are uncomfortable at the gap between what we believe and what we have achieved.

But none of us should forget that we share common traditions and common aspirations, and we shall share a common fate.

We are gathered here today in affirmation of this unity and this common faith in our capacity to achieve our highest aims under self-government.

The occasion of our gathering is timeless and familiar, but the challenge is ever new. It is a time, as President Wilson said, when "men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do."

I am proud to stand before you as your governor. And I am deeply conscious of the demands on the office of governor to serve with equal devotion the hopes of Cairo and Chicago, of young and old, of black and white.

As we begin this new administration in Illinois, let us bow to the past and to those whose time of service has ended. Let us look to the future too, but above all, let us commit ourselves to the present—and to present action.

None of us can predict with certainty the full nature or extent of the problems we will face in the next four years. But we can establish how we will perform.

We can determine now the nature of our conduct, the quality of our response, and the character of our stewardship.

We shall hold no objective more important than to mobilize the full force of this state government against poverty and ignorance.

For these are the twin scourges of our society. They are the roots of crime and of the decay of our cities.

In this effort, we shall take the initiative—searching out problems and solutions, rather than waiting to react when situations have become crises.

As a vital part of our concern for social problems, we shall move to exploit our eco-

nomical potential for the benefit of all the people, and in so doing we shall improve our already prestigious economic position among the states.

Further, we shall preserve and restore our natural resources. For we are seemingly at war not only with ourselves, but also with nature. We have the power to destroy nature, and we have already done so to an alarming degree. This process must be stopped—in fact, rolled back.

We are not content to stop short of that America which our conscience and courage can create. And our expectations are ever rising.

We expect more of life, and we expect more of government, both for ourselves and for the less fortunate. With your support, this new administration can match its efforts to our collective expectations.

Our goal is simply this: To enlarge the opportunities and satisfactions of life in Illinois.

Bearing this in mind, let us work together, putting aside partisanship in a common effort to achieve common goals.

Let our actions be based always on respect for individual dignity.

Let us re-dedicate ourselves to individual opportunity and to individual responsibility, the great human developers.

For our part, we in this new administration pledge to be responsive to the needs and the will of the people. Our purpose must be to serve.

We pledge to create effective checks on official arbitrariness and abuses.

We pledge to operate this administration in a spirit of full disclosure, assuring public access to public information.

And we pledge to work for diffusion of official power and responsibility so that state and local governments—the governments closest to the people—can succeed in partnership with the federal government.

In state government itself, self-discipline and innovation must go hand in hand.

State government must be reorganized to become a management tool for accomplishment. It must be sharpened to become the agent for constructive change instead of the custodian of an accumulation of separate and unresponsive agencies and programs.

There is no use in shuffling the boxes around on an organization chart if Illinois begs in Washington and quarrels with its own cities.

We must have a strict system of priorities under annual budget controls that will help us do our most important jobs well, while letting other tasks wait their turn.

We have sought—and continue to seek—men in government who are devoted to work, animated by principle, and committed to success.

They must find better ways of doing the traditional jobs of state government, and they must have the perception to recognize new needs and goals.

All of us must discipline ourselves so that we can work effectively with all sections of the state, to avoid bickering our way into stalemate.

We are going to think not in terms of human misery, but in terms of increasing the potential for human happiness.

We are going to attempt to turn life's dead-end streets into new avenues of opportunity.

Our prisons and mental hospitals must not be ends in themselves, but rather they must be means to repair and renew human lives.

Above all, we must put an end to the historic split between Chicago and the rest of the state. This dichotomy has cost us dearly in wasted bitterness and squandered effort.

More than ever before, the different parts of Illinois, like the different parts of the nation, are united in their interdependence. No single section can stand apart from the rest. We are all Illinoisans together, and together we must make progress in the cities,

in the suburbs, in the towns, and on the farms.

All our goals, in short, must be positive—to heal where there is hurt, to rebuild where there is damage, to succeed where we have failed.

In the days ahead, we have one special and immense opportunity. And that is to create a new constitution that will help us achieve present and future goals.

The constitutional convention can write a new document that will live and grow, and will provide a rational basis for fair taxation and fiscal responsibility. No other task before us will demand such a moratorium on partisanship and such an exercise in citizen involvement.

In the convention, in new legislation, in all our acts and thinking, we must work together. We must stay together.

And now, on this day of dedication, I ask you all to join in a new partnership for Illinois.

We ask more of government, more of life itself. And we must give more of ourselves for what we seek. This is the sacrifice demanded for success.

For myself, I ask for your prayers. For Illinois, I ask for your time, your talent, your ideas, and, yes, your criticism.

All of us meeting here today might well remember Lincoln's admonition to a clergyman who said he hoped the Lord would be "on our side."

Lincoln replied: "The Lord is always on the side of the right. But it is my constant anxiety and prayer that I and this nation should be on the Lord's side."

So let it be for us today. For what each of us will do will be judged by our consciences and our Maker.

The final judgment will be the sum of each of our days—of what we did, or did not do, day by day.

Together we can seek the best we believe in for Illinois. This is our land, and the people shall prevail. This is our America that Carl Sandburg called—"Seeker and finder, yet ever more seeker than finder, ever seeking its way amid storm and dream."

And now, confident in our dream and in our abilities, let us seek the Illinois of tomorrow. Together, we will not fail.

ASTRONAUT COL. FRANK BORMAN VISITS HIS NATIVE CITY, GARY, IND.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week the city of Gary, Ind., was host to its native son, Astronaut Frank Borman, the commander of the moon-circling Apollo 8 spacecraft.

This was not only a banner day for the city of Gary, but Gov. Edgar Whitcomb and the State legislature designated Wednesday, January 15, 1969, as Borman Day throughout the State of Indiana.

The Borman Day festivities started at 8 a.m. with an overflow prayer breakfast at the Hotel Gary. This gathering was attended by relatives of the astronaut living in Gary and the immediate vicinity and by those from business, labor, schools, and others representing all segments of our city.

After the breakfast a mammoth meeting of high school students was held at the Memorial Auditorium—a mass gathering of over 6,000. The space hero, after

brief remarks, devoted over an hour to answering questions from students. After this, Colonel Borman was taken to a dedication ceremony at one of the city parks, where he was honored by the Gary Park Board designating a beautiful municipal park as Borman Square.

From the park ceremonies the welcome was transferred to the city hall where, in the council chamber, Mayor Richard Hatcher and members of the council presented Colonel Borman with the key to the city and presented both Colonel Borman and Mrs. Borman suitable presents so they can treasure the memory of Gary's Borman Day celebration.

After the city hall ceremonies, a parade through the principal streets of the city gave thousands more in the Calumet region an opportunity to see Astronaut Colonel Borman and his charming wife. After the parade Colonel and Mrs. Borman and relatives were taken to adjacent Crown Point for a visit with Colonel Borman's 93-year-old grandmother, Mrs. Frank Borman, Sr. In the late afternoon Colonel and Mrs. Borman were joined by Lt. Col. William A. Anders and Capt. James Lovell and took off for the space headquarters in Houston.

Wednesday was the second great reception given Colonel Borman by the citizens of Gary, Ind. The first reception was given in January 1966 after he had orbited the globe 206 times in 14 days.

The Gary Post Tribune on Wednesday, January 15 sounded the sentiment of everyone in the following editorial which I hereby submit for the Members to read:

THERE WILL NOT BE ANY PROBLEMS TOO BIG
FOR GARY

"There won't be any problems too great for Gary."

Frank Borman said that on his visit here three years ago. He is here again today.

In the interim, Borman has helped prove that same theme insofar as space flight is concerned by going up and around the moon. We say "helped prove" for Frank Borman, great as are his skills and his spirit, didn't do it alone. Nor was it done only by Borman and his lunar traveling companions, James Lovell and William Anders. As all three have emphasized time and time again, their voyage to new horizons was a team effort. It involved the thousands of experts in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). It involved the cooperation of science and industry and other branches of government.

To prove that "no problems are too great for Gary," the city and its surrounding area must exhibit that same kind of cooperation. It has demonstrated that ability again in the unavoidably hurried effort to arrange a fitting welcome for its No. 1 hero.

By demonstrating on the home front that NASA spirit of teamwork and determination, Gary can bring its own dreams into realization just as one of our native sons has helped forward the dream of making manned contact with the moon.

In the words of Mayor Richard G. Hatcher, "Let's get ourselves together," and then, in the words of Colonel Borman:

"There won't be any problems too great for Gary."

The city could provide its native son no greater gift.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The above editorial is being engraved on the sterling silver plate presented to Mrs. Frank Borman by Mayor Richard G. Hatcher at today's special session of the Gary City Council paying tribute to Col. Borman.)

IMPLICATIONS OF THE SOVIET "PEACE OFFENSIVE"

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Embassy of Israel has prepared an excellent analysis of the so-called Soviet "peace offensive".

I believe it is important for all Americans—but in particular, the opinion-makers of this Nation—to understand the full implications of the Soviet "peace offensive".

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am placing the entire analysis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The analysis follows:

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE SOVIET "PEACE OFFENSIVE"

(1) Recent press reports of Soviet feelers in Western capitals urging a great power initiative for an imposed settlement in the Middle East call for an appraisal of Soviet motives and intentions.

