

be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Raymond E. Peet, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 20, 1970:

July 20, 1970

### ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1975.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### CONTINUATION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

**HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Board of Directors of the Virginia Dairy Products Association at Virginia Beach, Va., on July 10 adopted a resolution endorsing the continuation of the Highway Trust Fund concept as a means of financing an adequate highway program.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas, high quality and economical highway transportation is the essential factor to modern economic progress, especially as it relates to the dairy industry and the dairy distribution segment of the industry, and;

Whereas, the Interstate Highway program has proven that modern highway design is one of the most effective means of reducing the death toll on the highway, and;

Whereas, in 1956 Congress established the Highway Trust Fund as a means of financing the Federal-aid highway program including the System of Interstate and Defense Highways and the primary and secondary urban programs, and;

Whereas, said Fund is entirely self-liquidating, debt-free and has as its source of revenue only special taxes levied on motor vehicle owners and users thereby affecting no other federal program in any adverse way, and;

Whereas, proposals have been advanced in Congress that would terminate the trust fund concept of highway financing and permit the diversion of federal highway user taxes to non-highway purposes after the legal expiration of the present Highway Trust Fund in 1972;

Now therefore be it resolved, that the Virginia Dairy Products Association, Inc. is vigorously opposed to the use of highway funds for any non-highway purpose, and;

Be it further resolved, it heartily endorses the highway trust fund concept as a proven means of funding a balanced and adequate highway program, and that we urge Congress to enact legislation that would establish a Highway Trust Fund in its present form as a permanent instrument of financing the federal portion of our National highway program, and;

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to members of Congress from Virginia and the Governor of the Commonwealth.

I certify the above resolution is a true and accurate extract from the minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting of Virginia Dairy Products Association, Inc., held July 10, 1970

W. M. GAUNT, Jr.  
Executive V. P. and Secretary.

### THE FOURTH GENERATION: INTIMATIONS OF REALITY

**HON. BROCK ADAMS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on June 23-26, the 1970 International Data Processing Conference and Business Exposition was held at the Seattle Center in Seattle, Wash. The sessions featured 12 separate seminar series covering areas of wide-ranging technical and general management interest. Topics covered a broad spectrum, from "The Human Element in the Information Processing Community" to "Computing Equipment—Today and Tomorrow."

At the latter session, a paper was delivered by Robert L. Chartrand, the specialist in information sciences for the legislative reference service at the Library of Congress. Mr. Chartrand, in his presentation on "The Fourth Generation: Intimations of Reality," noted the impact of yet more powerful computer and microform tools and techniques on management. Many of his comments are germane at a time when the House of Representatives has undertaken a study of its information requirements, and has contracted to have a design prepared for an improved information handling system. I would like to have his remarks included in the RECORD at this time:

#### THE FOURTH GENERATION: INTIMATIONS OF REALITY

##### THE CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT

Computer technology occupies a prominent position in the pageantry of American scientific achievement, and all indications point to an enhancement of this posture during the remainder of the twentieth century. In our time we are accustomed to lauding or blaspheming the impact of automatic data processing (ADP) on all aspects of our lives: political, cultural, economic, private. And yet man's insatiable need for—and generation of—information has created an unprecedented crisis! This must be viewed and responded to as a challenge of the highest priority, for the mechanisms by which our civilization functions are threatened by the inexorable deluge of information media.

Within the span of its brief existence, the computer has emerged from its tentative, experimental beginnings to an impressive and often essential role. As one computer "generation" has succeeded another, with a fanfare usually reserved for coronations and cinematic colossus, man has begun to ascribe superhuman attributes to his creation. Such is the vanity of those who innovate, and while today's logic circuits do react  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million times faster than human nerve cells, the "beast" does not possess an artificial intelligence. There are, of course, numerous well-proven areas where its massive manipulative power has proven to be of inestimable value but all too often the more imaginative uses

of the computer has been ignored or deprecated. The Data Process Management Association has both the opportunity and the responsibility to seize the initiative and hasten the intellectual development of those who use the computer in functions pedestrian or exotic.

The evidence of growth in the data processing field is more than ample, and allows some perception of certain key trends:

The number of computers in operation fast approaches the 100,000 mark (based on an annual increase of more than 15%).

The emphasis on quick-time access in an on-line mode is reflected in the spectacular growth in numbers of various types of terminals: time-sharing terminals increased from 500 in 1966 to more than 20,000 in 1970; CRT devices are experiencing a projected growth that will raise the total from 17,000 in 1969 to an estimated ten-fold figure in 1975.

A question has been raised which merits our consideration: are we unduly hastening the obsolescence of equipment and software long before it has mastered and gainfully utilized? The companion query must be: is a fourth generation really necessary; and can we successfully synchronize our development of the requisite technological elements?

The significance of these questions should not be taken lightly, and will be discussed hereafter within the context of three major areas:

1. The responsibility of management in responding to the more stringent demands on its time and judgment, as imposed by the ever more sophisticated technology.

2. The role of microform in the information systems of the future, and in particular its promising integration with computer technology.

3. The continuing evolution of ADP machinery and software, and the advent of a "fourth generation."

##### THE MANAGEMENT RESPONSE SYNDROME

The ubiquitous presence of the computer is changing man's intellectual interface with his environment, with the foreseeable result that he must rethink virtually every aspect of his day-to-day existence. Management groups, striving to cope with problems of unequalled complexity and broad-ranging consequence, continue to search for those tools and techniques which will abet the analysis-decision function.

The ability of American management to raise its performance in order to meet any challenge is a hallowed tradition in the annals of our private enterprise system. In this day and age, management has recognized that there are critical matters which must be addressed, and positive reforms which must be instituted:

Management has accepted and begun to refine the role of cybernetics in controlling the operation of an office or plant; in particular, the manager should be receiving both positive and negative feedback concerning corporate operations.

The imaginative use of computer technology and systems analysis can allow the manager to examine in detail management information reports; access to selective "cuts" of data can allow the manager to more effectively utilize his time.

A willingness on the part of management to depart from the mundane use of computers—inventory, payroll, accounts payable and

receivable—into exploratory experiments with simulation and variable manipulation can lead to improved management performance.

Management must undertake to educate itself in the power and potential of the computer, for the importance of this instrument and its service to the company no longer may be left to technical personnel.

The onus, then, is on management as never before, to grasp the possibilities inherent in the burgeoning technology. Now as never before the manager has a responsibility to play the visionary, and he has at hand the array of magic devices which can help fulfill his objectives! There will be no penalty for creativity, which was perceptively defined by Myron Tribus as "the ability to generate alternatives which enhance the value of a set of acts—and, by extension, the representation of acts."

What can the fourth generation of computers specifically offer the manager? First, man-machine management functions can be enhanced through the availability of high performance access devices offering video-screen narrative and graphic presentation options, image overlay, on-line correction and alternative manipulation, and retrieval from a variety of storage media. Second, the computer-modeling of certain categories of problems will be more achievable with systems in development. Finally, as character and pattern recognition systems evolve, management will be able to scrutinize its behavior and take corrective action. Never before has there been such an opportunity for the development of creative management.

#### THE ROLE OF MICROMATION

It would be unconscionable, in considering the information technology developments of the future, to omit the essential role to be fulfilled by microform. This mass-memory medium allows the storage of multitudes of words, symbols, numbers, and diverse graphic forms. The technology features "packing" densities many times that of magnetic tape, for example, and allows rapid retrieval and display of selected data elements or pages of information.

The mood, within government and industry, is to reduce the amount of hard copy and turn to other record media for space and cost savings. The Archivist of the United States, Dr. James B. Rhoads, recently opined that by the year 2000 no more than 50 per cent of those records would be some form of paper, as compared to 95 percent in 1950. Among the non-paper forms to be utilized in the forthcoming quarter-century are:

Photochromatic image forming materials, the only commercial product at this time being the PCMI (Photochromatic Micro Image) which allows high order reductions from 115X to 150X.

Photopolymers, featuring an "amplification factor" allowing a higher density to be achieved with a small amount of light; these are heavily used in storing engineering drawings, for which the consumption of sensitized film has increased almost 825 per cent over 1957 levels.

Electrostatic micro-images are under development, allowing high resolution (120 lines per millimeter) at 30X reduction.

Holography, meaning "whole writing," offers a host of possibilities; even now three-dimensional color pictures can be produced; not only can the subject image be viewed from both sides and front as one changes his vantage point, but the hologram can be broken into smaller pieces, each of which retains the entire image.

Dry silver film, which has been successfully used with reference type prints.

Diazo films continue to be improved and are used in microfilm enlarging processes, with the advantage of producing positive (rather than negative) copy.

Thermoplastic recording, whereby an eye legible micro-image is placed on a plastic

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

surface using electron beam technology; an example is "Frost" xerography.

Some of the new techniques have reached the production stage. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has placed in operation the first "Video File," featuring electron beam technology employing a plastic medium. UNICON (laser beam technology using a metallic-fused plastic) produced by Precision Instruments, Inc. allows ultra high data compaction: 16,000 feet of magnetic tape (one-inch width) is compressed into 16 inches of four-inch UNICON tape.

As the fourth generation ADP hardware evolves, COM—for Computer Output Microfilm—will provide the necessary added dimension and flexibility required by the users of information technology.

#### MACHINE AND SOFTWARE EVOLUTION

As the Nation's computer users struggle to assimilate the multifaceted devices and software packages of the third generation of ADP technology, their credibility and endurance are strained to the utmost as they listen to the harbingers of the impending new generation. It would be accurate to report that the consensus views any fourth generation as arriving in an evolutionary fashion. And perhaps the great expectations of the tireless enthusiasts will be tempered to some degree by the responses still being elicited, and the lessons learned, from matching often exploratory software with admittedly conglomerate configurations in an attempt to satisfy naive, strident users.

Characteristic of the innovations identified as fourth generation components or systems:

Development of semiconductors, involving large scale integration of many circuits on a single silicon chip.

Improvement in display technology, including the transfer of alphanumeric and graphic data within the hard copy-microform-ADP triad.

Memory development—from primary core to discs, drums, bulk core or mobile storage media (tapes, etc.); the implementation of high speed "look ahead" memories and scratch pads, and special microprogram and control memories.

The establishment of multi-processor computer utility systems, with various level processors ranging from minicomputers in a transmission-control role to array or pipeline models.

Creation of highly flexible computer terminals offering input-storage-editing-retrieval capabilities and allowing final output through printers, plotters or ancillary data output stations.

Development of microprogram packages, providing control sequencing for small computers or monitoring stations for large configurations; conceivably this may take the form of a variable microprogram storage unit.

Increased computer-communications interaction and, in some cases, interdependence.

Few specifications on the proposed hardware are available as the computer manufacturers are understandably reluctant to share their secrets prematurely. A recent feature article in *Computerworld* (May 20, 1970) was devoted, however, to a discussion of the rumored IBM "fourth generation" of equipment. Reportedly the principal characteristics of the new series include:

Variable micrologic used for both instruction and execution processing alterable through software.

#### Built-in communication capabilities.

Cost/performance ratios improved by a factor of from 6 to 12 over similarly priced IBM 360s.

Inclusion in all models of high-speed buffer memories similar to those introduced for the 360/195.

No machine language compatibility, but much simpler conversion than that required by the move to the 360.

One of the significant trends is that of giving the user more for his money. The IBM new series allegedly will provide three times as much computational power per dollar and four times as much storage.

As thought-provoking as these projections may be, there is still room for a great deal of original research and uninhibited application of new devices and software. Future systems must have increased flexibility and speed—already there are problems which require processing speeds from 500 to 1,000 times faster than now is possible. Input and output constraints, particularly the latter, often deter users from employing the more elaborate processors which they sorely need. A constraint which will pose a severe challenge for the systems innovators and designers involves the formulation and writing of the software. Even at this point, the user community is hard-pressed to staff its facilities, and with each succeeding generation the shortage of trained personnel becomes more acute. Managers must be created out of scarce, senior project leaders ranks, leaving all too few experienced designers to confront the impossibly complex problems born of our own ingenuity.

Paramount in the thinking of those concerned with "things yet to be" is the concept of a computer utility. The Federal Communications Commission has evinced increasing concern about the manifold interactions between computer services and common carriers. This oversight may well have to be supplemented by legislative action leading to formal, more encompassing regulations.

Even on an *a priori* basis, certain improvements are sought through the development of fourth generation technology: an upgrading of cost performance, improved hardware-software reliability based on better diagnostic capabilities, enhanced control through equipment improvements, and more efficient use of hardware through better programming.

#### A COMPELLING FUTURE

In the volume *The Year 2000*, the authors are far from skeptical about the role of the computer at the end of the century:

By the year 2000, computers are likely to match, simulate, or surpass some of man's most "human-like" intellectual abilities, including perhaps some of his aesthetic and creative capacities, in addition to having some new kinds of capabilities that human beings do not have.

The difficulty in anticipating the future also is noted by the same group of eminent logicians, who recall that in 1937 the computer was not even foreseen by an equally prestigious group of prognosticators.

The opportunities for expanding and improving computer services to persons in all walks of life are virtually unlimited. Those responsible for governing the Nation, the States, and our cities will have access to planning and program information which can be used not by one, but several, governmental decision-makers. An international technical data network already is being conceived of, and the benefits to be derived from this by the scientific community and the peoples of the world are immeasurable. Analog and digital devices, capable of accepting and dispensing variable forms of data (including audio and translations) are in the process of moving from conceptualization to refinement through testing. Small computers of extraordinary power will be available for a host of uses.

Thus, the magnitude of the support to be provided by computer technology to our civilization in such that those responsible for its nature and scope share a unique opportunity and responsibility. The capability to provide guidance exists within the Data Processing Management Association, which can perform a critical advisory function in the years ahead.

HON. JEROME H. HOLLAND, AMBASSADOR TO SWEDEN

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. BOGGS.** Mr. President, earlier this year, President Nixon appointed Jerome H. Holland as our Ambassador to Sweden. Since that time, Ambassador Holland has served our Nation with great distinction in that post. He has traveled throughout Sweden to meet and get to know the people of Sweden, and he has been most helpful to numerous Americans visiting that country. Despite an occasional personal insult, Ambassador Holland has become one of our most valued representatives abroad.

Recently, the Wall Street Journal carried a most provocative and penetrating article describing, in considerable detail, Ambassador Holland's work during a single day. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks for two purposes: To demonstrate the important work of our embassies abroad, and more importantly, to indicate the devotion and effort to Ambassador Holland.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal,  
July 8, 1970]

IN SWEDEN, U.S. ENVOY PLAYS IT COOL  
(By Felix Kessler)

STOCKHOLM.—Like many other Swedes, Kristian Svenberg is personally impressed by U.S. Ambassador Jerome H. Holland. "He's really trying to move around this country to find out what the people are like," says the 23-year-old medical student.

But Mr. Svenberg says he'll still throw eggs at the new American envoy to Sweden any chance he gets.

"That's not personal," says Mr. Svenberg. "We look on Mr. Holland as the representative of U.S. imperialism. Our aim is to get him out of the country."

So far, the aim of radical young egg-throwing demonstrators hasn't been too good; They've scored no direct hits on the tall black ambassador and the State Department says it has no intention of recalling him—as it did his predecessor for five weeks in 1968—in protest against the Swedish government's pro-Hanoi leanings.

In fact, the egg-throwing and name calling demonstrations—Mr. Holland has been taunted with shouts of "nigger"—have gained him considerable sympathy. This is no mean feat in a nation where, Swedish officials estimate, at least 80% of the people oppose America's Vietnam war policies, and where, in the U.S. view, a policy of "active neutrality" amounts to support for North Vietnam. Under such conditions, what is life like for a U.S. ambassador?

A day spent in the company of Mr. Holland, who arrived here three months ago, reveals that it is pretty much the predictable round of conferences and social engagements—some important and some not so important—and all enlivened a bit by the delicate state of U.S.-Swedish relations.

The U.S. has had 20 consuls or ambassadors in Sweden starting with a bearded gentleman named William Widgery Thomas in 1863. Mr. Holland, a rugged 54-year-old former All American end at Cornell, is the first

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

black U.S. ambassador to serve here. (In its 116 embassies around the world, the U.S. currently has five black ambassadors. The other four are assigned to Haiti, Uganda, Chad and Liberia, which received the first black American ambassador in 1949.)

### EASYGOING AND ACCESSIBLE

An easygoing manner, willingness to talk and a conscious attempt to make himself as accessible as possible all seem to characterize Mr. Holland's approach to his problem of dealing with a country whose relations with the U.S. are often strained. Mr. Holland has already met formally three times with Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Palme, and he has also met with practically all segments of Sweden's population—except with the demonstrators, who won't meet with him.

"An ambassador has to go out, to meet people in the big cities and the small towns," says Mr. Holland. "Visit housing projects, churches, homes, shops. It's important for gathering information—and at the same time imparting it."

To date, the approach seems to be paying off. The radicals may still want to throw eggs, but Swedish government officials are known to regard Mr. Holland favorably as "more mature" than his predecessor, who was considered isolated and remote.

On a recent day, Mr. Holland began setting the pace for the 42 American civilians, 17 military attaches, 5 Marine guards and 81 Swedish and other nationals assigned to this medium-sized embassy by arriving at his fourth-floor office shortly after 8:30 a.m., as is his custom. Having browsed through news wires and other overnight messages at home, he quickly tackles the mail with his secretary, Marguerite Spreitzer.

"I believe it's important that every letter gets a personal reply," he says.

Shortly before 9, the embassy's Political Attaché, C. Arthur Borg, drops in to analyze the morning newspapers. Mr. Holland, the previous day had toured an important Swedish industrial group's plant, and the newspaper *Dagens Nyheter* implies he was "not exposed to any egg-throwing" because the visit "was surrounded by great secrecy to avoid demonstrations. . . . To play safe, the dinner which followed was given in a very secret place."

"There was nothing secret," snorts Mr. Holland. "I had dinner at the managing director's home, just as planned."

Hostile treatment in the press and elsewhere is something the U.S. ambassador has to get used to in Sweden, however. During his first month in the country, Mr. Holland observes diplomatically, "the time has been full": 14 demonstrations, at least three egg-throwing occasions, and two times when he's heard himself called "nigger." A Swedish press spokesman disputes this last charge by claiming that an American Black Panther derisively shouted "house nigger" at only one demonstration. "That's laughable," exclaims Mr. Holland. "I'm a black man—and I don't know when people call me names?"

A tour of the embassy reveals a number of "combat souvenirs" of Sweden, decorating the walls of embassy officials. A paper Vietcong flag that had been planted in an embassy geranium pot and a chain with which a demonstrator had fastened himself to a railing hangs on a relief-map of Sweden in the office of Turner Cameron, the embassy's Deputy Chief. A picture of a demonstrator's placard politely requesting "Mr. Bodde go home" hangs in the room of Political Officer William Bodde Jr. (He is, in fact, being routinely reassigned to Washington.)

Mr. Holland considers the more extreme protest, such as egg-throwing and personal abuse, "an embarrassment to Sweden." But he believes that the demonstrators nevertheless are only a small percentage of the population and the Swedes, are happy with his

July 20, 1970

presence. The 50 letters he's been receiving daily express support in the form of "apologies for the Swedish people," invitations to dinner, cocktail parties and informal gatherings.

### A MEETING WITH BUSINESSMEN

Speedily reading letters as he signs them with a black Government issue ballpoint, Mr. Holland says that his past 17 years as a college president (at Delaware State College and Hampton Institute) have proved good experience for his ambassadorial tasks.

At 10 a.m., four embassy officials enter the ambassador's office to discuss a meeting he will have the next day with 30 managing directors of American concerns established in Sweden. After settling down on a couch and chairs in his modest office, the officials decide the businessmen will be most interested in Sweden's fall election prospects. "Everybody thinks an embassy has inside information," someone observes.

Other points that will be covered as Sweden's economy, its dependence on exports and the possibility that an American Chamber of Commerce will be formed in Stockholm.

After the 40-minute meeting, Mr. Holland flicks through some more mail. "Just want you to know I'm pulling for you," writes an American superior. Another says that "I am Swedish and in your corner." Still another bears greetings from "one of the people living in little houses in the big forest."

At 11, two teenagers from the Anglo-American school—a Bulgarian girl and Mr. Borg's daughter—are ushered into Mr. Holland's office to receive scholastic awards: "Well, let me congratulate you two ladies on your achievements in English," says Mr. Holland easily. He then poses for photographs with the girls. "Speaking as an old educator," he says, "I'm sure it would help if the principal got in the picture." After an un hurried five minutes, he's back at his desk reviewing more mail and wire messages.

Col. Harry Tyndahl of Sweden's Salvation Army enters diffidently at 11:25. Mr. Holland immediately puts him at ease by asking detailed questions about the Army's operations. After 10 minutes, Col. Tyndahl places his hands together as if in prayer and beseeches Mr. Holland: "Could you please meet with our international head and Swedish head?" Without hesitation, Mr. Holland says he'd be delighted and offers to bring everyone to his home for coffee.

Shortly before noon, the embassy's Public Affairs Officer, Patrick Nieburg, enters to discuss a Washington directive and to brief Mr. Holland on the people with whom the ambassador is lunching at Sweden's state-owned television center. "Mostly administrators, not journalists," says Mr. Nieburg.

Mr. Nieburg is followed by William Zavis, the Press Attaché, who checks on arrangements for a four-day trip the Ambassador is making to central Sweden over the weekend.

Mr. Zavis is concerned that a scheduled police strike will leave Mr. Holland unprotected. It's Mr. Holland's fourth such country swing and he's previously taken his wife, Laura, and two youngsters, Joseph, 13, and Lucy 14. "Protecting me is their (the Swede's) business," he says. "I'll go alone if need be but I'm not calling off the trip."

Mr. Holland is, however, sympathetic to Swedish police on their demands for more overtime pay, partially because demonstrations against the U.S. have contributed heavily to their working long hours. "Police all over the world have been left behind on pay," he says. And he finds the bearded, mustachioed or long-haired Swedish police not much different from their American colleagues. "I've got a brother-in-law who's a member of the New York police," he says. "I don't go along with those who call them pigs."

July 20, 1970

25075

Shortly, Mr. Holland's wife picks him up for the broadcasting lunch. The lunch lasts two hours and Mr. Holland, on his return, terms it "friendly," with discussion involving differences between American and Swedish approaches to the media. Back in his office, he signs a few more letters before a conference with an executive of International Business Machines.

The IBM official insists he has a "private" matter to discuss with Mr. Holland and over-stays his appointment; he's followed by a clergyman who also has "something personal" on his mind. Outside, Miss Spreitzer's phone rings constantly with calls from bridge players (involved in a big tournament held in Stockholm), business men and tourists who've lost passports or otherwise seeks the ambassador's help.

During the afternoon, a Swedish caller tries to enlist Miss Spreitzer's aid in helping establish a Wild West exhibit. A woman calling from Wisconsin wants to know which Swedish hospital will perform an abortion on her granddaughter. (The embassy obliged her request.)

All afternoon embassy officers button-hole Mr. Holland briefly to discuss policy. (Three days a week he has more formal meetings with various staff members.) At 4:30 he emerges, is cornered separately by Mr. Borg and Mr. Cameron, and finally makes his getaway.

He receives a snappy salute from a Marine in the lobby, steps into his Cadillac limousine and is driven to his nearby home.

Mr. Holland gets home a few minutes before some guests begin to arrive. They include sociologists Eli Ginsburg, Dr. John Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges, two Ford Foundation visitors touring Sweden, an American television producer and various embassy and Swedish officials.

#### AN IMPRESSIVE RESIDENCE

The residence, the former home of a wealthy publisher, is considered one of the finest owned by the American Government. It includes a sauna, a squash court and an indoor swimming pool. One room is now lined with African carvings and busts that the Hollands acquired during their travels.

Mr. Holland introduces guests and makes small talk with ease. By 6:30, everyone has gone except a late-arrival, a self-assured television newsmen with a hot idea. "What we want to do," says the American TV man poking a finger at Mr. Holland, "is hang a mike around your neck and follow you around for a day or so. You know, go everywhere with you except the bathroom."

The newsmen promises that he, the cameraman and sound technician will be unobtrusive. "You'd be surprised how soon you'll forget we're here," he says. "The first thing I want is not interfere with what you're doing." Then he corrects himself good-naturedly. "No, the first thing I really want is to shoot a lot of good film."

Mr. Holland agrees amiably and ten minutes later everyone has gone. At 6:50, Mr. and Mrs. Holland leave to attend a small private dinner with a Swedish medical college president, some academics and several social welfare officials—people whose professional background isn't very different from that of Mr. Holland.

Although the Hollands have eaten dinner at home only once in the past two weeks, he says they've always had breakfast together. He also finds time to play ball or Ping Pong with his son, whose major complaint is acute sports deprivation, though he plays on three Swedish basketball teams.

Except for a lack of confrontations with angry protesters, it's been a normal day for America's Ambassador to Sweden. "Not heavy, not light," says Mr. Holland, "just average."

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### CRADLE OF THE CONFEDERACY

#### HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

MR. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I have just read the cover story appearing in the July 1970 issue of the American Bar Association Journal and take this opportunity to offer the same for inclusion in the RECORD. Written by Milo B. Howard, the very able director of archives and history of the State of Alabama and, incidentally, an old and treasured friend of mine, the article traces the history of State government in Alabama, culminating in location of the capital in Montgomery over a century ago. The cover of the ABA Journal further honors our great State with a beautiful night scene picture of the capitol building itself. I commend the article to my colleagues and others who might be interested:

#### "CRADLE OF THE CONFEDERACY"

Few buildings in the United States can boast of having served as a nation's capital; only two can claim to have served as a convention hall where a national constitution was written. The State Capitol at Montgomery, Alabama, has both distinctions.

Before the eyes of the world came to rest on the "Cradle of the Confederacy" during the momentous days of 1861, the capital had been moved five times between 1817 and 1846, when it finally came to rest on a hill set aside for that purpose in 1817 by Andrew Dexter, the founder of Montgomery.

The territorial government moved from St. Stephens to Huntsville, where the first constitution was written and where Cahawba, at the confluence of the Alabama and Cahawba Rivers, was chosen as the first permanent capital of the state. Flood waters and a population shift caused the removal of the capital to Tuscaloosa, but another population shift following the final extinction of the Creek Indian claims resulted in the selection of Montgomery as a more central location. In the general assembly, the vote on removal was hotly contested. But Montgomery had sent her ablest sons to the legislative session of 1846; moreover, it could offer free land on the most commanding of the town's seven hills and a readiness to raise \$75,000 for building the state house.

Stephen Button, an able architect from Pennsylvania, was engaged to design the new building, which was occupied in November, 1847. The town took on a prosperous air.

Along with the Capitol, numerous fine homes in the classical and Italianate style and solid commercial structures were begun. Then, suddenly, on the thirtieth anniversary of Alabama statehood, December 14, 1849, the future hopes of Montgomery appeared to go up in smoke. At 1:20 p.m. the roof over the house of representatives was discovered to be on fire. The state senate, then in session, adjourned promptly, but the house members, over whose heads the fire was blazing, waited for no such formal action. In spite of heroic fire-fighting efforts, within three hours all that remained of the handsome new building was the blackened ruins of the outer walls.

Fending off suggestions to move the capital again, Montgomery persuaded the legislature to appropriate \$60,000 to rebuild on the same site. The original design was followed closely in the building depicted on the cover of this month's Journal, which has served Alabama since 1851.