Published reports suffice to show that what the Soviets have in mind is not peace. The intent is to impose a unilateral and unconditional Israeli withdrawal to the Armistice line which existed before the Six-Day War without concluding a peace.

What the Soviets contemplate is a system of arrangements substantially similar to those set up following the hostilities of 1956. In principle, they are proposing a resurrection of the palliatives and fragile arrangements that served as the breeding ground for the 1967 war and which will, inevitably, preserve the roots of the existing conflict intact, setting the scene for more war in time to come.

(2) A formula of total withdrawal is demanded without the slightest reference or allowance for those critical principles which must attend any effort to establish true peace in the area:

(a) explicit Arab recognition of Israel's sovereignty and a permanent end to hostility;

(b) contractual agreements between the parties to the conflict;

(c) boundaries that are both secure and recognized, inevitably different from the old fragile Armistice lines;

(d) freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal;

(e) freedom of shipping through the Straits of Tiran and the means to guarantee its protection.

In sum, the Soviet scheme is designed to exempt the Arab governments from undertaking any act which would constitute a recognition of Israel's rights and national integrity as well as any movement that could lead to the development of normal relations between the peoples of the area. Israel, on the other hand, is expected to renounce interests crucial to its very existence.

(3) The Soviet design for an imposed political settlement is one more effort to impose its own, and the Egyptian interpretation, of the November 22nd Security Council resolution—namely Israel's withdrawal without peace or the conditions and guarantees for peace. It is an endorsement of the Arab summit Khartoum resolution (no recognition, no negotiation, no peace), and of the Egyptian doctrine which opposes any real measure calculated to foster an Israel-Arab rapprochement. At no time has a Soviet spokesman, or any Soviet document, ever expressed the aim of Soviet policy to be the establishment of true peace between Israel and the Arabs. Employed instead are calculated euphemisms designed for Western

ears, such as "political settlement" or "peaceful settlement," meaning the bringing about of an arrangement by methods short of war. Explicit recognition of the necessity to assist in the promotion of a genuine peace settlement is neither the Soviet intention nor policy, just as it is not that of the UAR.

(4) The Soviet version of a "settlement," were it to be acted upon, would inevitably be interpreted as a Communist political victory enhancing Communist prestige in the area. It would offer new encouragement for the Soviet-oriented Arab regimes and pave the way for an even more assertive Soviet policy throughout the Middle East.

(5) The Soviet proposal that the political settlement be upheld by a four-power guarantee is of particular seriousness. The very notion of the Soviet design opens up the prospect of direct Soviet intervention under a legalistic cloak. The Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia serves notice on small states what they are likely to expect when the Soviet Union claims for itself the right to act outside its own borders in order to impose a settlement.

(6) More than that, it brings into very real focus the potential threat of direct super power confrontation. To be effective, the Soviet-endorsed arrangements would have to be actively guaranteed by the great powers. Practically speaking, therefore, the Soviet scheme would enhance and increase the role directly to be played in the area by these powers and thus heighten rather than reduce the chances of their violent confrontation. For were the arrangements to break down, the powers might find themselves in a situation in which they would be obligated to act, perhaps physically. In doing so, it is inconceivable that they might find themselves on opposite sides.

(7) The seeds of a Berlin situation would have thus been transplanted into the Middle East. Given the volatile nature of the Middle East, risks of a super power confrontation would stand to be even greater than in Europe. Is every border incident, however minor, to become the object of big power anxiety and of potential involvement as is true of Berlin? These are the implications of a four-power imposed settlement.

(8) Ultimately, Soviet talk of an imposed settlement must seriously undermine the Jarring mission, whose mandate (the bringing together of the sides) is in total discord with the Soviet intention. Israel's support of the Jarring mission is motivated by the same considerations which have directed American policy since June 1967. The essential principle of that policy was summed up by President Johnson on June 19, 1967: "Clearly the parties to the conflict must be the parties to the peace. Sooner or later it is they who must make a settlement in the area. It is hard to see how it is possible for nations to live together in peace if they cannot learn to reason together."

INCREASE WOULD COST AMERICAN TAXPAYERS \$13,400,000

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with some of my colleagues in filing a resolution which would block a proposed pay increase for Members of Congress.

The annual pay increase of \$12,500 per Member of Congress, as proposed by the

President, sounds like a substantial amount.

However, it becomes another staggering Federal figure when the total amount of this pay increase is computed.

This increase would go to each of the Senators and Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, a total of 536 individuals.

It amounts to \$6,600,000 annually. This would cost the American taxpayers \$13,400,000 during the course of the 91st Congress.

No Member of either the House or Senate was, so far as I know, coerced into seeking office. All should have been, and I am sure were, well aware of the salary long before they began seeking office.

During this period when talk of holding the line against inflation is uppermost it seems almost unreasonable that we could sit by and allow this increase to come about.

This resolution, declaring that the salary of Members of Congress should not be increased should be unanimously agreed to.

These millions can better be used elsewhere in our Nation.

LAYING IT ON THE LINE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while the Paris peace talks with Hanoi continue to drone on, it must be borne in mind that Ho Chi Minh would not be participating if present conditions left him any alternative. In commenting on the talks, Roscoe Drummond, in the Christian Science Monitor of December 31, 1968, stressed that:

The North Vietnamese leaders have always and openly contended that the conquest of South Vietnam had to be won on the battlefield by military victory, not by half a victory.

Mr. Drummond adds:

On this crucial objective the Communists have failed. They wouldn't be in Paris at all if they had been winning the war militarily. They accepted negotiations as the only practical alternative when they saw that the massive Tet offensive and the lesser offensives were failures.

In his column of December 25, 1968, in the Washington Post, Columnist Joseph Alsop concurs with the view of Mr. Drummond concerning the military setbacks of the North Vietnamese:

Militarily, every informed person now agrees that Hanoi's three 1968 offensives were almost unqualified disasters.

In the January 1969 issue of the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, VFW Commander in Chief Richard Homan and Ray Gallagher, senior vice commander in chief, after a recent visit to the area of Southeast Asia, state in the article, "Our Men Are Doing Their Job," that the Communists have agreed to the peace talks because they have failed to

take over South Vietnam militarily. This is not just the opinion of the two VFW officials:

We came to this conclusion after discussing the Vietnam war with officials of South Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia, New Zealand and Australia.

With this fact in mind, it would be indeed tragic if the present peace talks resulted in political concessions to the Communists after their military efforts had failed in South Vietnam. In addition, it would be ironic if the Vietcong gained at the peace table what they had failed to accomplish by the brutal killing of thousands of Vietnamese civilians.

It should also be made plain to the Vietnamese Communists that if they contemplate another offensive against South Vietnam, not only will the bombing be renewed but Haiphong will be closed and the bombing of the dikes and dams along the Red River would be given consideration.

Under unanimous consent I insert the above-mentioned columns and article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Veterans of Foreign Wars magazine, January 1969]

OUR MEN ARE DOING THEIR JOB

(NOTE.—Far East situation reviewed by VFW leaders after their trip.)

(By Richard Homan, Commander-in-chief, and Ray Gallagher, senior vice commander-in-chief)

The Communists agreed to the Vietnam Peace talks only because they have been beaten in their attempt to take over South Vietnam by military means.

This is not just our opinion, or that of U.S. personnel in Vietnam, but one also held by Southeast Asian leaders we met during our three week visit to the Far East.

We came to this conclusion after discussing the Vietnam war with officials of South Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia, New Zealand and Australia. These people understand Communism because they live next door to it.

They know the Communists went to the battlefield to force their will upon the South Vietnamese. Even with the use of terror tactics, such as murder to intimidate these people, the North Vietnamese have failed to achieve this aim.

The leaders of Southeast Asia were not surprised by the Peace talks for they knew the Communists had been beaten militarily and that they would want to sit down and negotiate.

Southeast Asians firmly believe the Communists will seek to prolong and delay the talks in an attempt to wear down our country's will to the point where we are ready to settle at their price.

In 1967, we visited Vietnam. On our return a year later, we found both the military and civilian situations vastly improved.

Contrary to what some Americans believe, the withdrawal of the North Vietnamese into Laos, Cambodia and across the DMZ was not voluntary. It was the result of military victory. Our forces have literally cut the Communists to pieces on the battlefield.

The Tet Offensive is an example. We are the only people in the world who believe this infamous attack was a victory for the Communists. But this is not the case, for it was anything but a victory for the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong.

When the Communists launched this act of aggression, they had certain goals in mind. One was to destroy the South Vietnam central government in Saigon. Secondly, they believed the South Vietnamese would rise up in support of them. Thirdly, they hoped

to destroy the military capabilities of South Vietnamese, American and Allied forces.

The Communist leaders had great confidence they would achieve their goals. Well, they did not. Just look at the results.

Because they thought they would have the support of the people, local Communist leaders came out of hiding and into the open. The result was that the South Vietnamese literally gobbled them up destroying the local Communist leadership structure. This is one of the reasons for our recent successes in Vietnam.

One must remember that the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong do not operate as we do logistically. We move our forces up and then bring up the supplies to support them. The Communists do not have this mobility. Instead, they have to infiltrate their supplies out ahead so when their forces move out they can pick them up.

For this to be successful, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong have to locate supply depots in villages and keep the locations secret. In the past, they would threaten everyone in the village. They might say, "If you expose this, tomorrow morning you will be dead," or they would destroy the village.

At one time, it was felt the reason the people did not divulge these locations was that they were sympathetic to the Communists. We have since discovered the actual truth was that they were afraid. They knew the Communists could move back at night and make good their threats.

General Pham Xuan Chieu, President of the Vietnamese Veterans Legion Association, told us that some 85,000 local leaders have been murdered or kidnapped in the past.

But with the destruction of the local Communist leadership, the South Vietnamese are not afraid to tell what they know. As a result, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong have lost their advantage of sanctuary.

Maj. Gen. Ellis W. Williamson, Commander, 25th Infantry Division, showed us captured documents and reports which support this.

One taken off the body of a North Vietnam trooper said this, in essence: "I can't find the old havens. The security that used to be available to me is no longer here. There is nobody I can trust anymore to hide me or my supplies."

This shows that the practice of intimidation and fear by the Communists is not as effective as it was. This is probably due in large part to the improved local security the South Vietnamese government is providing.

We found that the South Vietnamese have improved greatly as a military organization. Coupled with this has been an improvement in the civilian government. Previously, the latter was situated largely in Saigon with few programs for the rural areas. The government now has extended itself to the province level and has initiated programs to take care of the needs of the local areas.

The South Vietnamese now feel they have the advantage of time with them. They feel that with our remaining for a little longer, they will soon be able to take over the bulk of their own defense.

We left Saigon on the evening of the announcement of the bombing pause. Everyone, especially the leaders, were expecting it but, frankly, were hopeful it would not happen.

But despite this, we found among the South Vietnamese and Southeast Asia leaders a complete understanding of the situation in our country. They all expressed great respect for the President and were aware of the extent of the pressures on him to do something.

They expressed hope, however, that if the North Vietnamese violated the agreement, then the United States would resume bombing immediately.

What made the greatest impression upon us was the American soldiers we met. All Americans can learn something from them, for they are the best men this country has ever produced.

We talked to field commanders who have had experience in three wars and they have nothing but praise for the young men we are sending over there.

Their ability to fight is second to none, but even more important is their attitude. They are not necessarily military in their approach to the situation. Instead, in their off-duty hours they are promoting a host of humanitarian deeds to aid the South Vietnamese. In communities where they are stationed, our men are finding something to do that will assist the community to develop. It might be supplying medical and first aid needs or the building of a hospital or a school. Others use the knowledge of their background to help. A boy from a farm will help them with their agricultural problems, such as teaching them about the use of fertilizer.

Our men are just not military people; they are missionaries in the true sense of the word, for they have won the hearts of the people of South Vietnam.

There is no question about it. We saw it in Hue, which was hard hit by the Tet offensive. As we drove through the streets, you could see it on the countenances of the South Vietnamese. They all smiled and waved as we went by. It was almost like France during World War II when it was liberated.

The first stop on our three-week trip was in Anchorage, Alaska, where we received a briefing from General F. S. Roberts, Chief of Staff, Unified Alaskan Command. We also toured the air transport operation and viewed the servicing of a jet headed for Southeast Asia.

After a stop in Tokyo, we went on to Korea. We were never accepted more warmly than by the servicemen there. These men feel and know that it was the Veterans of Foreign Wars which helped them get hostile fire pay for those on the DMZ and the awarding of the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal to those who have served there after Oct. 1, 1966.

These men deserve this recognition, for the DMZ line in Korea is almost as active on some days as it is in many areas of South Vietnam.

While in Korea, we met with General Illwham Kim, Chairman, Korean Veterans Association, and Gen. Charles H. Bonesteel, Commander, U.S. Army, Korea.

From Korea, we flew to Hong Kong and then to South Vietnam. In addition to our talks with General Chieu and General Williamson, we were also briefed by Gen. A. J. Goodpaster, Deputy Commander to General C. W. Abrams; Lt. Gen. Richard Stilwell, Commander, XII Corps, and other high ranking leaders.

After our stop in Vietnam, we went on to Thailand and Malaysia before returning to the United States. In Thailand, we chatted with U.S. Ambassador Leonard Unger.

The character of the people of Southeast Asia left a lasting impression upon us. Those in our country who say that these people do not care for us or for freedom are doing them a disservice. They earnestly seek and desire it and look upon our country as the beacon of hope in obtaining it. We must not let them down.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 25, 1968]

ALLIES' PROGRESS IN VIETNAM BELIES PESSIMISM OF CRITICS

(By Joseph Alsop)

For months after the Tet offensive, the American public was inundated by torrents of hogwash about the situation in Vietnam. To this day, moreover, the veracity of the hogwash is strongly insisted upon by persons like Prof. J. Kenneth Galbraith, who are great hogwash-fanciers where Asia is concerned.

Thus an attempt to sum up a prolonged, intensive, on-the-spot inquiry in Vietnam must begin, alas, with hogwash clearance. The best method is to ask how the balance sheet stands for the Hanoi war-planners, after the fearful efforts and hideous losses of their three 1968 offensives.

On the balance sheet's plus side, there is the undoubted fact that the hogwash had a powerful political impact in the United States. But right there is where the plus side of the balance sheet comes to an end. Militarily, every informed person now agrees that Hanoi's three 1968 offensives were almost unqualified disasters.

In South Vietnam, moreover, these offensives were also political disasters, mainly for a reason that is barely beginning to be understood. In brief, the offensives gravely weakened the Vietcong—the Southerners serving under Hanoi's orders—who are after all, Hanoi's chief political assets in South Vietnam.

Some proofs and illustrations of the effects on the VC were given in the last report in this space. Briefly recapitulating, what you find from the DMZ down to the border of the Delta is a grim and recent transformation of the only remaining fighting units which formerly deserved the true VC label.

This transformation of the "local forces"—the provincial battalions and district companies under orders from the VC province and district committees—has taken more than one form. Just before this reporter visited the American Division in Quangnai province, for instance, one of the VC local force battalions had been sharply encountered.

This enemy battalion was already at less than half strength, with under 100 troops. In the fight, it lost 15 dead and 16 captured. And among both the dead and the prisoners approximately half were women, who carried arms like the men.

Far more commonly, however, the local force battalions and even the little district companies have been transformed by ceasing to be true VC units. Instead of getting their replacements locally, in other words, they have begun to depend on North Vietnamese replacements. As long ago happened to the larger units of the "main forces" the local force battalions and companies above the Delta are therefore undergoing rapid North Vietnamization. And even in the Delta itself, substantial Northern replacement packets are now required each month.

These, wholly novel developments can only mean that 1968's hemorrhage of manpower left the VC in the South both gravely weakened, as noted, and hence incapable of self-regeneration. There can be no other reason for the widespread transfer of the local forces' manpower burden to North Vietnam, where manpower is the single most acute problem.

These symptoms of grave weakness are not the end of the VC story, either. "Do your hamlet and village chiefs sleep in their villages and hamlets?" used to be the standard question put by anyone skeptical of the government's pacification program. Today, in contrast, in province after province, you find that VC village and hamlet chiefs are quite often the ones who do not sleep at home. Instead they lurk on the fringes, in little, local base areas, whence they make hasty forays to try to maintain their old authority.

Meanwhile, the impact of the 1968 offensives on North Vietnam itself can be judged from still another wholly novel development. In the past, when a Northern soldier came South, it was for the duration; and it did not matter whether or not he was wounded.

But that system has been changed, no doubt because of the dreadfulness of the recent losses. Ant-like processions of porters are now carrying hammock loads of non-ambulatory wounded from Laos to North Vietnam. Study of the reconnaissance photo-

graphs recently revealed a flow through the Mughia pass of no less than 2500 hammock loads per week!

That dire statistic in turn explains the withdrawal northwards, or into transborder sanctuaries, of so many of the enemy's largest fighting units. This withdrawal, to be sure, is not necessarily permanent. At the moment, in fact, a renewed push into III Corps is apparently being attempted. But if you add up all these facts, you can easily perceive the really central fact—that Hanoi's options have now been cruelly narrowed.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 31, 1968]

WHAT NEXT IN PARIS?
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—When the Paris talks get down to the serious business of trying to reach an acceptable Vietnam settlement, it will be well not to expect quick results.

The Communists have never negotiated that way—not on the Berlin blockade, or the Austrian peace treaty, or the Korean war, or anywhere else I can recall. Even when they know exactly what they will settle for, they always begin by demanding the impossible, asking for twice as much as they will accept. Their tactic is to drag out the negotiations as long and as tortuously as possible.

It should be expected that the Paris talks will be the same for two reasons.

One reason is that Hanoi aims to get a significant military victory on the battlefield in order to demand more at the conference. Hanoi has often said that the state of the fighting will determine the shape of the peace, and the North Vietnamese negotiators will not likely be very flexible until they find out that it is not possible for them to mount a successful offensive in South Vietnam. This is why events in Vietnam will be more revealing for a period than the headlines from Paris.

The other reason why the tactic of delay is useful to Hanoi is that its target is the American people. The Communists know that public opinion in the United States wants to end the war, that it would be tremendously helpful to the new president politically if agreement could be soon reached and that, so the Communists believe at least, American opinion will become so impatient at delay that we will take any kind of peace.

It remains to be seen whether this tactic of delay will be as effective with the American people as the Communists hope, but we do need to steel ourselves against its calculated effect.