Ten years after the Capitol was rebuilt another fire was started in it, but this one spared the building, consuming instead a civilization. In 1860 the general assembly directed the governor, in the event of the election of a President of the United States hostile to the interests of Alabama, to call a convention to consider what appropriate course the state should follow. On January 7, 1861 a convention met in the house chamber; on January 11 it withdrew Alabama from the Union and invited representatives of other seceding states to meet in Montgomery on February 4 to consult together for their mutual protection and benefit. Accordingly, at noon in the senate chamber, the Provisional Congress of the Confederate States of America was organized. By February 8 the provisional constitution was adopted, and the next day Jefferson Davis was elected president of the new government. Seven days later he arrived in Montgomery, and on the 18th, standing between the center columns on the front portico of the building, he took the oath of office with his hand resting on the State Bible, purchased in 1853 and used at the inauguration of every Governor of Alabama since.

The Confederate Government remained in Montgomery only until the end of May, but during that time the Confederate president and congress had created a nation. The permanent constitution was drafted in the senate chamber and on March 4 the "Stars and Bars" was first flung to the Southern breeze, hoisted above the Capitol by Letitia Tyler, the young granddaughter of former President John Tyler. Four years later, on April 12, 1865, three days after Robert E. Lee surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia, General James H. Wilson entered Montgomery, and at the foot of the Capitol steps a proclamation was read placing Montgomery under martial law.

For the second time in five years a convention was called in the house chamber to draw up a new state constitution, an action that was to be repeated in 1867, 1875 and 1901. Hence, four of the state's five constitutions have been written in the house chamber, which remains basically as it was in 1851.

As the state government grew, the Capitol was expanded. A rear wing to house the Supreme Court Library was added in 1885, and the Capitol grounds were improved by the planting of additional trees and the paving of walks. Next year Jefferson Davis laid the cornerstone on the Capitol grounds for a Confederate monument that was completed finally in 1898 and remains the tallest Confederate monument in the world. An over-all plan for expansion of the Capitol was begun in 1905 in accordance with a design by Frank Lockwood that called for the addition of wings on the north and south ends of the historic building.

The corridors of the main floor are lined with portraits of the former governors of Alabama, while the dome, which rises 190 feet above the ground level, is adorned with eight murals painted by Roderick MacKenzie depicting the development of Alabama.

### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

#### SENATOR SCOTT'S RECORD ON MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICY

#### HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, while the Nixon administration is making a gallant and successful effort to bring our economy under control, they are aided in the Senate by our able minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Scott).

His record on monetary and fiscal policy is outstanding and certainly indicates a clear understanding of the issues and the need to bring our inflation under control and thereafter move forward with steady and sustained growth.

His record, likewise, shows full support for tax reforms that will benefit the working man in America and those who have been most in need of tax relief. I ask unanimous consent that a statement outlining his outstanding record be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### SENATOR SCOTT'S RECORD ON MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICY

With our economy seemingly at the mercy of an inflationary spiral, Senator Hugh Scott knows that government spending must be controlled. Efforts are being made to reduce or eliminate entirely, nonessential Federal expenditures.

Following a fifteen year lapse, the Congress finally got around to reforming our complex tax structure. Senator Scott approached this comprehensive overhaul with two objectives in mind—to give tax relief to low- and middle-income taxpayers, and to bring tax reform. The final tax bill was essentially a good one. It provides for genuine tax relief and reform but still leaves open the incentive for charity and investment, two very important stabilizers in our economy.

The following summary outlines Senator Scott's position on monetary and fiscal policy:

#### THE 91ST CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 35—To extend head-of-household benefits under the Internal Revenue Code to unmarried widows and widowers, and individuals age 35 and over who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for three years or more, and who maintain their own households.

S. 50—Federal Revenue Sharing Act.

S. 1285—To establish a National Economic Conversion Commission.

S. 2259—To amend the Federal Credit Union Act to assist savings and credit needs of low-income persons.

S. 3077—To amend the IRS Code of 1954 to allow credit against income tax to individuals for expenses in providing higher education.

Votes

Voted to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowance to the 23% level recommended by the Senate Finance Committee.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Voted to increase the personal income tax exemption \$750 by 1972 (a similar plan was included in the final Tax Reform Bill approved by the President).

Voted for Scott-Yarborough amendment to provide that funds of private foundations may be used to influence the outcome of specific public elections or in voter registration drives under certain conditions.

Voted to delete provisions requiring private foundations to terminate their tax-favored status after 40 years.

Voted to provide for a tax credit for expenses of higher education.

Voted to allow charities, educational institutions and art museums to continue receiving contributions without undue tax burden, and to not unduly restrict those who make these beneficial contributions.

Voted to liberalize the restrictions on rental housing and rehabilitation expenses.

Voted for the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

#### THE 90TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 1744—To provide Federal controls over foreign banking corporations operating within the United States.

Votes

Voted to allow income tax credit to individuals for higher education.

Voted to restore the investment tax credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Voted to exempt from tax the profits from advertising in publications of certain tax-exempt organizations.

#### THE 89TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 1130—To allow employers income tax credit for providing employee training programs.

S. 1635—To require annual approval by Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts.

S. 2311—To provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers.

S. 3014—To allow income tax credit for contributions by individuals to National and State committees of political parties.

Votes

Voted against a two-year suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit applicable to certain depreciable property.

Voted to provide a sliding scale income tax credit up to a maximum of \$325 for college tuition and other costs.

Voted to exempt railroad rolling stock from the suspension of the investment tax credit.

Voted to exempt aircraft acquired pursuant to exercise of option under contract binding as of October 9, 1966, from suspension of the investment tax credit.

#### THE 88TH CONGRESS

Legislation

Voted to provide liberalized treatment of certain long-term capital gains.

Voted to provide a sliding scale income tax credit for college costs up to a maximum of \$325.

Voted to provide a tax deduction from earned income by a working college student.

Voted to retain the 4 percent dividend tax credit but to limit it to a maximum of \$300.

Voted to repeal retail excise tax on jewelry and furs costing less than \$100, and all such tax on luggage, handbags and cosmetics.

Voted to repeal manufacturer's 10-percent excise tax on mechanical pens and pencils.

Voted to reduce from 10 to 3 percent the so-called cabaret tax.

Voted to repeal the 10 percent tax on live theater dramatic and musical performances.

Voted to reduce the tax on general telephone service.

Voted to provide tax deductions for expenses of transportation to and from one's place of business or employment.

July 20, 1970

#### THE 87TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 2—To provide tax deduction for small businesses, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory and accounts receivable.

S. 3384—To provide income tax deduction for taxpayer supporting dependents handicapped so as to be unable to care for themselves.

Votes

Voted not to eliminate the 7 percent tax credit to segments of business for investments in new machinery and equipment.

Voted to permit deduction of certain entertainment expenses "associated" with the active conduct of the taxpayer's business.

Voted to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

Voted to reduce oil and gas depletion allowance from 27½ to 15 percent on a sliding scale based on gross income.

#### THE 86TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 526 To prohibit deduction of expenses or losses incurred in illegal wagering.

S. 564 To increase personal income tax exemption to \$1,000 for any year dependent is student at college level or above.

S. 566 To allow income tax deduction for vocation transportation for disabled persons.

S.J. Res. 113 To establish Committee on Taxation of Interstate Commerce in order to bring about greater uniformity in state taxation of business income derived from interstate commerce.

S. Con. Res. 70 To create a Joint Committee on Federal-State Economic Relations.

Votes

Voted against repealing credit against income tax for certain dividends received by individuals.

Voted not to deny deductions in excess of \$1,000 annually for (1) entertainment expenses, (2) gifts, (3) dues or initiation fees, and (4) travel to places outside the U.S., Canada and Mexico to attend conventions for advertising purposes.

Voted not to repeal the 4 percent credit for dividends received from domestic corporations.

Voted not to withhold income tax on interest and dividends.

Voted not to deny as trade or business expense deduction expenditures made for entertainment, gifts and club dues.

As the Republican Leader, Senator Scott expects to continue his fight for controlled government spending as one means to end the inflationary trend of our economy. Because of Senator Scott's efforts, Pennsylvania's citizens are getting more equal treatment under our tax laws than ever before.

#### SCHOOL DESEGREGATION POLICIES

#### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Newport News Daily Press of July 9 contains a thoughtful editorial on the school desegregation policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "More Federal Flim-Flam," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The editor of the Newport News Daily Press is Mrs. Dorothy R. Bottom.

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

#### MORE FEDERAL FLIM-FLAM

Sometimes and too often, the actions of the federal government resemble the old flim-flam game—great expectations turn out to be nothing but a wad of worthless paper. This has been the situation in regard to school integration ever since it ceased to be a civil rights issue and became a political one.

It has also been true of the Newport News school integration problem. First, the HEW Department labored mightily to produce a mouse suffering from the malnutrition of inadequate study, but then seemed well on the way to recovered health through a process which every schoolchild knows as reasonable reflection. Even the federal courts, which are not distinguished by their consistency in school integration matters, had even mentioned the word "reasonableness" once in a while.

Now, the Justice Department has become a new irritant in an already delicate situation by sending a letter to the State Board of Education demanding further school integration in five Virginia localities, including Newport News. Just what impulse compelled Justice to make this move at this time remains unclear, but it quite obviously is a situation where the department did not do its homework. As First District Rep. Thomas N. Downing observed, it appeared Newport News and HEW were on the verge of reaching a solution to the problem and the Justice Department onslaught came as a surprise. However, Congressman Downing added that he found Justice ready to call off the attack on Newport News if HEW will certify the city as a proper scholar of its methods.

That certainly is good news, coming at a time when it appears possible that HEW will remember that education is part of its title, too. The problem is acute enough—Norfolk parents are having to organize in hopes of preserving some rights over treatment of their children and a federal judge in another section of the state wants to restructure the entire school system to accommodate integration—without another debilitating factor.

#### HELP SAVE THE WILD HORSES

#### HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, many of Nevada's schoolchildren have written me over the last couple of years urging my help in protecting the wild horses for they know that I have been a champion of the wild mustang for many years and thus I am enclosing an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, June 25, 1970, written by Mr. P. F. Kluge, which I believe will be of interest to all horse lovers.

Preservation of the wild horse is as much a part of the American heritage as protection of the buffalo, and I sincerely hope that the BLM will take heed and help in establishment of proper wild refuges for these fast disappearing animals.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The article follows:

#### WILD HORSES DISAPPEARING FAST, BUT THEY ARE STILL KILLED AS PESTS, USED IN PET FOOD

(By P. F. Kluge)

CALIENTE, Nev.—The wild bay stallion panics as the strangers approach. Eyes rolling, he races desperately around the corral that is his prison, tripping over wires, crashing against the fence.

He had come down from the arid mountains near here and was drawn to a familiar salt lick that had been fenced, its gate left open. Entering, he tripped a wire and the gate slammed behind him. When the gate opened again it would lead to the back of a truck. There would be other corrals then, and finally, the last stop at a pet-food plant.

Trapped and sold for six cents a pound on the hoof, shot and left to rot on the range, driven off cliffs, the mustang is a slowly vanishing symbol of the American West. Descended from stock brought to the New World by the Spanish conquistadors and the settlers who came after, mustangs once roamed the Great Plains by the hundreds of thousands. No more.

As barbed wire and the plow marched across the grasslands, the mustang retreated farther and farther west. Exterminated as a pest by ranchers, driven into dry country where pasture is hard to find, his numbers dwindled. Today about 17,000 mustangs are left in 11 Western states, about half of them in Nevada, many in the arid moonscape of that state's southern region.

Conservationists—and some repentant "mustangers" who have slain many of the animals in the past—are now working to preserve those that are left. They will have to work fast; Stan Routson, Nevada state inspector of brands, expects the mustang to survive only about eight years more in his state. . . .

If the mustangs do disappear, it will be because of economics and the animal's lack of status as an endangered species. The Federal government doesn't recognize it as such because, strictly speaking, the mustang is not a distinct species, just a horse of mixed parentage. Old mustang hunters, however, view him as a wild animal in the truest sense of the word; they have seen mustangs leap over cliffs rather than be caught or starve themselves to death when trapped in corrals rather than eat the food proffered by captors.

Mrs. Velma (Wild Horse Annie) Johnston, a Reno secretary who has been a strong champion of the mustang, says: "No one wants to be responsible for them. They're not an edible animal and they're not a trophy animal. They're in limbo."

Mrs. Johnston was instrumental in obtaining a 1959 Federal law that forbids the use of planes and motor vehicles in rounding up mustangs on Federal land (86% of Nevada is Federally owned). A bill introduced in Congress earlier this year would give the Secretary of the Interior authority to set up and maintain preserves for mustangs and burros, but the fate of that is uncertain and the 1959 law is the principal protection now available.

#### HOLES IN THE LAW

The 1959 law has ended the massive roundups of the past, when hundreds of mustangs were driven over cliffs or rounded up and sold by teams of hunters in jeeps, trucks, and airplanes; about 100,000 of the wild horses were removed from Nevada in the four years after the end of World War II, for example. Still, the 1959 law is poorly enforced and has holes in it.

"You're not going to get the FBI out here to enforce it," says Mr. Routson, the Nevada brand inspector. "And the county commissioners are elected by ranchers, who want that land for cattle."

Many ranchers lease grazing rights from

the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, paying a fee based on how many cattle the bureau estimates can be supported on a given tract. In the Nevada badlands, where cattlemen joke that a cow has to graze at 20 m.p.h. to get enough to stay alive, every tuft of green is precious—and the mustang is a wide-ranging rival for available pasture.

So ranchers and others still trap and kill mustangs legally and illegally. The anti-motor vehicle provision of the 1959 law is evaded by mustang hunters who release their own branded horses into a mustang herd and then chase and round up the whole lot using jeeps and trucks. If anyone gets curious, the hunter can argue that he was just after old dobbin . . .

Ellis (Cougar Lefevre, a grizzled mustanger who says he was personally involved in the capture and extermination of some 10,000 of the animals, says he repented years ago when it struck him that his children might never see a mustang. Retired rancher Holland, the Mustang Association president, recalls a similar change of heart.