In watching the Paris negotiations we need to bear in mind that the North Vietnamese leaders have always, and openly contended that the conquest of South Vietnam had to be won on the battlefield by military victory, not by half a victory.

On this crucial objective the Communists have failed. They wouldn't be in Paris at all if they had been winning the war militarily. They accepted negotiations as the only practical alternative when they saw that the massive Tet offensive and the lesser offensives were failures. Unwelcome as it is to South Vietnam and the United States, the present military standoff is hurting Hanoi and the Viet Cong far more than it is the allies. There is, therefore, every reason why we should not be tempted to throw away the peace by yielding to impatience.

Being unable to seize control of South Vietnam by military means, Hanoi's goal in the Paris negotiations is to achieve this end by a kind of settlement which would so weaken the elected government of South Vietnam that a Communist takeover would be the end result. That is why the issue of imposing an unelected Communist coalition on Saigon is at the heart of the matter.

What is at stake in this war? Surely at stake is the right of self-determination, the

right of the people of South Vietnam to a government of their own choosing. The people of Hungary wanted to exercise that right and the Kremlin sent in the Red Army to deny it to them. The people of Czechoslovakia wanted to exercise that right and the Kremlin occupied their country with 600,000 troops to deny it to them. All the government and people of South Vietnam want at Paris is the right to make their own decisions.

A peace which secures that right will be a good peace.

A settlement which does not secure that right will be no peace.

To remain steadfast in behalf of a just peace will undoubtedly be President-Elect Nixon's most difficult task because the political pressures within the United States for a peace-at-any-price will be vocal and vigorous. If he believes, as I think he does, that such a peace is in the national interest and is essential to preserving the independence of all Southeast Asia, he will have to lead the nation to his view, not just heed the loudest voices.

Nixon wants peace in Vietnam, but he doesn't want a peace which rests on quicksand.

WHAT MY FLAG MEANS TO ME

HON. DANIEL J. RONAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, recently Mrs. Roland Barile, South Berwyn service unit, chairman of the Girl Scouts contacted me requesting assistance in obtaining 12 new American flags for use by the Girl Scout troops in her area. I agreed to personally donate five flags and have them flown over the Capitol in honor of the troops designated to receive them. In order to determine which Girl Scout units would have the flags an essay contest was set up and each trooper was asked to write a short essay on "What My Flag Means to Me."

Believing that such examples of good citizenship and patriotism deserve recognition, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the winners and their winning essays. I am sure their parents and fellow troop members are proud of the efforts of these fine young citizens, and I extend my congratulations to them and to all who participated in the contest.

WHAT MY FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Francine Klus, Junior Troop No. 31, First Methodist Church, Berwyn, Ill.)

Our flag stands proud
Among any crowd
It deserves a salute
With the band and the flute
And when we say
The pledge each day
You should be proud
That our flag stands out in front of the crowd
In the U.S.A.

WHAT MY FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Allison Witczak, Junior Troop No. 130, First Presbyterian Church, Berwyn, Ill.)

From dawn to dusk the flag will fly
Across the blueness of the sky.
It tells me of the brave and true
Who lived and died for me and you.
It tells me of freedom's fight.
It tells me of our country's might.

For peace and charity our flag stands,
And when'er I see it, I'll hear brass bands.
And those so very far from home,
Just remember the flag on top the white dome.

WHAT MY FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Junior Troop No. 75 (joint effort), First Baptist Church, Berwyn, Ill.)

We want this flag with all the heart,
For of our Capitol, it has been a part.
What a thrill it would be to carry this banner,
Proud and privileged, in a true scout manner.
We'll take good care and keep it dear,
And pass it on from year to year.

WHAT MY FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Kimberly Kral, Junior Troop No. 175, St. Leonard Altar and Rosary Society, Berwyn, Ill.)

My flag means to me a great deal.
When I see our country's flag it makes me feel proud.
Proud of the people who live here and of people of long ago and of people today who die to protect our flag.
The flag reminds me of the beauty of our land and of the trust and loyalty I owe to it.

WHAT MY FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Lorna Rely, Cadette Troop No. 235, Concordia Lutheran Church, Berwyn, Ill.)

Our flag gives us many privileges.
But to earn the privileges, you
Must accept responsibility.
Citizenship is both.

A GREAT SECRETARY OF INTERIOR,
STEWART UDALL

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today is a time for farewells. It is time to say a few words of appreciation to and about friends and colleagues who are leaving the Nation's Capital with the Johnson administration.

I particularly want to take this occasion to say a few words about Stewart Udall, who in my own opinion is the greatest Secretary of Interior. We in the West are of course sensitive to the work of the Department of Interior because this Department administers so much of our western public domain.

Today, the last working day of the Johnson administration, is a time for summing up. President John F. Kennedy wrote an introduction to a book by Stewart Udall, "The Quiet Crisis," which best sums up what Stewart Udall set out to do, and I believe accomplished during his tenure. John Kennedy in referring to the need to protect our natural resources wrote:

The crisis may be quiet, but it is urgent. We must do in our own day what Theodore Roosevelt did sixty years ago: We must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problems of the new age. We must develop new instruments of foresight and protection and nurture in order to recover the relationship between man and nature and to make sure that the national estate we pass on to our multiplying descendants is green and flourishing.

I think that it can be said of Stewart Udall that he kept that promise of John Kennedy to keep our national estate green and flourishing for 8 long years. He was originally part of that band of brothers that helped elect John Kennedy President of the United States. In 1960 he fought Lyndon Johnson on John Kennedy's behalf as hard as he served Lyndon Johnson as President.

The great accomplishments of Stewart Udall as Secretary of the Interior will be long remembered. But it is the personal things from the Kennedy years that I remember best, the fact that it was Stu Udall who brought Robert Frost to the Kennedy inaugural, who, more than any other major national figure kept alive the movement toward physical fitness, and who more than any other man kept the conservation movement in the public eye. But most of all I would like to remind my colleagues that it was Stewart Udall who worked so hard to bring the plight of Appalachia to the attention of the American public and to the White House. It was he who wrote the preface to the book, "Night Comes to the Cumberlands," by Harry Caudill.

Stewart Udall is in every sense of the word a good man. He has fulfilled every expectation and he has fulfilled every promise. I think he has a great future. His country will need him again.

LIBERALIZED TRADE—COMMUNIST COUNTRIES ONLY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly many American businessmen rejoice upon hearing plans to liberalize U.S. trade policies.

But apparently not all barriers would be removed—in fact, the policies would become more controlled as to various foreign trade. The liberal trade policies clearly do not extend to Rhodesia and South Africa. Rather, according to the release, the plan would grant full discretion to "the President to enter into agreements with Communist countries of Eastern Europe when he determined commercial benefits would result for the United States."

Past experience does not sound like any liberalization but rather more of the same socialized plan to subsidize defunct Communist countries to prevent their enslaved subjects from becoming disenchanted with the lack of progress under their system.

I place a report from Jeremiah O'Leary from the Evening Star of January 16, 1969, followed by the latest Executive letter dated January 8, 1969, extending full sanctions against Rhodesia, at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 16, 1969]

UNITED STATES IS URGED TO PRESS LIBERAL TRADE POLICIES

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

A strong thrust for continued U.S. liberal trade policies is contained in a report re-

ceived by President Johnson today from William M. Roth, special representative for trade negotiations.

The report, recommending broad outlines for future U.S. trade policy with other nations, was requested by the President and has been in preparation for the past year. Ambassador Roth took into account the recommendations of a Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy, including 35 business, farm, labor and consumer leaders.

Roth recommended legislation to establish a permanent Special Representative for Trade Negotiations as a statutory agency in the Executive Office of the President and reporting directly to the Chief Executive. The legislation, Roth recommended, should give the office of the special representative primary responsibility for formulating and coordinating trade policy and negotiating most agreements involving the movements of goods.

The report also proposed legislation as soon as possible authorizing the President to enter into agreements with Communist countries of Eastern Europe when he determines commercial benefits would result for the United States.

COMMERCIAL CONCEPT

These agreements, it was said, will have political value but should be negotiated primarily for commercial considerations.

The United States, it was proposed, should continue to participate with other developed countries in the formulation of a system of temporary, generalized tariff preferences for the benefit of less-developed nations.

The report said the United States must reject the quota or market-sharing approach as a general response to the pressure of world competition. U.S. trade policy should continue to be guided by the unconditional most-favored-nation principle by which the United States opposes creation of regional or other preferential arrangements among developed countries that do not comply with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Other recommendations included the following:

The United States should begin to explore in GATT the possibility of negotiating adjustments in domestic agricultural policies and related trade barriers.

The United States should insist on the inclusion in future trade negotiations of removal of foreign barriers to U.S. investments.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 8, 1969]

TRADE AND OTHER TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING SOUTHERN RHODESIA—A COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. Doc. No. 91-37)

THE SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By virtue of my authority under Section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, I issued on July 29 Executive Order No. 11419 relating to trade and other transactions involving Southern Rhodesia. It extends the mandatory selective sanctions imposed in Executive Order No. 11322 of January 5, 1967, which I transmitted to you on February 27, 1967. A copy of Executive Order 11419 is attached.

The current Order prohibits virtually all financial and trade transactions between the United States and Southern Rhodesia, I have delegated to the Secretaries of Commerce, Transportation, and Treasury, in consulta-

tion with the Secretary of State, the authority to promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out the Order.