"Back in the fifties," he says, "there was one horse, a white mare. We chased her for three years. We got to calling her Native Dancer. The last year we chased her, she was with a colt. We finally caught her, but it took three relays of men and horses and an eight-mile run. Now, that horse was the goingest concern I ever come across, and it about broke my heart when we shipped her out for pet food."

#### SUPersonic TRANSPORT SYSTEM

#### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James Sorenson of Walnut Creek, Calif., has pointed out the apparent negative aspects of the SST aircraft.

In pursuing the construction of the SST aircraft, the airline industry is illustrating the overenthusiasm of many businesses to build the biggest and the best equipment without taking into consideration the effects on the public in terms of safety, cost, quality, and pollution.

Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Sorenson points out, it would be wiser to spend public money on improving air traffic-control than to subsidize corporations to build unneeded aircraft. It seems that technology will again be allowed to jump so far ahead in certain areas that the effect it will have cannot be handled in other areas such as safety, and pollution. Not only are many of the technological gains dubious in worth because of the other technological difficulties they create, but the gains often help to destroy the environment.

His letter follows:

JUNE 30, 1970.

Representative JEROME R. WALDIE,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALDIE: Enclosed please find a copy of the letters my wife and I sent to Senators Cranston and Murphy on the SST. The note you sent us in response to your questionnaire was much appreciated. We also needed the spur to write on the SST, it was our first such letter. I wish it could be our last.

Keep up the fight against the peripheral canal, and thank you again.

Cordially,

JAMES SORENSEN.

**DEAR SIR:** Soon you will have before you a bill to appropriate funds for the supersonic transport. We strongly urge you to campaign against its passing in the Senate and to vote no when the opportunity arrives.

The two of us earn our livings by flying for a major airline, as a pilot and a stewardess. As a young pilot with the prospect of a long and rewarding career ahead of me, I see the SST as a very personal threat as well as a waste of taxpayers' money. Let me explain.

Everyone is aware by now of the overburdened and understaffed air traffic control system we operate in everyday. You may not be aware that our airline (as well as others) operates into airports such as Visalia and Merced, with jet aircraft, where there is no controlled traffic separation. Surely it makes more sense to appropriate money to alleviate these substandard areas in our present system and give the passengers and crews alike the safety they deserve. Why add an aircraft to the system whose speed envelope is incompatible with present aircraft?

Our company, in a cost analysis, has already determined that at a \$100 per seat fare to Hawaii from the mainland the Concorde, coach configuration, would require something on the order of 119% capacity to merely break even! Needless to say we will not get the Concorde, in fact whether to go into production or not is still undecided. So who will benefit from the SST? Boeing certainly. The airlines? Hardly, if no profit can be shown from its use. The Taxpayers? We do not wish to subsidize a company to build an aircraft of dubious qualities and then possibly have to subsidize the airlines to use it.

Economics aside, what are the environmental implications? This aircraft will be a Super Polluter. Airports will be bombarded with complaints of noise on takeoff and landing. Copious quantities of waste material will swirl around in its wake. And there is the sonic boom. Do we really need to be bombarded with explosions at regular intervals of the day and night so that a few can travel so fast they experience indigestion and other disorders due to their "body clocks" getting out of phase (already a subsonic problem)? Not to mention the environment that waits for us at 60,000 feet.

We again urge you to do all in your power to defeat the appropriations for the supersonic transport.

Respectfully,

#### "IRRESPONSIBLE" SPENDING BY CONGRESS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. HUNT.** Mr. Speaker, once again it is an election year and once again my colleagues in the other party have decided that controlling inflation for everyone is secondary to attempting to buy votes through massive overspending program.

The President was kind on Saturday when he referred to irresponsible spending by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a deliberate move afoot by the Democrats to

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

play fast and loose with the Nation's economy in the hopes of retaining control of the Congress.

They seriously believe that you can fool enough of the people enough of the time.

For that reason they continue to spend money we do not have while refusing to raise taxes to finance that spending. They continue to vote appropriations that lead to inflation while criticizing the President for not controlling inflation.

They continue to demand cuts in defense spending and criticize the President when defense spending cuts put some defense workers out of work.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are determined to have their political cake and eat it, too, regardless of how much indigestion they give an entire nation.

#### JULY FOURTH REMARKS OF REV. ALBIN H. RATERMANN

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. CLANCY.** Mr. Speaker, although the Fourth of July has passed, I thought it appropriate to present the comments of a sincere dedicated American about the Stars and Stripes on that occasion. The words of Rev. Albin H. Ratermann, pastor of St. Vivian's Church in Cincinnati, Ohio, reflect a deep sense of pride in this wonderful country of ours and a true reverence for our flag.

I am sure that all of the Members of the House of Representatives will find his words most inspiring:

#### THE GLORIOUS FOURTH

Exactly 194 years ago this Saturday the greatest nation in the world was born. Most of us first opened our eyes in this great land of ours over which Old Glory flies aloft "o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave." We are secure and protected in a land carved out for us by the bravery and the sacrifice of young Americans who have gone before us. Ours is a proud and glorious heritage to be Americans, and ours, too, is a correspondingly tremendous responsibility, for we indeed are America's present and future. Into our hands has passed the Torch of Freedom. Let us never let it down, or blow it out, or snuff its flame. Let us be always conscious of the fact that to this glorious Country of ours we have a sacred duty. Seldom within the history of this fair Country has there ever dawned a day when loyalty and submission to civil authority has ever been more needed than in this very day of ours. For the spirit of rebellion and unrest and defiance of authority have invaded the ranks of some of our citizens. But to us who have been taught our sacred duty of submission to lawful civil authority and loyalty to our flag, to us do our forefathers look to uphold the ideals of our Country and to hold the flag second in sacredness alone to the Cross of Christ. Most unfortunately today, however, to some radical traitors in our midst the Stars and Stripes have become, instead of a sacred symbol, an object of scorn. They have dared to desecrate our flag by tramp-

ling upon it, or shredding it, or even burning it. More than ever before, then, must we loyal Americans rally to the defense of those Christian, American ideals pronounced 194 years ago, and respect that glorious flag of ours as a cherished symbol of truest freedom. May the white of her stripes, then, be ever a symbol of the purity of our Country's ideals, may her blue be in earnest of her devotion to her sons, and may the luster of her red remind us of the blood that has been shed that we might be free.

July 20, 1970

#### ROCKY MOUNTAIN COAL MINING INSTITUTE RESOLUTIONS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I introduced legislation to help alleviate the burden placed on the small mine operators, particularly in Health and Safety Act. Congress, in its giving them more time in which to meet requirements of the 1969 Coal Mine desire to enact strong protection for the miners, may not have taken into account the extreme burden the act would place on the small operators, many of which now face heavy fines for installation of equipment they are presently unable to acquire economically. Therefore, I was interested in the following resolution passed by the Rocky Mountain Coal Mining Institute in the recent meeting at Aspen, Colo.:

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act contains many provisions that are virtually impossible for many operators to meet which do not materially add to the first and primary objective of safety.

And, whereas, the Coal Operators and Mining Industry are equally concerned with the miners, their labor representatives, the U.S. Bureau of Mines and the Members of Congress, with the basic objectives of the Act, to insure safety and to prevent damage to the health of miners, but have the considered judgment that safety can be achieved without the enormous economic waste and in the case of many small operators, economic ruin, that will result from the Act as presently written,

Therefore be it resolved, That The Rocky Mountain Coal Mining Institute does urge that the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the appropriate Congressional Committees, and representatives of industry and labor immediately engage in a full, frank and cooperative effort to agree upon changes in the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act that will retain, enhance and insure its basic objective, the health and safety of the miners, but at the same time, will avoid economic waste, financial ruin to many small operators, and will encourage better operating practices and economies of operation by the Coal Mining Industry.

Be it further resolved, That we express our appreciation to the many officials in the U.S. Bureau of Mines and also to the Congressional Committees who have expressed concern over the problems created by the Act and have endeavored to cooperate toward carrying out its basic objectives without diminishing its health or safety requirements.

**CONGRESSMAN FLOOD SPEAKS TO  
CONGRESSMAN PRAYER BREAK-  
FAST GROUP**

**Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY**  
OF MISSISSIPPI  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday morning of last week our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, inspired and informed the Members of the congressional prayer breakfast group with some outstanding remarks entitled "Doldrums and Storms." I share those remarks with the other Members of the House:

DOLDRUMS AND STORMS

There is a curious relationship in life between calm and storm. You can see this vividly and dramatically in the world about us—for example, in the process which results in formation of a hurricane, a process at work during these pleasant months of Summer, months which spell relaxation for millions but which also have a menacing aspect to many because of the destructive power of the hurricane.

A recent study of hurricanes observes that, "Meteorologists cannot explain down to the last detail what causes a hurricane"—this, in spite of the fact that the National Hurricane Research Project has been in operation since 1956, that it owns DC 6's, that these planes fly into tropical storms, record their pressures, wind speeds, water content. In spite of all this, a full understanding of what causes a hurricane continues to elude us. So we are reminded that there are some things scientists do not know.

I say this not in any way to deprecate science and its achievements, but, rather, because in the popular mind there is often the feeling that science knows everything and has all the answers to all the questions. Science, for good reason, in the last hundred years has achieved a prestige and authority so that, when it speaks, the ordinary person automatically believes that it has all the answers to all the questions.

Of course, the great scientists of the world would never dream of saying anything like this. They would be willing, and more than willing, to grant that while science may now know something of how life developed from amoeba to man, *why* it developed remains a mystery. Life will always have some secrets it will jealously guard. Just as a real person never reveals all of himself, so the likelihood is that life will never reveal all of its ways to any of us. What causes a hurricane? Some day, no doubt, we will find out. But what makes one man good and another bad, or why some have so hard a time of it and others so relatively easy a time, we may never know. The password comes from a poet who at the age of 80 published her third book of poems and by these three slim volumes has attained a distinctive place among American poets—Abbie Huston Evans:

"We have come through the edge of the continent; we know it.

We are through with solid ground.

The world of substance is dissolved in force, In charge, in energies commensurate With nothing that we know.

And *Humble* is the password of the wise."

The study, to which I have referred, concluded that hurricanes "require certain conditions—most prevalent in late summer and autumn." Hurricanes which strike the eastern United States, it continued, "are born in the Atlantic Ocean . . . in the calm, warm,

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

moist air of the doldrums." We think immediately of popular folk-sayings in which we speak of ourselves as "in the doldrums"—dejected, low in spirit, spiritually empty. You begin to think of storms of quite a different kind—not those that come in the sky and shatter the landscape—but storms that come into a person's life and may wreck the work of a lifetime. Most of these storms, too, begin in the doldrums.

Exactly the same thing is true of those big storms that rip the world apart. Think of the First World War and the conditions of the western world just before it. Britain ruled the waves, and a large part of the world as well, and did it better than most. Let them rule, most people said, unless they happened to live in India or Africa or Ireland or some other part of the world where they wanted to be free of any foreign domination. The United States was safe and happy, surrounded by seas which, it was thought, protected it from every sort of physical attack. And, finally, the Christian Church was on the march. The motto of the Student Christian Movement in 1912, two years before the outbreak of the war, was "The Kingdom of God in this generation!" I call that state of affairs the doldrums—such complacency, such lack of awareness, such blindness to the facts, a static, lifeless time, "the calm, moist air" in which a hurricane is born.

Think of the Second World War. Our attention is concentrated on Germany and her situation: defeated, humiliated, ground into the dust. It was in just this defeat, in disgrace and in debt, into just these doldrums, that Hitler came and stirred up such a storm as the world had never seen before.

Then we come to the present. I suggest to you (and I speak out of love for my Country) that the United States of America has been in the doldrums—and that the storms we are encountering in this troubled time are the product of the doldrums, not of defeat and poverty, but of success and abundance. We have had too much—too much money, too much comfort and ease, too much freedom with too little sense of National purpose or mission. Freedom apart from purpose is anarchy. Certainly there are many exceptions—and we thank God for them—but it is hard to avoid the reality of our present condition. We are generous as a Nation, often to an incredible degree, but people who have never had anything need more than generosity. They need understanding, companionship, patience, and guidance. There is a tragic distortion in our sense of values, a distortion which can be documented in almost every area of life.

So the word of the prophet comes to our land from this simple fact about storms: hurricanes are born in the doldrums. A small but significant and disturbing evidence of this may be seen in the recent Harris Survey, a comprehensive in-depth study of attitudes among a cross-section of 820 under-graduates in 50 four-year colleges. The results reveal a lack of faith in the leadership of our country. By 78 to 20 percent, students believe "the real trouble with U.S. society is that it lacks a sense of values—it is conformist and materialistic." I am not concerned for the moment with how valid this judgment may be; we may well feel that it is exaggerated and out of balance, not wholly justified. Nevertheless, it represents an emerging storm from the doldrums of academic life, a growing alienation and polarization on the American scene.

However, there is another aspect to what I have been saying, a dimension which carries us beyond both the doldrums of the storms: it is this—the doldrums near the Equator are *un-like* the doldrums of the human spirit in one important respect. The doldrums near the Equator, so far as we know, cannot be changed, whereas the doldrums of the human

spirit can be changed. While we may not know the cause of the storms that threaten to destroy humanity, we *do* know the climate in which the storms are bred, and we know that that climate can be changed—and if any people under the sun can change it, it is those who are gathered together as we here are met to turn in prayer to Strength and Purpose greater than all our striving.

There is a sense in which we cannot stop the storms, we cannot turn the clock back. We cannot stop the development of nuclear physics nor, indeed, of nuclear weapons. We cannot make this Nation a Nation that is poor in material things, and I doubt that we can bring about by the activity of a religious group any significant disarmament. What we *can* do is to change the climate in which a storm might be bred. And this is something we can do as individuals and together to heal and restore the common good.