The Executive Order implements the mandatory provisions of the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 253 unanimously adopted on May 29, on which the Representative of the United States voted affirmatively. In this resolution the Security Council determined that the situation in Southern Rhodesia continues to constitute a threat to peace under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and decided that all states should apply comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that territory in accordance with Articles 25 and 41 of the Charter. The Security Council thereby extended the selective sanctions imposed by its earlier Resolutions No. 217 of November 20, 1965 and No. 232 of December 16, 1966, taking note that the measures taken under those resolutions had failed to bring the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia to an end. A copy of Resolution No. 253 is attached.

The resolution requires all member states to extend the earlier prohibitions on imports from and exports to Southern Rhodesia to cover all commodities and products except those needed for medical, educational and humanitarian purposes. The resolution also obligates each member state to prohibit activities promoting or calculated to promote such imports and exports, the shipment and transport of such articles in ships and aircraft of its registry or under charter to its nationals, transfers of funds and economic and other financial resources to persons and bodies in Southern Rhodesia, flights to Southern Rhodesia by aircraft of its registry or aircraft owned or chartered by its nationals, and coordinating operations with airline companies constituted in or aircraft registered in Southern Rhodesia.

I am submitting this report to the Congress in accordance with Section 4 of the United Nations Participation Act, as amended.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

GENERAL FARLEY'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, last October 16, my good friend, the Honorable James A. Farley, delivered a memorable address at the annual Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner.

Jim Farley, former Democratic national chairman and Postmaster General, was selected to serve as chairman of the first dinner held in 1945 and has attended all but one of the 23 subsequent events. In his latest address he offers some interesting insights into the lives of both Al Smith and the late Francis Cardinal Spellman, who instituted the dinners in commemoration of the Governor.

I believe all our colleagues will be interested in General Farley's remarks and I include the full text of his address at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

Your Excellency, Archbishop Cooke, President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, Mr. Nixon, Your Excellencies, Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignor, Reverend

Fathers, Governor Rockefeller, Governor Hughes, Governor Dewey, Mayor Lindsay, Mr. Silver, Mrs. Warner, distinguished guests on the dais, ladies and gentlemen.

My appearance as a speaker tonight can be explained by an incident I witnessed in 1922, when Governor Smith was a candidate for reelection after his defeat in 1920 in the Harding landslide. It was believed that Commissioner Murphy, leader of Tammany Hall, had indicated he favored the nomination of William Randolph Hearst for the Governorship but the county chairmen and leaders north of the Bronx line, and the City too, were most enthusiastically in favor of Governor Smith being the candidate in that election. There was much tension around the hotel in Syracuse where the delegates were congregated because many of the leaders and prominent Democrats feared they would be placed in the position of having to support Mr. Murphy's choice of Mr. Hearst and none of them wanted to face that decision. I was visiting in Governor Smith's rooms in the Onondaga Hotel with several of the leaders when it was announced that Congressman Bourke Cochran of New York was calling on the Governor. I shall never forget the Congressman standing at the foot of Governor Smith's bed, where he was resting, when he delivered the second best oration I ever heard on why Governor Smith, for the sake of the Party on that ticket, should be willing to accept Mr. Hearst on the ticket as United States Senator, because at that time it was apparent that Governor Smith would be nominated. The Governor listened patiently to the Congressman's appeal. When Mr. Cochran concluded Governor Smith delivered the best oration, without exception, I ever heard, in language and voice which shook the walls, explaining why he would not accept Mr. Hearst on the ticket.

The counter-blast of the Governor left the Congressman speechless and he bowed quite gracefully and left the room. Suddenly, however, the door opened and there was the Congressman again, smiling, and he addressed the Governor as follows: "Governor," he said, "I want you to understand distinctly that I did not come here of my own volition"—indicating to the Governor that he thoroughly agreed with the position he had taken in inferring, of course, that he was there to deliver the message although he was wholeheartedly in favor of Governor Smith's position.

His last point is my first point. I, too, did not come here of my own volition. His Excellency Archbishop Cooke indicated that since both Governor Smith and Cardinal Spellman were among my oldest and most intimate friends that I speak as much in the vein of reminiscence of an old friend as of their great stature as a statesman and a religious leader.

I first met Al Smith in 1918, over fifty years ago. As Rockland County Democratic Chairman, I among others urged his candidacy upon Commissioner Murphy and he was nominated at the State Convention in Saratoga. Incidentally, I was a delegate to every State Convention where he was nominated for Governor.

As the 1918 campaign opened, a major epidemic of Spanish influenza raged throughout the country, and of course this State. Only on rare occasions were large public meetings permitted by the State Department of Health, and then only in the open air. We had such an open air meeting in Orangeburg in my own County of Rockland where I introduced him. He made his usual splendid response and it was well received.

At the end of it I said to him, "Al, I'm optimistic." He growled and looked at me and said, "Jimmy, about the campaign or about the influenza?" "Both," I answered.

He was elected Governor and the influenza subsided—but the Republicans didn't.

The Republicans secured control of the

legislature in the Harding landslide in 1920 and they abolished my job at Fort Warden to which the Governor had appointed me early in 1919, by reducing the number of wardens from nine to five. We were ready again to battle in 1922. Governor Smith won a great victory over Governor Miller. It is interesting to recall that as County Chairman I was unable to get anyone to run for the Assembly on the Democratic ticket in Rockland County that year, and I felt obliged to accept the nomination myself. I was elected and was, of course, a beneficiary of the Smith landslide.

One of the most outstanding pieces of legislation passed in the 1923 term of the State Legislature was the repeal of the Mullen-Gage law. The State was prohibition-minded then and there was much agitation during the 1921 session of the Legislature to pass a law assisting the enforcement of the 18th Amendment and hence the Mullen-Gage Act. Governor Smith was committed to its repeal.

Although I was personally dry I voted wet, but it turned out the voters of Rockland County preferred a candidate who was personally wet but supported prohibition and as a result I was defeated in the next election. When Governor Smith was reelected in 1924 he appointed me to the New York State Athletic Commission where I remained until 1933 when I went to Washington as Postmaster General.

There are a lot of legends arising from the deadlocked 1924 Democratic National Convention when Governor Smith and Secretary McAdoo of California were candidates for the nomination for the Presidency. I shall always remember carrying the New York State banner for Governor Smith, after his name was presented to the Convention, around old Madison Square Garden at 26th Street, for so long a time that I felt like a six-day bicycle rider. The Convention, after 103 ballots, compromised on nominating John W. Davis. The story is that Governor Smith, in agreeing to the compromise, declared, "They say I've got smallpox and McAdoo has diphtheria—so they settled for a case of measles"—I did not hear him say it, and I doubt if he did. John W. Davis was one of the country's most distinguished lawyers and had served as Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

In 1928, I again carried the New York State banner at Houston, where I shall always remember that in ringing tones Franklin D. Roosevelt again nominated Governor Smith as the "Happy Warrior," a name which so suited him that as such he is known to history. I well recall that fateful election evening when Governor and Mrs. Smith came over to Mr. Roosevelt's headquarters in The Biltmore at the time when it was apparent that the Governor was losing his race for the contest for the Presidency. He was in an affable frame of mind when he congratulated Mr. Roosevelt on his successful campaign for the Governorship, and his apparent election by a very narrow margin.

Early in the post-election hours of the 1928 campaign there were many amusing incidents, but one which I shall ever remember was when fearing some upstate shenanigans by the Republicans we alerted the Democratic watchers and workers to be on their toes; the Socialists were screaming like mad that we were telling our watchers not to count their ballots, which, of course, was not so, and Governor Smith ordering the boxes impounded said, "Remember it is not the votes which are cast which win elections; it is the votes which are counted."

For all of the great personal warmth of Governor Smith, he was as rigid as a steel girder about building New York State and he made it a model. He called the best men and women in every field in, and asked them what was best for the people and promised them he would sponsor legislation that would enable them to carry out the program.

He did that. From mental health to workmen's compensation, from public education to state highways, he revolutionized the State Government. New York State became and remains a model. Even more importantly, the method of calling experts to assist started with Governor Smith's Kitchen Cabinet. President Franklin D. Roosevelt brought Governor Smith's idea to Washington where a similar group was called the Brain Trust. It has been said that Jimmy Kiernan, a well known New York Times reporter, coined the term.

This deep concern for the Common Man, the man who had to work for a living to take care of his wife and children, was the core and heart of Governor Smith's philosophy. He once said, "I don't want to know what a raise of one cent a quart of milk means to the industry, I want to know how many kids will have to do with less milk."

In a deep sense, therefore, Cardinal Spellman and Governor Smith were alike in mind and spirit. Both devoted their lives to helping the great masses of people build a future for themselves and their children.

I first met Cardinal Spellman in 1933, when my late wife and I had an audience with His Holiness Pope Pius XI.

I recall full well listening to the radio before going over to the nine o'clock mass that Sunday morning in 1946, at St. Patrick's Cathedral, and hearing the announcement of Archbishop Spellman's elevation to the Cardinalate, with three other American Archbishops—Glennon of St. Louis, Mooney of Detroit and Stritch of Chicago. After Mass that morning I called at the Archbishop's residence to offer congratulations and he invited me to join his party for the Consistory. I shall ever be grateful to His Late Eminence for making it possible for me to be present on that never-to-be-forgotten event in history.

With the Cardinal's other guests on that trip to Rome, I was privileged to attend all the ceremonies at St. Peter's and the various functions associated with it. One that will ever remain in my memory was the official dinner in the Quirinale Palace in honor of the newly elevated Cardinals—given by King Umberto II, who was reigning at that time. It was attended by the other members of the College of Cardinals, the Papal Nobility and the Diplomatic Corps in Rome, all wearing their decorations. The impressiveness of that gathering will always live with me; it was the most spectacular grouping I have ever seen. And, I am sure that Dr. Martin Spellman, Mrs. Pegman, Mrs. Gerrity, John C. Kelly and others who may be in this room tonight like myself, members of Cardinal Spellman's party, would have the same recollection.

I feel it can be safely said without fear of contradiction that no member of the Catholic Hierarchy in the United States rendered as much service as Cardinal Spellman not only to the New York Archdiocese but to the State of New York and the country as a whole. His yearly visits overseas to the men and women in the military service will be remembered by those whom he visited, throughout the world where our service men and women were located and also by members of their families and friends.

It was characteristic of Cardinal Spellman to commemorate Governor Smith's devotion to his fellow man and to public service by instituting the Governor Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinners. I shall always remember that I was Chairman of the first dinner in 1945, and I have attended every dinner except one in 1946 when I was out of the country on business. Down through the years they have resulted in the raising of millions of dollars for St. Vincent's Hospital and the Archbishop's manifold charitable activities.

I count it the greatest of honors, therefore, that Archbishop Cooke in carrying on Governor Smith's and Cardinal Spellman's noble ideals, has permitted me to pay tribute to

both my old and dear friends and the causes for which they so untringly worked. I am satisfied, as I know they are, that the work they started will be carried forward with undiminished vigor by the tremendous energies and clear determination of His Excellency Archbishop Cooke and his devoted assistants. I am confident, too, that the memories and ideals of our late Governor and Cardinal will be carried on by generations as yet unborn.

Your Excellency, I am grateful to you for inviting me to address this gathering tonight in memory of our dear departed friends. And, I hope you will extend to me the same privilege they did—to call upon me as much and as often as you think the efforts of this humble servant can advance the cause of God's mercy—here on earth.

NEW YEAR'S STATEMENT

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of a new year and a new session of Congress, it is fitting to take a look at the past and to see what must be done in the future.

Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, in his new year's statement has made these reflections. In his statement he pledges American organized labor to do its utmost to "help solve the tremendous problems which face America's people, her cities, and her future."

Mr. Meany further pledges labor's support to "house the homeless, feed the hungry, succor the sick, protect the consumer, educate the young, provide the elderly with an old age free from fear, continue the march toward equality, and improve the lot of the Nation's workers and their unions."

These are noble pledges and I think they should be of interest to Members of Congress and the readers of the RECORD. Accordingly, I include Mr. Meany's new year's statement in the RECORD at this point:

NEW YEAR'S STATEMENT

(By George Meany, President, AFL-CIO)

American labor faces the new year in a spirit of determination—determination to continue to push for progress at home and an honorable peace in the world.

On the domestic and international scene, the future is uncertain. A new, untried Administration and a legislative branch of different political viewpoint are being called on to work together for the nation's benefit. How effective this division of power will be, only time will tell. But all Americans, no matter what their political beliefs, owe it to their country to support responsible efforts of the new Administration and the 91st Congress to meet the problems of our time.

The labor movement will do so. We will do our utmost to help solve the tremendous problems which face America's people, her cities and her future.

At the collective bargaining table, the unions of the AFL-CIO will be seeking contracts that guarantee to workers their fair share of the fruits of the enterprise.

In the halls of Congress, we will work on behalf of sound measures to house the homeless, feed the hungry, succor the sick, protect the consumer, educate the young, provide the elderly with an old age free from fear, continue the march toward full equality and

improve the lot of the nation's workers and their unions.

We intend to support, with all our strength, the efforts of the most exploited workers in our nation—the farm workers—to achieve the protections and benefits that workers have a right to enjoy in a free society. The farm workers and the AFL-CIO will not rest until this goal has been won.

That means we will seek new programs where necessary, urge the broadening of existing programs that are too narrow to be effective and insist upon the adequate and proper financing of such measures.

In the state legislatures, AFL-CIO central bodies will be seeking adequate unemployment and workmen's compensation laws, adoption of state consumer-protection laws, modernization of factory and mine safety legislation, as well as the elimination of election and registration procedures designed to deny the ballot to citizens.

On the international scene, the AFL-CIO will continue its support of this nation's pursuit of peace with honor and its defense of freedom. We will continue to work in the developing countries with free, democratic trade unions secure in the belief that by helping build strong, free democratic institutions we are simultaneously helping building democracy and freedom for all.

It seems to me proper to add to these views of the coming year, labor's high regard for a great American who is about to lay down the burdens of office, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

No President has ever done more for the poor, the homeless, the elderly; no President has achieved more in the fields of education, civil rights or health care; no President has suffered so many unfair, unjustified attacks.

The American labor movement owes President Johnson a deep debt of gratitude and, on behalf of the AFL-CIO, I am honored to acknowledge it.

BOYD L. RASMUSSEN CITED FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Interior held its 37th honor awards convocation on December 11, 1968. In Oregon we are very proud that in a short 2½ years Boyd L. Rasmussen, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, has so distinguished himself in the complex management of land and natural resources that Secretary Udall cited him for distinguished service. Those of us who know him personally and know of his dedication to public service are particularly proud that he has earned this award.

Boyd is from Ontario, Ore. He is a graduate of our Forestry School at Oregon State College, began his conservation career in Oregon. His mother, Mrs. J. R. Rasmussen, continues to live in Ontario.

As Director of the Bureau of Land Management, he is directing the monumental classification of public lands required by the Classification and Multiple-Use Act of 1964, plays a prominent role in the United States-Japanese log exports situation. He traveled to Tokyo in February 1968. In October 1968 he appeared before the Brazilian Academy of

Science in Rio de Janeiro to set forth the American experience in public land management.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point Secretary Udall's citation of Boyd S. Rasmussen for distinguished service:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington.

Citation for distinguished service to Boyd L. Rasmussen in recognition of an eminent Government career in the management and conservation of the Nation's land and natural resources.

Mr. Rasmussen came to the Interior Department as Director of the Bureau of Land Management, one of the Nation's largest land owners. A professional forester and career civil servant of many talents, Mr. Rasmussen brought to the Bureau's operations a wealth of experience in land and resource management with the Department of Agriculture. As an outstanding Public Land Administrator and foremost authority on multiple use management of the public lands, he demonstrated technical competence and extraordinary leadership in the Bureau's varied programs. Under his direction, the testing stage of land classification operations under the 1964 Classification and Multiple Use Act was completed. The land classification program gained wide participation and approval. Department goals have been met and by August 31, 1968, 104 million acres were classified for multiple use management. Mr. Rasmussen received wide recognition for these achievements and has been invited to appear before the Brazilian Academy of Science to explain the objectives of the Multiple Use and Classification Act, and review accomplishments to date. He has a prominent role in the United States-Japan log export crisis. Through his guidance, the Bureau's highly competent participation in meetings, conferences and negotiations became a major factor in coping with the log export issue. He had a most effective part in February 1968, in Toyko, at the second meeting of representatives of both countries to discuss possible solutions to the softwood log export problem in the Pacific Northwest. As a tribute to his distinct contribution to the Bureau of Land Management, Mr. Rasmussen is granted the highest honor of the Department of the Interior, its Distinguished Service Award.

STEWART S. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 17, 1969, I was invited by the President, as the ranking minority member on the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives, to attend the presentation of the National Medal of Science at the White House. The National Medal of Science was established by Congress in 1959, "to provide recognition for individuals who make outstanding contributions in the physical, biological, mathematical, and engineering sciences."

Because of my attendance at this official ceremony to honor our distinguished scientists for their important contributions to our country's progress, I was not able to be present to answer to my name on rollcall No. 11, a quorum call taken early this afternoon.

ISRAEL RETALIATION POLICY A
MUST

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this time in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of January 16, 1969, by the distinguished columnist Ralph McGill. I do so because I think it clearly brings into focus the underlying weakness of the position taken by the U.N. in adopting its censure of Israel. I commend to all my colleagues careful attention to the reasoned statement by Mr. McGill:

ISRAEL RETALIATION POLICY A MUST

(By Ralph McGill)

No more transparent mixture of hypocrisy and weakness has been paraded on the international stage than the plea of Jordan and Egypt for peace in the Middle East.

It is hypocrisy because, even as the talk goes on, Nasser, in particular, is building and training his re-supplied army and air force for a "get-even" war against Israel. To a lesser extent, this is true of Jordan, Algeria and Syria. They want peace—for a while—"Give us peace . . . we are not quite ready for war—almost, but not quite."

Their plea is a confession of weakness, because it is an admission that they, first of all, do not themselves wish to halt the commando raids on Israel. And, they are saying that even if they did desire to say "stop" to the commando-guerrillas, they could not enforce the order because of political repercussions.

In the weeks after the humiliation of the Arab military failure in the six-day war, Hussein, Nasser and others encouraged commando actions. That they have financed them and seen to it that these guerrillas had a share of the arms provided by the Soviets to replace those lost is not denied.