We can help to change our attitude toward the government—by which I mean not any particular administration or agency, but all those chosen by us to manage and administer the system which orders our life and makes it possible. We can change our attitude toward money—or, rather, toward the things that money can buy. And, finally, we can help to change the climate of this Country by the power of faith and in the spirit of words spoken long ago, "If you love me, keep my commandments." Our prayer here today is for our Country and for our world. We ask for protection, but even more for guidance; for knowledge, but even more for imagination; for power, but even more for grace—to do and to be the kind of people who change the climate, meet the storm head on, and avert its impact. In the words of a great American theologian and prophet, Reinhold Niebuhr, "O God give us serenity to accept what cannot be changed, courage to change what can be changed, and wisdom to know the one from the other."

**TRIBUTE TO REAR ADM. JOSEPH L. HOWARD**

**HON. CHET HOLIFIELD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we hear much in the Halls of Congress and we read in the daily newspapers about cost overruns and deficiencies in defense procurement. We do not hear or read often enough about those dedicated public servants who work tirelessly but without fanfare toward efficiency and economy in the Government's business. Rear Adm. Joseph L. Howard, Deputy Director of the Defense Supply Agency, is one of these dedicated public servants.

It was Admiral Howard's duty, as Deputy Director, to take charge of the Defense Contract Administration Services—DCAS. This agency performs a vital function in procurement which is not too well understood. Understandably, contract administration gets less congressional and public attention than the initial procurement action, where interest centers on the bidding contest and who gets the award. Contract administration is concerned with how well the contractor performs, his accountability for Government property, and the like. The many activities encompassed in con-

tract administration are necessary to determine whether the taxpayer is getting a full return on the dollars expended.

In 1968 Admiral Howard took command of DCAS as a large but relatively young organization and quickly developed it into a superior administrative unit responsible for more than 235,000 contracts and a large portion of the \$55 billion defense budget.

Admiral Howard made significant contributions in revitalization of value engineering, prompt payments to contractors, use of packaging services contracts, and standardization of product quality assurance methods.

His management ability and the performance of his organization have earned frequent praise. Further, the stimulus provided by his professional testimony before the Military Operations Subcommittee in support of H.R. 474 to establish a Commission on Government Procurement was recognized and appreciated by members of the committee.

From the beginning of his assignment, Admiral Howard sounded the keynote of efficiency and responsiveness and through exceptional intellectual dimension has given his organization a new sense of identity and dedication.

The support of our military forces and the accomplishment of the programs of our Federal Government at minimum cost depend heavily upon effective management effort by senior executive personnel. It is a privilege to record special recognition of Admiral Howard's ability and effectiveness and to note that he will be tendered the Legion of Merit—gold star—citation for his outstanding performance.

Within a few weeks, Admiral Howard will assume command of the Naval Supply Center at Charleston, S.C., in the district of our distinguished colleague and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Congressman MENDEL RIVERS. I know I speak for the members and staff of my Military Operations Subcommittee in wishing Admiral Howard success in his new and challenging command.

#### HORTON PRAISES ANDREW D. WOLFE'S FEATURE STORY ON 1970 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES, "A CLASS PORTRAIT"

#### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, there is much speculation on the part of the older adults as to the frame of mind of today's teenage students. After January 1, 1971, the minimum age for voting will be 18, due to the actions of the 91st Congress. This new responsibility for many young Americans causes wonder among the older generations, and questions are being asked about the teenagers' ability to handle in a mature fashion this very important privilege.

Recently the editor and publisher of

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the Brighton-Pittsford Post and the Henrietta Post, Andrew D. Wolfe, decided to answer some of those questions by having his reporters interview a cross section of high school students in his area.

As their Representative in the U.S. Congress, I was especially interested in their answers. I found each interview stimulating, inspiring, and sometimes awesome. The depth of their thinking, the perception of their curiosity, the boldness with which each confronts tomorrow, all tended to make me even more confident that the future of this great land of ours will be in good hands.

Editor Wolfe approached these 1970 high school graduates to find out what they are thinking, where they are going, and how they would change things. He reminded his readers that graduation is usually a time for contemplation of the past and future, so he set out to record their views on everything from education to environment, from personal philosophy to political positions.

I would like to share with my colleagues the very revealing thoughts of some of today's young people. I also would like to thank each one of them for giving us an opportunity of looking into their minds and getting a better idea of their thinking, their plans for the future, and their abilities to cope with the problems they believe will confront them.

Here now are the answers of 11 of these splendid young people, to the questions posed by the inquiring reporters. They truly do give us a class portrait of some 1970 graduates:

Larry Stoler, 103 Meadow Dr., Brighton, son of welding supply salesman; National Honor Society; president of his junior class; honorable mention All-County baseball player and co-captain of the Soccer team; will attend Oberlin college

Career.—No decision, studying toward Ph.D.

Concerns.—I don't see why people are surprised by student unrest. Education encourages you to think and then people get upset when we do. Students sometimes expect too much. They can get a lot done by talking to people instead of using violent means. I don't approve of violence. It seems to get more publicity but it's not the only way to accomplish an end. It's very important to be responsible and patient.

Overpopulation and the tension it creates is our worst social problem. It is responsible for just about every other problem. It can be solved by birth control education. There is no place for a big family and it is smart to limit size to two. I would rather prevent a life than erase an existing one, as in war.

One change I'd like to see is more concern for the individual. The government should be more responsible to the individual and in general should be set up on a people to people basis instead of a people to money basis. I don't like the alignment of the government with big business and the military. The justice and equality of the system is brought to question in the military.

I am confused to the purpose of the government in fighting a war in Vietnam. I am forced to admit the South Vietnam government is not democratic and we are not stopping communism. I don't see why we have to kill to build up—there must be some way to just build up.

Taking drugs should be left up to the in-

dividual. Personally I don't drink or take drugs. I play my baritone horn for an hour but that may not be the answer for everyone.

The Future.—Ideally, if I can make money doing something I enjoy I'll be happy. I don't plan to stop learning. I hope to travel—the more you see, the more you can appreciate.

Philosophy.—There is nothing I value most in life but I place great value on the concept of man living harmoniously with nature. Religion satisfies a need in man. It provides him with answers and gives him a place. I am still searching for what my religion means to me.

My life had been quite protected in experience and outlook but my high school experience has helped me accept people as they are. I'm generally happy with my education.

John (Randy) Lane, 913 S. Lincoln Rd., East Rochester, son of area salesman; president of East Rochester High School class; captain of football and basketball teams; will attend Waynesburg University.

Career.—Undecided, possibly in sports.

Concerns.—I would go to Vietnam if asked because I believe in world peace and the threat that communism poses to it. I won't try drugs. I have better things to do. Prejudice is a two sided problem which only communication can solve. I'm a good Catholic. I'll condone student protest until someone tries to push me around. I won't stand for that.

The Future.—I never plan too far ahead. I'd like a family and a place in the country, but I enjoy the suburban atmosphere here in East Rochester with my friends close by.

Philosophy.—The thing I value most in life is friendship.

Pam Little, 9, Countryside Rd., Fairport, daughter of director of quality control at Eastman Kodak Co.; in top 10 percent of her class at Pittsford High School; recording secretary of Student Council; active in Girls Leaders club and gymnastics; will attend Duke University.

Career.—Undecided.

Concerns.—Society's basic problem is a lack of communication and willingness of people to listen to each other. Other problems seem to stem from this. I'm tired of hearing people say that it's up to government to handle the environment problem. It is everyone's responsibility. My education has been most rewarding when a teacher has shown a personal interest in my work. Teachers who aren't interested in helping a student guide himself and instead turning to rules and detention for incentive, are in the wrong profession. If someone skips a class he's the one who loses, and no amount of detention will change that attitude. I wish there were less "mickey mouse" courses required and more courses available which I enjoy.

The Future.—I want to be happy and married to a man I love very much. I don't want any children. The overpopulation situation is too dangerous to allow it. I'd like to go to Europe and work after college.

Philosophy.—I value most in life my own sense of happiness and being alive. I wouldn't say I was deeply religious. Religion to me is how you treat other people.

Robert Huizenga, 51 Huntington Meadow, Penfield, son of University of Rochester science professor; valedictorian of Penfield High School; Harvard Book award, Kiwanis Athletics Excellence award; captain of this year's football team; section 5 wrestling champion; will attend the University of Michigan.

Career: Scientist.

Concern.—I can't decide which is the worst another. Poverty tends to be self-generating, making the poor immune from progress. Social problem, because one seems to cause elimination of regressive taxes, reform of the social security system and appropriate

July 20, 1970

housing are part of the solution. Frankly I'm at a loss to find answers for those judging a man by the color of his skin. Politically, I sometimes get a helpless feeling regarding the system. For example, the phenomenon that money is a prerequisite to political power and/or office and that key Senate and House positions go to the man of highest seniority and not necessarily to the man of greatest ability is disillusioning.

We should declare a victory in Vietnam and pull out. Student unrest is closely linked with the War and the ho-hum responses the establishment has given their pleas. As the menace of pollution grows, so does the need for effective legislation against it and for some sort of national enforcement agency.

**The Future.**—At 30 I want a place to live free from pollution and over crowding: a place where my talents would be encouraged, not suppressed; a place where I could find happiness and live in peace. At 45 I still want the same thing. At 65 I'd like to be assured that my descendants would live in prosperity and peace. I plan to have a family of no more than 2 or 3 children.

**Philosophy.**—If I were to change the educational system I would loosen the rules so that names such as bore, prison and cage become nonexistent. Presently I value sports most in life. Life can be only what I put into it so I try to put into it as much as I am able.

**Michael Iannessa,** 39 East Park Rd., Pittsford, son of Williamson High School French teacher; in the top 10 per cent of Pittsford High School class; president of the student council; will attend St. Michael's College of the University of Toronto

**Career.—Physician.**

**Concerns.**—The Vietnam War is a complete waste of life, energy, time and money. Like all wars, it is unreasonable and everyone loses. I'm glad students are taking an active role in world affairs—this type of unrest is constructive. Some changes I would like to see in education include more links between the students, faculty, administration and the community; curriculums should be enlarged to provide a wider choice of subjects; teachers should take refresher courses in their subject matter to be better qualified.

**The Future.**—I don't plan. I like to take life a day at a time—to involve myself totally.

**Philosophy.**—I value my family most in life—I'm really proud of it. I am a Roman Catholic and having a close relationship with God is the most important thing in my life.

**Mary Kay Rudman,** 2 Ludlow Way, Penfield, daughter of Penfield High School English teacher; ranked 54th in class of 360 at Penfield High School; academic average 86; D.A.R. and V.F.W. awards for citizenship; 1968 Harvest Queen of Penfield High School; will attend Hiram College

**Career.—Spanish interpreter.**

**Concerns.**—Pollution is society's worst problem because it is a threat to the life of every human. To solve the problem one should start with himself then work with groups and industry. Over population is also a problem. People should limit the size of their families. I plan to have two children of my own and adopt two.

**The Future.**—When I am 30, I plan to be married and have had a job. When 45, I hope to live in the suburbs of a city in New York State. At 65 I want to be healthy and have a big house for grandchildren.

**Philosophy.**—I value most my family and friends who are my source of happiness. I am Catholic and go to church on Sundays. I have become much more outgoing in high school and have never felt happier. I think

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the schools should be integrated more. Children live a sheltered life in Penfield—it's all white and rich.

**Deborah Greenlaw,** 132 Taylor Rd., Mendon, daughter of comptroller of Kodak Park; student at Columbia School; involved in dramatics, gymnastics, art and singing activities, will attend Transylvania University

**Career.—Elementary Education.**

**Concerns.**—People don't care enough to communicate with each other or work at problems which they complain about. Education and teaching are the quickest and best ways of implementing change. Violence closes lines of communication and is the poorest solution to a problem. Drugs are an escape mechanism and ruin many more lives than they help. Need for them shows an individual's inability to cope with his problems.

I trust the nation's leaders more than myself in making policy decisions, because I am uninformed about the situations. I would have to know much more in order to take a stand with which I could live confidently.

**The Future.**—I believe in God, and reincarnation of the soul. I'm more relaxed in a daisy field than I am in a stuffy church. I want a family of no more than four children. At 65 I want to have read the whole Bible and traveled in all 50 states. Then I'm going to start my second life—helping younger generations in any way I can.

**Philosophy.**—I love nature and wide open spaces. Whenever I do anything I ask myself if I'll be able to live with myself or if I'll ever have cause to regret it.

**Lorraine Yu,** 651 Claybourne Rd., Brighton, daughter of University of Rochester professor, physician (father) and physician (mother); editor of Brighton High School yearbook; National Honor Society; big sister in Rochester Community Involvement program; will attend Wesleyan University

**Career.—Undecided.**

**Concerns.**—Society's worst problem is man's inhumanity to man—including wars, pollution and over population. Maybe through education people will develop concern for their fellow man. I think students have a valid reason for the unrest they cause. They are fighting for change and are frustrated and have to do something. They are turning a lot of people off, but they are also educating them. Penalties on marijuana are much too strict. Hard drugs scare me—what they might do to my mind.

**The future.**—I'd like to live in a country of which I would be proud—sometimes I'm ashamed of this country. I'd like to adopt a large family. Can't think of anything material that I want. I just want happiness. I haven't thought much of the future; I just live from day to day. That way you don't worry very much.

**Philosophy.**—I value most the feeling that I'm doing something to help someone else—a self-satisfaction in doing something not for myself. I have no need now for religion. Maybe later I'll find one which I can believe in.

**Donna Pettipas,** 71 Kenwick Dr., Henrietta, daughter of printer (father) and manager of motel (mother); ranked 6th out of 457 at Sperry High School; editor-in-chief of the 1970 yearbook; 1969-70 Harvest Queen alternate; will attend Elmira College

**Career.—Uncertain, possibly a career in media.**

**Concerns.**—Society's major problem is the disregard for individuality and pressure to conform. It encourages hypocrisy and artificiality. Social injustices such as war, poverty and racism are unnecessary, unjust and inexcusable. Vietnam War: "Out Now!" Students have a right to protest, but destroying

the campuses accomplishes nothing. Change should be done from within the system.