Arab governments cannot now give orders to these groups. They would not dare send military forces to crush them, because they—the Husseins and Nasser—consistently have encouraged and assisted such raids. The Arab peoples, glorying in these crumbs of violence, would rise in wrathful street protests if their own governments were publicly to put down commando units.

It is precisely this political impotence and hypocrisy of the Arab countries that has made Israel's program of retaliation necessary and inevitable.

Lebanon certainly knew of the commando group operating from her territory. It would be most surprising if there is not direct communication between the army of Lebanon and the guerrilla staff. This also would be true of similar clandestine fighters operating from Egypt, Jordan and other "neighbors" of Israel. One is reminded of a bit of humor that circulates in Czechoslovakia:

"Israel is a lucky country."

"Why is she lucky?"

"She is entirely surrounded by enemies rather than friends."

And so she is. There was, in retrospect, a little too much of holding up of protesting hands and too much of piety in the comments following Israel's raid at Lebanon's airport.

Arab terrorists, armed and given sanctuary by Lebanon, had attacked an Israeli airliner, killing one person and wounding others.

Where, then, should Israel have turned?

To the United Nations?

To Russia, Britain, France, the United States, or any other nation?

Let's not further pursue so painful a line of

questioning. The U.N. is impotent to act in such matters. The world's organization for preventing aggression is impuissant because the powers themselves keep it so.

So much of the deploring was lacking in the essential quality of providing understanding. Israel is surrounded by enemies—not friends. Her friends are caught in the great game of power politics.

So, the candor of reality makes it necessary to admit that if Israel is not to be nibbled to death by raids and terrorists acts, she must retaliate strongly and well.

And, until the world powers attain moral puissance, let us quit being so pious.

LONG BEACH MOUNTED POLICE:
A RICH TRADITION

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the Inaugural Parade for President Richard M. Nixon on Monday, one of the most spectacular units in the parade will be a group of 30 matched golden palomino horses and their colorfully costumed riders.

This unit is the Long Beach Mounted Police from Long Beach, Calif., and it probably is the world's best-known equestrian parade unit. Every New Year's Day for the past 23 years, the civic leaders, businessmen, and sportsmen who make up the group have had the privilege of leading the Rose Parade in Pasadena. The 30 riders, 30 golden palominos and 30 American flags have become a familiar sight in millions of American living rooms on New Year's Day.

As fully deputized auxiliaries of the Long Beach Police Department, the Mounted Police for 34 years have exemplified one of California's great links with the traditions of the State's pioneer days.

It is only fitting, then, that the 30 riders from the 100-plus member organization should represent California here in Washington for the Inaugural Parade honoring President Nixon, whose birthplace in Yorba Linda is only a short drive from Long Beach.

The Long Beach Mounted Police take part in nearly two dozen major parades each year, thrilling countless spectators with the beauty and excitement of their white-maned palomino horses and the gleam of their finely detailed, hand-crafted silver and black leather saddles and accessories.

Each rider is colorfully dressed in Western-style outfits—complete with 10-gallon hat, riding boots, embroidered boleros, decorated gauntlets, riding pants, handkerchiefs and silver-decorated gumbelts, holsters and good old-fashioned "six-shooters," while he guides his mount with skill developed in years of riding.

In the parade Monday the total value of the silver equipment will be over \$300,000 and the 30 horses are valued at nearly \$100,000.

The organization was founded in 1935 by 16 men who combined affection for riding with pride in the city of Long

Beach and a desire to help publicize their city by representing it in major spectacles. They also shared a desire to keep alive Western traditions.

Today, the members continue to share the organization's founding ideals. They meet each Sunday morning for an informal breakfast trail ride, unless, as is often the case, 25 or 30 or more members are riding that day in a parade. The men care for their own horses, van them to and from parades personally and then carefully saddle and gear their mounts themselves before beginning their precision marches.

Three charter members remain active in the mounted police, and there are many second generation members. There are even second and third generation palominos.

One of the most memorable rides in the organization's history came in 1953 when the troupe had an honored position in the parade marking the inauguration of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States. Two years ago, the unit toured Latin America on a good will mission on behalf of Long Beach and all of America, and the unit has appeared at least once in virtually every parade held in the West.

Now, the Long Beach mounted police return to the Nation's Capital to help honor Richard M. Nixon on his inauguration. The President-elect is a southern Californian, which makes things absolutely appropriate.

Here is an alphabetical listing of the 30 riders and two alternates of the Long Beach mounted police who will ride in the Inaugural Parade in Washington, D.C., on January 20, 1969, with their residence cities and occupations. Each rider, as a member of the mounted police, is a fully deputized auxiliary of the Long Beach Police Department.

Dr. Charles Booth (Long Beach), orthopedic surgeon.

James Bragg (Long Beach), truck crane rental business.

Ollie Brown (Long Beach), real estate. Thomas Cole (Long Beach), market chain operator.

Walter E. (Bill) Cozart (Long Beach), beauty salon operator.

Fred S. Dean (Long Beach), wholesale electronics.

Norbert Dean (Long Beach), electronics engineer.

Paul R. Deats (Long Beach), member of Long Beach City Council.

John D. Downing (Long Beach), wholesale auto parts service executive.

M. L. Dunagan (Long Beach), oil drilling company executive.

John J. Dunn (San Fernando), automotive tires sales.

Conrad A. (Connie) Fischer (Rolling Hills), crude oil sales.

John D. Flanagan (Rolling Hills), mortician.

H. G. (Hal) Haney (Long Beach), offshore oil drilling contracting.

Carlton (Carl) Hess (Long Beach), heavy duty truck service.

Chauncey LeValley (Burbank), ready-mix concrete company president.

Mac C. McCoy (Huntington Beach) dredging.

Dean McLeod (Long Beach), Long Beach Police Department officer.

Robert McNulty (Long Beach), taxicab company executive.

George Mitchell (Long Beach), retired former auto dealer.

Earl G. Myers (Rolling Hills), retired former oil tool executive.

Fred M. Riedman (Long Beach), attorney.

Joseph W. Robinson (Long Beach), manufacturer.

Axel Springborg (Corona), operator of Glen Ivy Hot Springs.

Dr. Wilmer Starr (Rolling Hills), Long Beach physician.

Roger H. Stokes (Calmesa), retired former tool manufacturer.

Charles C. Sullans (Santa Ana), retired former polygraph expert for Long Beach Police Department.

*Fred Taylor (Long Beach), display-decorations company president.

William C. Thomas (West Covina), ready-mix concrete company president.

Ward Thompson (Hawthorne), real estate investment.

*James A. Worsham (Long Beach), insurance executive.

Andrew M. Zurick (Anaheim), television sales and service.

A CUBAN REFUGEE ASKS, "WHERE WILL YOU GO?"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in nearby Cuba within our lifetime free men should have been educated to the lesson repeated often times before in history—one that free men should never forget or forgive—the brutal force of totalitarian communism.

How can we forget so soon with the exiles still living in our midst?

A Cuban refugee here in the United States reminds us:

I was there. I saw it happen. I was on the list to be killed, for days they gave my name over Havana Radio and announced the price on my head. Today that price has gone up, believe it or not, you see I am a political refugee in Washington. But where will you go?

I include a letter from Dr. Mario Garcia Kohly to us Americans, as follows:

SOMETHING AMERICANS SHOULD READ

I was there, I saw it happen: I was on their list to die. For days the Havana Radio spelled out my name, over and over again. Even today there is a price on my head. I am a Cuban Political Refugee.

President Johnson said his greatest regret was his failure to get a Gun Control Bill. You applauded his statement.

You Frighten me when you try to disarm the honest citizens of this great Country of yours. For this Country is Humanities LAST HOPE. I was able to come here, but where will you go? Stop and think.

Let me first point out similarities between this administration and that of Gen. Fulgencio Batista.

Like President Johnson, Batista suddenly became extremely unpopular and subject to the most vicious attacks in speeches, the

press etc. Nothing he did was right. It became popular to be anti-Batista, it is popular to be anti-Johnson here today. Almost over night. Who gave the order to force the TWO Presidents out of office?

Havanas University (just like Columbia, Howard and many others here) became a hotbed of rebellion an arsenal for revolution, Sit-ins, strikes, marches, parades and protest meetings about everything. Live Phosphoros was placed on seats in Buses, theatre and church seats, Brutal killings, Fires, Bank robberies all the signs of rebellions were present, just as they are present here today.

President Batista. Just like President Johnson gave orders to the Army to stay in their barracks, and to the Police to be gentle to avoid bloodshed, not to make arrests. This order of Batista was greeted with joy by the communists. Rocks, Molotov cocktails, insults were poured on the defenseless Police. Yet everywhere the cry was heard of "Police brutality" Along with the theme song of "We Shall Overcome" in Spanish it was "Vencemos".

Army hospitals were attacked and sick soldiers brutally murdered. Yet Pres. Batista (like President Johnson) tried to pacify the so called opposition. Don't shoot, don't arrest, conciliation was his "theme" but it was a useless effort against a trained and Russian Communist directed conspiracy. The "mobs" were taught to taunt the Police and men in uniform. "Yellow Bastards" (referring to the color of the armies uniforms) every effort was directed at breaking the principal of Government authority. Of respect for the law. If you don't like any Batista law break it. (Reminds one of Martin Luther King)

Merchants were blackmalled into contributing to Castros, marches, parades and protest meetings under threat of bombing or burning or bodily harm to their wives and children. The Police were powerless to act, because of Pres. Batista's orders and his desire to bring about peace. Aggravated to the limit many resigned, others even joined Castros gangsters as the only means of staying alive (will we someday see Washington policemen doing the same?)

When Batista realized that the Army and Police had taken all they could and had become completely demoralized, that the principal of Authority had disappeared. . . he resigned and fled the Country. President Johnson also resigned, feeling he could not be re-elected.

Fidel Castro came to Havana unopposed, not one shot was fired. He was welcomed. Yet his first speech was one asking the people to disarm. Why? "Armas, armas para que" (translated) Arms, Arms what for? We have won the revolution (from within) no more killings, I don't want a single tear to be shed by a Cuban mother or wife because someone tries to take the law into his hands. We shall have "law and order" Register your guns, better yet turn them in, your rifles too. We are a civilized society, we are at peace.

The good citizens did just as Castro asked, they turned in their hand-guns, rifles and shot guns by the thousands. And felt real proud being good law abiding citizens.

Soon as Castro was sure that most arms had been turned over or registered or confiscated, came the forced labor camps, blood baths, collective farms, expropriation, homes and business: Hunger and misery and raping of white women, violent death all the wonders of Russian style communism, this all fell on the good law abiding citizens who disarmed themselves. Is that what you want for the good law abiding citizens of your wonderful United States? I am sure you do not. I am sure you are just as misguided as were most of my people.

Remember that Batista like President Johnson wanted peace, conciliation to unite his people, wanted to go down in History as a Social Reformer an advanced thinker a Liberal President. Wanted to avoid blood-

shed. . . Castro didn't want a single tear shed by reason of armed citizens.

You see I am compelled to write you about what happened in Cuba when the good people are disarmed or guns registered so that when the Police of a communist "Government" takes over, they confiscate your only means of overthrowing them. Oh they are sweet about it, not a single tear, Hipocrits.

Remember, I was there, I saw it happen, I was on the list to be killed, for days they gave my name over the Radio and announced the price on my head. Today that price has gone up, believe it or not, you see I am a political refugee in Washington. But where will you go?

MARIO GARCIA KOHLY.

RUSS PAPER TRAPPED IN BIG LIE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ted Zierins, one of my constituents, recently did an excellent job of research which shows how the Communist press can be caught in the web of its own lies. I congratulate Mr. Zierins for his ability and his contribution toward defending the proud name of Archbishop Arnolds Lusis, spiritual head of the Latvian Lutheran Church throughout the world.

Mr. Zierins' exposé appeared recently in a letter to the Minot News in Minot, N. Dak.

His letter follows:

RUSS PAPER TRAPPED IN BIG LIE

EDITOR, THE NEWS: While during the Christmas season the members of Latvian Lutheran Church all over the world intend to remember also the birthday of their Archbishop Arnolds Lusis, head of this church, the Soviet newspaper Dzimtenes Bals (Voice of Homeland) has again proved that for Communists nothing is impossible and that they are willing to use even the biggest lies in their efforts to sow distrust and hostility among the people.

In recent months many of us have received this Soviet newspaper with an article about Archbishop Arnolds Lusis describing him as a bloody criminal in the spring of 1919. It reminds the readers that it was the time when Germany tried to destroy the new republic of Latvia. German occupation forces had set up a puppet government headed by Andrievs Niedra with Dr. T. Vankins as secretary of war.

The Soviet paper states that Arnolds Lusis at that time was the personal assistant to Dr. Vankins and helped to send to death hundreds, even thousands, of innocent people without any trial or investigation. The article declares that such a man should have no place in church nor elsewhere among honest people.

No doubt the Communists worked hard to write such a terrible story about our beloved Archbishop Arnolds Lusis, who lives in the free world now. It seems they have forgotten only one thing—Arnolds Lusis was born on Dec. 30, 1908, which made him just 10 years old when, according to the Soviet story, he was the assistant in the puppet government.

Or perhaps the Communists hoped that some people would accept their story as it is told without checking Lusis' age, thus seeing how ridiculous the story is.

To many people who have lived under the Red tyranny, the Soviets send this newspaper with smear articles about the recipients, their friends, or describing their pastors as former criminals. And always the cultural ex-

*Indicates Inaugural Parade alternate.

change treaty and so-called bridge building between East and West serves the Reds to spread their propaganda lies here.

TEDIS ZIERINS.

CHICAGO, ILL.

THE NATIONAL MEDAL OF SCIENCE
FOR 1968

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 17, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the President of the United States presented the National Medal of Science for 1968 to 12 distinguished scientists who have served our country through their outstanding contributions in the physical, biological, mathematical and engineering sciences. These medals were authorized by the Congress in 1959 to provide recognition for the important contributions to America's progress made by our scientists.

It is a pleasure to join with the President and the Nation in honoring these 12 men and I am placing their names in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with a brief description of their accomplishments:

RECIPIENTS OF THE NATIONAL MEDAL OF
SCIENCE FOR 1968

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

H. Albert Barker, for his profound study of the chemical activities of microorganisms, including the unraveling of fatty acid metabolism and the discovery of the active coenzyme form of vitamin B₁₂.

Bernard B. Brodie, for pioneering new qualitative concepts which have revolutionized the development, the study, and the effective use of therapeutic agents in the treatment of human disease.

Detlev W. Bronk, for his highly original research in the field of physiology and for his manifold contributions to the advance of science and its institution in the service of society.

Jay L. Lush, for bringing the science of genetics to bear upon animal breeding, and thus helping to remould the flocks and herds of America and Western Europe.

B. Frederic Skinner, for basic and imaginative contributions to the study of behavior which have had profound influence upon all of psychology and many related areas.

ENGINEERING SCIENCES

J. Presper Eckert, for pioneering and continuing contributions in creating, develop-

ing, and improving the high-speed electronic digital computer.

Nathan M. Newmark, for contributions to the development of powerful and widely used methods for analyzing complex structural components and assemblies under a variety of conditions of loading.

MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Jerzy Neyman, for laying the foundations of modern statistics and devising tests and procedure that have become essential parts of the knowledge of every statistician.

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Paul D. Bartlett, for his leadership in advancing our understanding of the mechanisms by which chemical reactions take place, and for his success in training younger teachers and researchers.

Herbert Friedman, for pioneering work in rocket and satellite astronomy and in particular for his contributions to the field of X-ray astronomy.

Lars Onsager, for a brilliant variety of seminal contributions to the understanding of electrolytes and other chemical systems, especially to the thermodynamics of systems in change.

Eugene P. Wigner, for his many unique innovations in the physical, mathematical and engineering sciences ranging from quantum chemistry to nuclear theory and from reactor engineering to civil defense.

SENATE—Monday, January 20, 1969

(Legislative day of Friday, January 10, 1969)

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our Fathers and our God, before whom the generations rise and pass, on this high day when vows are made and dedications reaffirmed, make us indeed "one nation under God with liberty and justice for all."

Give Thy special aid and grace to the President. Be his counselor and defense. Give him faith, wisdom, courage, health, and patience. Keep him in safety and grant that, relying on Thee and seeking to do Thy will, he may inspire and guide the Nation in the way of righteousness and lasting peace.

May Thy special blessing rest upon the Members of the Senate. In times demanding keen minds, compassionate hearts, courageous spirits, resolute faith and willing hands, so may they stand above all trivialities, and petty rivalries, to serve this Nation in the higher order of Thy kingdom.

By the light of Thy pervading spirit bind us together as one mighty people in the unity of Thy spirit and in the bonds of peace. And may the love and loyalty of all the people transcend all lesser loves and loyalties and be given in full measure to Thee.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 17, 1969, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT
RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 17, 1969, the following messages from the President of the United States were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

On January 18, 1969:

Two postmaster nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Noah C. Atkins, to be postmaster at Jackson, Ky.; and

Walter E. Comstock, to be postmaster at Williamstown, Vt.

On January 19, 1969:

Sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees, and the withdrawal of the nomination of R. Todd O'Flynn, to be postmaster at Philpot, Ky.

(For nominations received above, see the end of Senate proceedings of today.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSIDERATION
OF NOMINATIONS THIS
AFTERNOON

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the majority leader has asked me to announce that this afternoon, at 3 o'clock, the Senate will meet to confirm the non-controversial nominations of the President. The majority leader has recommended that at 3 o'clock, because of the seriousness of the nature of the business, we have a live quorum.

Mr. President, we anticipate leaving for the inaugural ceremonies at 10:50 a.m., and it is appropriate that Members of the Senate be aware of that procession.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 3 P.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate proceeds in a body to the inaugural ceremonies, it stand in recess until 3 p.m. today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON NATIONAL HOUSING
GOALS—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting today the first annual report on National Housing Goals, as required by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

That Act affirmed the national goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." It determined that this goal can be achieved by constructing or rehabilitating 26 million housing units in the next decade, 6 million of which will be for low- and moderate-income families.

This report lays out a plan for housing production to meet this goal. It also identifies the potential problems that may be faced in the coming year.

—It notes the sensitivity of residential building to credit conditions.

—It reviews the long-run need for adequate labor, land and materials to maintain an increasing level of construction.