**The future.**—I want to be happy. Who knows what will bring me security when I'm 30, 45, or 65-years-old. At 65 I ask only to have learned from my mistakes and to feel that I have done with my life what I was capable of doing.

**Philosophy.**—I value communication and understanding most in life. I am Catholic by birth and am just now becoming Catholic by choice. At present I have many doubts about the existence of God.

**Richard Garrett,** 405 Allens Creek Rd., Brighton, son of general contractor; ranked 4th in class of 16 at Allendale School; academic average of 80; Allendale Alumni Cup Varsity basketball co-captain; senior class president; student council vice president; will attend University of Denver.

**Career.—General contractor.**

**Concerns.**—The War is the greatest problem today because there is little true backing. We must, however, fulfill our commitments. I agree with President Nixon's method of solving the problem. People should change their attitudes about the youth of today, who often are unfairly stereotyped. A few have made many look bad by their violent action. The problem can be solved by having discussions with adults about the problems of today, not taking violent action. Drugs are a terrible problem and the student of today should learn not to become so involved with drugs that he can find no way out.

**The Future.**—When 30 I hope to be married with a nice home and beginning to raise children. At 45 I want to be successful in business and in raising my children. When 65, I want to be able to look back on my life and see happiness and see some worthwhile contributions I have made to life.

**Philosophy.**—I value people most and what is gained by being with different kinds of people. Religion is not a formal thing to me. Church seems unnatural to me because of the formality. I have not really changed for I still believe the same things I did a few years ago and I will probably stay the same.

**Robert McKee,** 110 Clearview Dr., Pittsford; son of athletic director at Rush-Henrietta High school; National Honor Society; president of Sperry High School senior class; Senior All-Around athlete; football, basketball and tennis teams; will attend Harvard College

**Career.—Undecided, interested in the ministry.**

**Concerns.**—Society's major problem is that it has turned away from and rejected God. The absence of His love working through people has been the cause of hate, prejudice, violence and unrest present in America today. The churches have to wake up and start preaching the Bible, not just the social gospel which has become so common in American churches. Change must come only through the use of the present legal system and must be non-violent. There is great social prejudice of minorities who have been economically forced into a ghetto existence. The wealthy people in America are able to exploit the less well-off classes by influencing legislation and government officials. The problem could be solved by legislation. Otherwise change will only be caused by a change in man's attitudes which comes from within. It was wrong to become involved in the War in the first place, but now that we are there and have pledged our support we have to remain there until the South Vietnamese are capable of defending themselves.

**The Future.**—I plan to have a family but no more than two children because of the population problem.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**Philosophy.**—I value most my relationship with Jesus Christ. It is something lasting in contrast to the impermanence of material goods and superficial relationships in life. I am very satisfied with my education. I am looking forward to more schooling because I'd like to develop myself intellectually and because I am interested in becoming informed in areas of life about which I know little.

My philosophy of life would be a testimony of my religious convictions.

**THE NEED FOR VETERINARY MANPOWER IN OUR COUNTRY TODAY**

**HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. LANDGREBE.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a statement from the dean of Purdue University's School of Veterinary Science and Medicine, Dr. Erskine V. Morse, relating to the need for veterinary manpower in our country today. As this appropriation bill will be before the House this week, I urge my colleagues to give it their careful attention and consideration:

**STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF HEALTH MANPOWER LEGISLATION BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE**

The School of Veterinary Science and Medicine of Purdue University has received an NIH Institutional Grant of \$126,026 for one year (P.L. 90-490). The support will permit the School to admit five more students in the entering class of 1970. Unless the Grant is continued in 1971, we cannot continue the increased enrollment policy.

There is a critical shortage of veterinary manpower in our country today. In addition, the School submitted a request for several NIH Special Project Grants (P.L. 90-490) which would enable revision and improvement of the veterinary curriculum and its implementation in 1970 and 1971. Greater freedom in students' choice of electives to meet today's demands of the veterinary profession and its expertise would be the ultimate impact. Ways and means of improving pedagogical methodology were incorporated in the request for Special Project Grants. Without these grants the School will be forced to continue offering the rather traditional curriculum.

Veterinary medical students do not come, in general, from affluent income groups. Much of their education (\$6,000 or more/year) is financed by part-time employment, loans, scholarships, as well as from funds provided by their working wives. The average age of our students is approximately 23 years, and  $\frac{1}{3}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$  are married. Loan and scholarship funds received from the Health Professions Education Act have had a beneficial and critically needed effect on the support of our students. In 1969-70 a total of \$84,500 was received; more was needed! With inflationary trends and tight money, considerable hardship is placed upon our young people and their families to finance their education. Inclusion of the veterinary medical students' educational support (loans and scholarships) in Health Professions Educational Act is an imperative matter.

Programs to increase the pool of veterinary faculty for existing schools (nearly all schools are increasing enrollment), and for the contemplated new schools requires faculty salary assistance. Presently, there are at least 10 faculty positions vacant at each one of the

18 U.S. colleges. There are 1922 veterinarians employed at universities in veterinary colleges. More teachers are needed to meet enrollment increases and fill current vacancies.

Why are veterinarians important in today's national economy and national welfare? The veterinary profession, numerically, is the smallest of the health professions, and one of the most poorly supported! There are approximately 26,400 D.V.M.'s in the U.S.; of these 25,000 are active, non-retired practitioners of the veterinary science and art. Contributions are made by service in the U.S. Public Health Service, Federal Food and Drug Administration, and both state and local health departments (2% of the profession). Some 4.3% of our veterinarians are on duty as veterinary officers in the Armed Forces; approximately 20% of Purdue's 326 graduates have served or are serving in either the U.S. Army or USAF Veterinary Corps. Approximately 9.1% of the U.S. veterinarians make and have made great contributions to consumer protection through their meat and poultry inspection activities.

Nearly 9,000 of the U.S. practicing veterinarians minister to the health of the nation's livestock and poultry. Without their expertise and aid, U.S. food costs would be even greater due to disease losses.

Veterinary research work by approximately 7% of our profession is conducted upon a host of livestock maladies which could decimate our food producing animals.

The regulatory veterinarian (7.1% of the profession) is the guardian of our multi-billion dollar livestock industries. One has only to look at the eradication of the plagues of the food producing animals to realize the important work of the veterinary medical doctor, i.e., tuberculosis, brucellosis, hog cholera, pullorum of poultry are a few costly infections which have been brought under control and in some cases nearly eradicated by the efforts of USDA and state regulatory specialists. In addition, these specialists protect the industry by excluding the entry of exotic animal diseases from foreign lands, i.e., foot and mouth, rinderpest, African swine fever, etc.

Over 200 animal diseases are directly transmissible to man; more are being encountered each day. The interrelationship of these diseases to human health is becoming ever more apparent. The "slow" viruses of scrapie and mink encephalopathy bear close resemblance to Kuru and multiple sclerosis (MS) of man. These findings, coupled with the significance of the virus cancers and their interrelationships, stress the need for great input from veterinary researchers. There are a number of conditions or diseases of a non-infectious nature which may be of a genetic, nutritional or environmental nature. These animal diseases may serve as models for the study of similar or comparable human maladies. It is not always possible to utilize the human being for valid, controlled experimental procedure; therefore, animal disease models may bring knowledge to solve today's human, as well as animal, health problems.

It is of the utmost importance that colleges of veterinary medicine receive continued support under proposed Public Laws relating to Health Manpower such as: the Institutional Grant Program, the Special Project Grants Program, the Student Assistance Loans and Scholarships Program, as well as the Construction Grants Programs of the USPHS, NIH. The inclusion of veterinary medicine was previously approved under Public Law 90-490. Veterinary educators express great concern that a reduction in federal funds for the operation of our veterinary medical colleges will decrease the number of critically needed veterinary graduates, lead to a less adequate progressive professional education, and in some cases might even force closing of some schools of veterinary medicine.

July 20, 1970

**LOUIS ARMSTRONG HONORED AT NEWPORT JAZZ FESTIVAL**

**HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. TIERNAN.** Mr. Speaker, the 17th annual Newport Jazz Festival has recently come to a successful conclusion. The 3-day event featured such renowned performers as Ella Fitzgerald, Mahalia Jackson, Dizzie Gillespie, and Bobby Hackett. This year's special performer was Louis Armstrong, who celebrated his 70th birthday on July 4.

The Newport Jazz Festival annually draws thousands and thousands of music lovers from across the country. This year was no exception, as over 40,000 persons were treated to some of the finest jazz singers and musicians in the world.

Needless to say, the festival receives excellent coverage by some of the leading newspapers in the country, including Rhode Island's Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin. This year I was particularly pleased that the Washington Post sent a reporter, Hollie I. West, to personally cover the jazz festival. At this point in the RECORD, I include the three excellent articles written by Miss West:

**TEN THOUSAND HONOR "SATCH" AT NEWPORT JAZZ FESTIVAL**

(By Hollie I. West)

**NEWPORT, R.I.—**Louis Armstrong brought 10,000 shouting clapping persons to their feet last night as he walked on stage to open the 17th annual Newport Jazz Festival.

It was a happy crowd, vociferous in its admiration. The night was all Satchmo's.

Musicians from all over the country were on hand to pay tribute to Armstrong, who turned 70 on July 4. Celebrations have been held in several cities since his birthday and others are planned.

The world's best-known jazzman and frequently called America's greatest ambassador of good will, Armstrong sang three songs, "When It's Sleepy Time Down South" (his theme song), "Pennies From Heaven" and "Blueberry Hill."

He came back to close the program with Mahalia Jackson. As they sang "Just a Closer Walk With Thee," there was a torrential cloudburst.

The downpour lasted five minutes. The crowd, soaking wet, stood fast and shouted for more. A jubilant Satchmo, joined by a host of New Orleans musicians, gave them "Hello Dolly" and "Mack the Knife."

He performed all with a gusto that belied the kidney infection he suffered almost two years ago and that has kept him from appearing in public recently. As expected, he did not play his trumpet because of his convalescence.

Armstrong looked trim and immaculate—conservatively cut brown suit, yellow shirt, a rust tie.

Accompanying him were cornetist Bobby Hackett, pianist Dave McKenna, Bassist Jack Lesberg, and drummer Oliver Jackson.

Hackett described himself as the "number one Louis Armstrong fan" before playing "Thanks a Million," an Armstrong hit.

Joining him in a trumpet tribute were Dizzy Gillespie, Wild Bill Davison, Jimmy Owings and Ray Nance, all of whom played two pieces, each associated with or written by Armstrong.

Gillespie said: "Louis Armstrong's station in jazz is unimpeachable. If it hadn't been for him there wouldn't be none of us."

The formal program got underway last night with the Eureka Brass Band, a New Orleans street and funeral ensemble, marching on stage. The group, led by trumpeter Percy Humphrey, performed "St. Louis Blues," "High Society" and several other classics in jazz history.

The New Orleans jazz tradition, in which Armstrong started performing more than 50 years ago, held center stage. Armstrong was born in the Crescent City, as was Mahalia Jackson who joined in the salute last night.

Also performing were the Preservation Hall Jazz Band, the New Orleans Classic Ragtime Band and the Capt. John Handy Band.

The skies above the festival field were heavily overcast this morning, but George Wein, the show's producer, brushed off a gloomy weather forecast of rain.

In a quip that augured the enthusiastic response of the crowd last night, Wein declared: "Even if it does, those will be just tears of happiness from heaven for Satch."

#### TINA AT NEWPORT

(By Hollie I. West)

**NEWPORT, R.I.**—"We never do anything nice and easy—we always do it nice and rough," Tina Turner announced Saturday at the second night of the 17th-annual Newport Jazz Festival.

Sure enough, the Ike and Tina Turner Revue, one of the hottest-selling soul acts today, exploded in a program of passion that had all the grunts, moans and moves of the fiercest of sex. The nine-piece band (including guitarist Ike Turner, husband of Tina) screamed a riff, and Tina and the Ikettes, three sensuous women, broke into an impromptu dance.

The crowd of 18,000 surged forward and roared its approval. Predominantly young, most of the audience had come to see this act.

Tina Turner, slender, shapely and in her mid-30's, is the personification of raunchy sex—lovemaking on display in an open-air market. She dares her listeners—especially men—to engage in vicarious sex with her.

Tina stands wide-legged, and when she twirls her body she reveals the briefest of undergarments. She forms her lips invitingly and throws her long hair with abandon. But it is not cheap sex—it is bold.

Her rendition of "I've Been Loving You Too Long" is a sensual experience. She sings it slowly and dramatically. The lyrics were frankly sexual.

She followed with a shouting rendition of "Who's Making Love to Your Old Lady While You're Out Making Love?" The crowd screamed with delight.

Despite such frankness, Tina gave a mild performance Saturday night. Her singing and dancing were restrained compared with the heat she usually generates, and the band did not stir much excitement.

Earlier, the audience came to its feet several times during the performance of singer Nina Simone, whose drama and charisma were in sharp contrast to the sex of the Turners.

She danced on the stage, bobbing and weaving to the rhythm the four percussionists played. She chanted a sad melody that led into "West Wind," a Miriam Makeba song about buyers and injustice.

Miss Simone, who frequently sings of black brotherhood and the need for international peace, performed a compelling version of "Someday," a song that looks to a brighter future for man. She also sang "To Be Young, Gifted and Black," an anthem she has popularized recently.

Although Miss Simone and the Turners were given ample time, tenor saxophonists Dexter Gordon and Don Byas were cut short

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

during their separate appearances because of a crowded program (eight acts were scheduled). Both men, among the greatest on their instruments, are expatriate Americans. Byas, a resident of Amsterdam, returned to this country on July 3 for the first time in 24 years. Gordon has lived in Copenhagen and Paris for the last five years.

Gordon, limited to two pieces, played an easy-swinging version of "Boston Bernie" and a deeply moving "Darn That Dream," the latter containing a marvelously constructed cadenza at the end.

Byas, performing with Dizzy Gillespie's rhythm section, played three pieces, the most notable of which was a lyrical version of "Round Midnight," during which his cavernous tone roared.

Rain fell for the second straight night at the festival. A downpour came during Gillespie's appearance, scattering most of the crowd. It returned moments later for Byas' performance.

Flutist Herbie Mann's group also performed briefly Saturday night.

On Saturday afternoon, trumpet, drum and violin workshops were held. Among the trumpeters were Gillespie, Joe Newman, Jimmie Owens and Ray Nance. The drummers included Elvin Jones, Chico Hamilton, Jo Jones and Philly Jo Jones. The violinists were Jean-Luc Ponty and Mike White.

Also performing during the afternoon were the Sadao Watanabe Quartet from Japan, the Elvin Jones Quartet and the Chico Hamilton Quartet.

#### NEWPORT: A SUCCESS

(By Hollie I. West)

**NEWPORT, R.I.**—"We're in the black," producer George Wein said early Monday when he ended the 17th annual Newport Jazz Festival.

"We didn't draw as many people as we did last year, but we didn't spend as much. The image is success. There will definitely be a festival next year. Woodstock lasted one year—we're in our 17th and we're still going strong."

The three-day event drew a total of 40,400 persons, compared with 80,000 in 1969 when the festival went in the direction of rock music for the first time. Police and festival officials did not encounter the problems with boisterous young people they experienced last year.

The largest crowd last weekend—18,000 persons—turned out Saturday night, attracted primarily by the non-Jazz acts of Nina Simone and the Ike and Tina Turner Revue.

Wein, who produces jazz festivals all over the world, got a resounding "yes" when he asked the audience of 7,500 persons if it wanted the 1971 festival to revert to the weekend of July 4, a date around which the 16 previous fetes were scheduled.

Not so happy were many people who expressed bitterness at the way many motels in the resort city raised room rates during the festival period. According to several guests who made reservations far in advance at a downtown Newport motor inn, they learned upon arriving that they would be charged \$50 a day for a single room that ordinarily cost \$30 during the festival and \$12 to \$15 in non-tourist seasons.

Single room rates at other mid-city motels were reportedly between \$35 and \$40.

Closing the festival on Sunday night was singer Ella Fitzgerald who received several standing ovations for her dazzling artistry.

Her impressive array of material included older songs such as "Crazy Rhythm" and "Satin Doll" and the contemporary "Spinning Wheel" and "This Girl's In Love With You."

Miss Fitzgerald was in exquisite form on "Crazy He Calls Me," a ballad associated with Billie Holiday. While soaring through "Rain-

drops Keep Falling On My Head," she brilliantly interpolated the "Oh Happy Day" melody and a lyric saying rain didn't bother her.

George Wein responded by putting his hands to his shaking head and looked at the cloudy skies that had sent down torrential rain on each night of the festival.

Preceding Miss Fitzgerald was the Buddy Rich Orchestra, a powerful, brass-dominated 15-piece ensemble that moved with throbbing energy through a suite based on the movie score of "Midnight Cowboy."

Also performing Sunday night were singer Leon Thomas and pianist-singer Lee McCann. Vocalist-songwriter Gene McDaniels performed "Silent Majority," his sharply worded song of social comment.

Roberta Flack was entralling on the Sunday afternoon program. The Washington singer performed deeply moving versions of "Reverend Lee" and "Let It Be."

Also appearing that afternoon was comedian Bill Cosby who, using the pseudonym Badfoot Brown, conducted his Bradford Buttons Marching and Funeral Band, a 12-piece rock-blues group that swung powerfully and used heavy amplification.

#### NEW SAFETY REGULATIONS FOR LONGSHOREMEN

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**MR. MAILLIARD.** Mr. Speaker, once again the present administration is showing its concern for the safety of America's working people. Taking note of growing containerization in our ports, outgoing Secretary of Labor George Shultz, on June 26, issued proposed new rules regarding longshore safety as authorized under section 41 of the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

The proposed rules, which would be administered as part of the Bureau of Labor Standards' longshore safety program, provide that cranes be equipped with load-indicating devices enabling the operator to know at once if a load is too heavy and therefore unsafe. This is a creative example of adapting new technology to the benefit of our workers.

Proposed container regulations call for the permanent marking on containers with the weight of the empty, the intended cargo weight, and the sum of the two, and provide that containers may not be hoisted unless the actual gross weight has been certified by an approved weighing station. Under the proposed rules, no container can be hoisted if its certified weight exceeds the maximum intended weight, or if it exceeds the capacity of the crane. Visibly defective containers would have to receive special, safe handling.

These forward-looking proposals are intended to meet the challenge to on-the-job safety created by advancing technology in our second most hazardous industry. The Bureau of Labor Standards is to be commended for preparing the proposals, and the administration credited for once again moving to protect the lives and limbs of America's working people.

## ON YOUTH: "OLD MYTHS AND NEW REALITIES"

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered by Stephen Hess, National Chairman of the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

I found his remarks sobering and worthy of attention, and I commend it to my colleagues:

## ON YOUTH: "OLD MYTHS AND NEW REALITIES"

(By Stephen Hess)

We are a nation fervently committed to George Bernard Shaw's adage that "youth is wasted on the very young."

It is perhaps for this reason that Americans annually spend \$5 to 7 billion on cosmetics; that middle-age men drive little red sports cars at excessive speeds; that antique women wear miniskirts; and that TV commercials suggest your hands will be as lovely as your teenage daughter's if only you use Joy.

This may also be, in part, why we are so outraged by the manifest alienation of today's youth and perhaps it is also a reason why we have constructed at least four myths about our children which allow us some unwarranted comfort in our old age.

The first part of my remarks shall be addressed to these myths and to some new realities.

Myth No. 1 is that the alienation of American youth is a college or elite phenomenon; that it is merely a byproduct of a pampered generation, economically protected from the realities of "the real world."

Myth No. 2 is that the end of the war in Indochina will signal an end to youth protest; that a return to normalcy will be in direct proportion to the number of troops withdrawn from Viet Nam; and that after the war, young people will again behave as we would like to believe that we behaved when we were young.

Myth No. 3 is that youth alienation is a fad. It too shall pass. Remember flagpole sitting, gold fish swallowing, panty raids?

Myth No. 4 is that young people will "settle down" just as soon as they leave school, get married, and start to support families. In other words, that alienation is a product of youth which will end when youth ends.

Let's now turn to the first myth . . . the college phenomenon.

There are some 40 million youth between the ages of 14 and 24 in the United States. Fifty-four per cent are in school. And of these, 7 million or 33 per cent attend colleges and universities.

Not all students, of course, are engaged in sit-ins, lie-ins, and shout-ins. A great many are neither disruptive nor rebellious. These are "the good kids" for whom being chosen cheerleader or quarterback or "most likely to succeed" is still a worthy aspiration.

Yet clearly we and our mass media have become infatuated with the dissenters on our campuses. One explanation for this obsession is that the protesters are the children of those who manage the news media. They are also the children of those who teach, write books, do research, run our businesses and industries, and determine our social policy. In short, they are *our* children. Of course they concern us. There has been a drug problem for years, but it used to be primarily confined to the ghetto. The seriousness of drugs was only recognized when "grass came to the suburbs." So too is it with youth alienation.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Numerous explanations have been offered for the dramatic increase in dissatisfaction among middle class youth. Briefly, they include: *industrialization*, which leads to an increase in the amount of time young people must spend in the holding stage of adolescence; *affluence*, which gives more and more youth more and more freedom to deal with what they think is wrong with our society; the *education system*, which many perceive as having changed little in the past 25 years although the world has changed much; the *mass media*, which not only brings the news faster, but in more traumatic fashion; *violence*, which seems to occur with growing frequency and tends to convince many youth that there is no sense to dialogue; and *government policy*, which makes supreme calls upon youth without their consent.

We must recognize, however, that there are other types of youth and other types of youth alienation. There are some 5½ million young people who are not white and many others who are white and poor. During the first quarter of this year, 32.7% of minority group teenagers in the labor market were unemployed; 12% of white youth could not find jobs.

These are the children of poverty who cannot afford the luxury of involvement in what many college youth see as relevant. The needs of poor youth are of a more immediate and less abstract nature. Rather than the pollution of our streams, they are concerned with the pollution of their neighborhoods and homes; rather than concern with the governance of educational institutions they are concerned with how one finds work without the required academic credentials; rather than concern with the legalization of marijuana, there is a concern with how one avoids pushers and dope addiction; rather than a concern with how one changes the system or removes oneself from it, there is a desperate effort to gain access to the system.

In many instances, unlike their middle class counterparts, poor youngsters do not seek to opt out. They do not appear to reject the very style which many affluent youth ridicule. There are many blacks, Chicanos, Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Appalachian youth who no doubt would be glad to change places with those who are seeking relevance. Unfortunately, many of the poor feel that despite their effort to abide by societal ground rules the system has abandoned them. Their increased militancy reflects a need to establish counter institutions and new ground rules. Their frustration is often grounded in the belief that the institutions now governing their lives are actively committed to keeping them on the outside, always looking in. This too is youth alienation.

Then there is in the youth population another 12 million or 33% who are employed. And another 14% who are primarily teenage housewives. And another 8% who are in the military.

These working class youth, the "hard-hat-blue-collar" youngsters, often stand in the middle between the poor and the affluent. They feel that they are the only ones who follow the rules, work hard, and appreciate their country. They see the middle class and the poor (particularly minority youth) as being coddled and overly supported. They see the groups on either side of them as not appreciating what has been done for them. In reaction, they often become openly hostile toward these other youth as well as toward the institutions which they perceive as neglecting them in favor of those who most reflect the traditional norms of our society. And this too is youth alienation.

My purpose in stressing the need to recognize that youth alienation goes beyond the more articulate and affluent college student is not to negate or ridicule their concerns and apprehensions. Rather it is to make very clear that youth alienation is not limited to any one segment of youth, which is an important consideration for all of us in

July 20, 1970

the business of trying to relate youth to our social institutions, and which makes the job of bridging the generation gap, as Theodore Roosevelt once said in another context, as difficult as trying to nail currant jelly to the wall.

In turning to myth No. 2—that the end to the war in Indochina will signal an end to youth protest—I do not mean to question the depth of feeling among youth about our involvement in Viet Nam or the degree to which the war has helped create a protest ethos among the young. Obviously the war is not only a major factor in youth alienation, but it is doubtful that we can truly attempt to rebuild confidence in our national institutions until young people come to believe that the government is seriously trying to extricate itself from Southeast Asia.

Nevertheless the concerns of youth go well beyond the boundaries of any one issue or social institution. In order to highlight this point I would like to share with you the results of a youth survey just completed last week for the White House Conference on Children and Youth as a public service by the Gilbert Youth Research Corporation. It should be kept in mind that this data was collected in March of this year prior to the events of Cambodia, Kent State and Jackson State.

The survey is a national representative sample of 3,000 youth between the ages of 14 and 24. It includes males and females, youth in school and out of school, and youth from every section of this country.

In response to the question, "Do you believe there is a so-called generation gap between you and your parents?"—40% of the youth sampled answered in the affirmative.

The feeling of generation gap is not limited to parents. A total of 42% believe that our constitutional form of government needs considerable change. Over a third believe they would not have volunteered for military service in World War II. Six per cent state they would have refused to serve if drafted. And 17% of the total group chose the Don't Know category in answering the question dealing with what they would do if they were called for military service.

The survey also suggests that many young people are accepting violence as part of the American life style. Almost half (47%) believe it will require drastic action on the part of individuals and groups in order to achieve equal rights for minority groups. Eighteen per cent do not believe that equal rights can be achieved without violent revolution. A fourth do not believe that equal rights can be achieved under our present form of government. Again, another 23% feel that violence is sometimes justified in order to attain social or political goals.

The 1,154 young people who felt violence was sometimes justified set the following conditions: 523 felt violence was appropriate in order to dramatize a vital issue; 935 felt it was justified when all other means failed; 521 felt it was acceptable in order to bring about government reform; and 263 believed it was justified in efforts to overthrow the present form of government.

In studies dealing with drug use among youth, there is general agreement in two areas: First, that drug use represents a form of defiance and alienation; and second, that there is a tendency among youth not to admit to using drugs. As a result, estimates of drug use based on personal admission are considered conservative at best. It was for these reasons that I was impressed with the following data:

Over a fourth of the young people in this sample admit they have used drugs at some time.

One-fifth of those under 17 years of age report they have tried drugs. The proportion experiencing drugs increases as youth move from high school into college.

Sixty per cent believe that at least half their age group have used drugs.

These and other data of the Gilbert Survey graphically underscore that the growing alienation of our young is not tied to one issue and will not evaporate—"like the evanescent morning clouds over San Clemente" as the political poet Daniel P. Moynihan once said—when Johnny comes marching home.

For the third myth—that youth alienation is a fad—one might usefully look beyond the present college students to their younger brothers and sisters in junior and senior high schools.

During the 1968-69 academic year well over 300 incidents of high school disruptions were reported in the press. In a survey of junior high school principals 56% indicated some type of protest or confrontation in their schools. (And these were not student pranks or horseplay.) Moreover, some 500 high schools now have underground newspapers.

There is indeed a significance in the degree to which "young youth" are being politicized, even radicalized. This shows up in the number of high school students who have been involved in war moratoriums, in the number who have been working in political campaigns, and in the degree to which high school students are getting into hard drugs.

Last week I received a letter from a woman in Galena, Illinois, enclosing a remarkable essay by her 13-year-old daughter. It began, "I am still in grade school, and today's youth are old folks to me." And it ended, "Hang on world! Here comes my generation!" This I do believe.

Thus I feel it would be folly to think that we are witnessing a youth fad and that this too shall pass. Equally, as in myth number four, it is wishful thinking to expect that once this current crop of youth enters the "real world" of adult life, their alienation—and our problems—will be over. If we are to accept the reasons given by social scientists for the mood of today's youth, we cannot anticipate a decline in alienation and unrest unless there are serious changes in how we deal with you.

Nor do I believe that once this generation of youth enters adulthood will they become just like the rest of us. Obviously, they will have new roles and responsibilities. They will need to provide for their families. They will need to operate schools, industries, and other institutions. At the same time I believe there will be significant differences in how they go about the business of adulthood. I would speculate that there will be less emphasis on economic security and more on personal growth and development. The status of occupation will be of less importance than the nature and quality of the work. There will be more women working and an equaling out of parental roles. Traditional notions of a man's rights and prerogatives will be challenged and modified. There will be a retreatism to self and to family, while, paradoxically, at the same time there will be a more overt commitment to work in the social and political arena.

Our political parties will have to make the adjustment from "the politics of distribution" to what Robert Wood, the new President of the University of Massachusetts, has called, "the politics of innovation." Instead of "satisfying needs for goods and services, allocating scarce resources, mediating between conflicting classes or ideologies (business and labor, farm and city), as in the present "politics of distribution," the focus of concern in the new "politics of innovation" will become nothing less than "the quality of national life." Raising minimum wage levels and providing farm price supports are the staples of the old politics; combating pollution, building community colleges and art centers will be the staples of the new politics.

As the attitudes and behavior of youth have been changing, so have those of adults.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

At a time when working toward understanding each other is so imperative, we seem to be growing apart. Too many adults are turning away from their responsibilities of reasoned leadership and guidance. Too many adults are trying to out-shout, out-intimidate, and out-confront the very youth who they accuse of shouting, intimidation, and confrontation. They are offering youth few examples to follow and little in the way of an opportunity for much needed discussion. Too many adults have been so offended by the form of youth protest that they fail to heed the content or the reasons for the protest.

Despite the urgency of the problem and the visibility given to it, generational polarization increases. It is cause for reflection that adult support for corporal punishment in our schools has more than doubled (to over two-thirds) since the 1940's, according to a series of Gallup polls.

In Pennsylvania several members of the state legislature have proposed that all public schools be classified in the same category as penal institutions and hospitals for the mentally ill, thus shifting the status of youth from student to "inmate." A recent survey conducted by Mervin Field in California indicates that a number of significant changes have occurred over the past two years in how citizens of this state feel about the behavior of college students. Increases have occurred in:

1. The number who favor expelling students who challenge authorities.
2. The number who oppose greater student voice in deciding campus rules.
3. The number opposed to increasing enrollment of black students.
4. The number who do not believe that calling in the police radicalize moderate students.
5. The number who do not believe professors should have the freedom to speak and teach as they see fit.
6. The number who feel that campuses should not be free of political control.

My purpose in dealing with each of these issues is to emphasize the depth and complexity of the problem of youth and our society. My purpose is to impress you with what it has taken me some time to believe: that there are no simple solutions, no quick remedies; no one single group of American youth, no one single issue, no one institution associated with youth dissent; that there is a general doubting and questioning of traditional values and expected behaviors; and finally that unless we do come together—youth and adults—we will see an increase in confrontation, protest, alienation, polarization, and oppression.

Whatever steps we take must be the joint effort of youth and adults. We must force ourselves to lay aside suspicions and hostility. We must accept the fact that there will be critical judgments made on all sides. Both youth and adults must enter into some kind of working consensus with a willingness to explore all issues affecting youth and our society. It must be an effort of sincerity, integrity, and commitment. It must be recognized that no matter what avenue we pursue in order to bring youth and adults together that it will be only a beginning—the start of a process that must continue.

During the course of the past several months my staff has been exploring alternatives in bringing youth and adults together through the mechanism of a national White House Conference on Youth. We have met with youth, we have met with adults who deal with youth on a professional basis, we have met with parents; and we have met with numerous youth policy and program people.

During this period we have developed sev-

eral different plans. Each was given serious consideration and each was rejected.

They were rejected because no plan would be credible or could fulfill its objectives unless youth themselves played the major and most critical role in the development and implementation of the plan.

Therefore, the White House Conference on Youth that I am announcing today is deliberately not a plan but an *outline*—an outline in which young people and others outside the Federal Establishment will have the mandate to fill in the details.

To get the process started, we have established just five basic "givens":

1. That there shall be convened a White House Conference on Youth next February in Washington.
2. That it shall be composed of two-thirds youth and one-third adults. (Young people have repeatedly told us that a youth conference must not be all youth, that they don't want to meet in a vacuum and just talk to each other, but rather that they want the opportunity to relate to the adult leadership of the country.)
3. That the Conference shall be issue-oriented and Task Forces shall be created in those areas in which youth have expressed greatest concern, such as Foreign Relations, Environment, Race Relations, Drugs, and Education.
4. That a planning meeting of the Task Forces shall be held in late August at which time they shall determine how they wish to formulate their reports, set the agenda for the Youth Conference, and decide on the delegate-selection process.

5. That the February Conference shall not be an end in itself, but must lead to a process of implementation that will involve all of our major social institutions and a large body of the citizenry.

We as a staff, of course, have some strong views on what the Conference should be, and what it should accomplish. For example, we feel that this should be a youth conference, not a student's conference, i.e., it should involve all types of young people—working youth, poor youth, youth in the military, teenage mothers, as well as students.

We feel that the Task Forces should review each issue as it presently relates to youth; that it should make predictions for the coming decade; that it should attempt to point out the consequences for youth and society if various policy actions are taken or not taken; that it should identify the goals we should seek to achieve; and that it should examine how to broaden youth participation in the decision-making process.

But these shall be suggestions, not directives. The Task Forces—two-thirds youth, one-third adults—shall tell us how they plan to proceed.

To prepare background material for these groups, we have brought 45 young people to Washington this summer. They are presently compiling the existing empirical data on youth attitudes on each issue; cataloguing programs, both public and private; and interviewing policymakers about what plans they have on the drawing boards. These materials, along with reports from state committees on youth and national organizations, will be presented to the Task Forces at their meeting in late August.

As you can see, we are trying to make the White House Conference on Youth as credible as possible. We have been told by the young that they want to deal with the issues—and they will deal with the issues. We have been told by the young that they want to meet with the people that count—and they shall. We have been told that they want to define the Conference in their own way—and we intend to allow them to do just that.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In many ways what is being proposed here is an experiment. We recognize the probability that our plans will need to be modified. We recognize that there are many potential areas for disagreement and confrontation. At the same time we are convinced that the risks are well worth the potential gains. We must begin somewhere and this is a start. Hopefully, others will learn from our difficulties and from our achievements. Perhaps from this convening of youth and adults we will have the foundation for other efforts. We have talked much of coming together—of listening to one another—of understanding one another. The attainment of such a goal cannot be the work of any one man, of any one group, of any one institution or political party.

It is my hope that no matter what is the outcome of the proposed Conference, others will seek other ways in which to bring youth and adults together. From this first National Conference should come similar efforts on the part of those who influence the policies of education, business, labor, religion, law enforcement, local and state government, and other major institutions.

From such efforts may come a realization that some of the norms, values, and procedures of the past are no longer adequate or appropriate; we may find, as many youth have indicated, that parts of the system must be altered. Most importantly, we may stumble upon a process by which we can combine our technological achievements with the energy and altruism of youth in order to bring about a society free of poverty, injustice, and inequality. We take but a solitary step in that direction, but I think an important one. It is a step away from myths and toward reality and it will hopefully be the first of many such steps.

## LINCOLN'S LETTER TO HERNDON

## HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert a letter written by Abraham Lincoln on February 15, 1848, to Mr. William Herndon:

DEAR WILLIAM: Let me first state what I understand to be your position. It is, that if it shall become necessary to repel invasion, the President may, without violation of the Constitution, cross the line, and invade the territory of another country, and that whether such necessity exists in any given case, the President is to be the sole judge.

Before going further, consider well whether this is, or is not your position. It is, it is a position that neither the President himself, nor any friend of his, so far as I know, has ever taken. Their only positions are first, that the soil was ours where hostilities commenced, and second, that whether it was rightfully ours or not, Congress had annexed it, and the President, for that reason was bound to defend it, both of which are as clearly proved to be false in fact, as you can prove that your house is not mine. That soil was not ours; and Congress did not annex or attempt to annex it. But to return to your position. Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation, whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so, whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose—and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect, after you have given him so much as you propose. If, today, he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada, to prevent the Brit-

ish from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, "I see no probability of the British invading us," but he will say to you "be silent; I see it, if you don't."

The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons. Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions; and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter, and places our President where Kings have always stood.

Yours truly,

A. LINCOLN.

## A SPECIAL REPORT ON DRUGS

## HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as an American citizen and as a parent of two children, I am sure I share with you a deep awareness and concern over the acute problem of drug traffic and drug addiction in our country.

Today the use of drugs is not confined solely to the ghetto areas, but it has infiltrated into every class of our society and it now poses a serious threat to almost every family and citizen in our Nation.

It is difficult to accurately quote the actual number of people involved in the use of dangerous drugs or those actually addicted, but the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has compiled statistics of actual hard core addicts and reveals that between 1960 and 1969 the number has risen nationally by 51.6 percent, while in Florida it has risen by 264.3 percent.

When considering those using marihuana, pep pills, or other forms of hallucinatory drugs, experts estimate that from 5 to 7 million Americans have used, or are using, drugs in one form or another. Instead of allowing these statistics to continue rising, we must all declare war to stop it.

Everything from marihuana and pep pills to heroin is being sold today in the schools of our Nation and, there is no doubt, to the children in the schools of the 10th Congressional District—perhaps the very school that your child is attending.

It is estimated that today 35 percent of all students in high schools and colleges use marihuana. Is one of these students your boy or girl, or a child of your neighbor?

Each of us must be aware of the seriousness of this situation since it has become apparent that no child is immune from the problem. It is indifference and apathy that are the weapons needed by the pushers to make addicts of our children.

The tragic part of all this is the number of deaths caused by drug abuse in

Broward and Dade Counties in recent years. I refer you to the table below.

We, as citizens, must stop ignoring the problem until it reaches into our own personal families. We must become aware.

No child, no school, no home is safe from this sickness that is rapidly prevading every element of our society.

I prepared this special report to aid and to better acquaint you with facts concerning drugs which your children, perhaps, may already know. Please study the material for your sake, for your children's sake and for the sake of America's future.

## Deaths caused by drugs

Dade County:	
1956-1967	4
1968	14
1969	37
1970 (five mts.)	22
Broward County:	
1968	4
1969	6
1970	3

## GLOSSARY OF NARCOTICS TERMS

Following is a list of major illegal drugs, how they are used, their popular names and the effects:

Marihuana—Called "pot" or "grass." Derived from female hemp plant. Usually smoked. A mild hallucinogen that distorts perceptions of time and space and coordination. Strong doses can cause short term psychotic reactions. Long term effects are not known. To use marihuana is to "get high," "turn on," or "get stoned." Marihuana cigarettes are called "joints."

Hashish—Called "hash," same as marihuana, except more potent.

Ampphetamines—Stimulants used to combat fatigue. Taken in pill form, although some stronger forms are dissolved in a liquid and injected with a needle. They speed action of the heart and metabolism. Called "bennies," "pep pills," "diet pills," and in strong doses, "speed." Not addictive physically, but psychological dependence is common. Larger doses are required for the same effect after a while.

Barbituates—Sedatives, called "goof-balls" or "downs." They relax the nervous system, slow the heart rate, lower blood pressure and slow down breathing. Effects can resemble drunkenness and users sometimes become irritable and angry. Physically addictive, like heroin, barbiturates are a leading cause of accidental deaths in the country.

LSD—A powerful hallucinogen called "acid." It causes sharp changes in perception. Nonaddictive, but can cause panic, paranoia, and hallucinations. Can also produce permanent derangement and physical defects. Mescaline, DMT, psilocybin are similar, but less potent substances.

Heroin—Called "junk," "stuff," "scag." Derivative of opium. Usually injected under the skin or "mainlined," injected directly into a vein, it depresses certain areas of the brain and nerves, causes physical and psychological dependence, and gradually takes greater quantities to achieve the same effect. Cocaine is similar.

If we are to save our young people from a life of horror, we must prevent their initial use of narcotics. If this is impos-

July 20, 1970

25087

sible and they have already started using narcotics then we must use firm efforts to help them stop. There are not enough doctors, or police to locate and examine each and every possible user, but there are enough parents and citizens if they will become concerned.

If you suspect your child is using narcotics call your family physician, your

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

local police department, or the sheriff's office of either Broward or Dade County.

If you need further detailed information concerning drug abuse, write to the National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information, 5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015; or write to me as your Congressman at 1127 Longworth Building, Washington, D.C. 20515,

and my office will lend such assistance as either I or my staff are able to do.

I have prepared this brochure in order to alert my constituents, many of whom are parents, to the various symptoms that drugs produce. Your interest in personally observing your children in any unusual changes in their normal behavior may prevent them from a life of horror.

Drug used	Physical symptoms	Look for	Dangers
Glue sniffing.....	Violence, drunk appearance, dreamy or blank expression.	Tubes of glue, glue smears, large paper bags or handkerchiefs.	Lung/brain damage, death through suffocation or choking, anemia.
Heroin morphine codeine.....	Stupor/drowsiness, needle marks on body, watery eyes, loss of appetite, blood stain on shirt sleeve.	Needle or hypodermic syringe, cotton, torn-quilt-string, rope, belt, burnt bottle, caps or spoons, glassine envelopes.	Death from overdose, mental deterioration, destruction of brain and liver.
Cough medicine containing codeine and opium.....	Drunk appearance, lack of coordination, confusion, excessive itching.	Empty bottles of cough medicine.....	Causes addiction.
Marijuana, pot, grass.....	Sleepiness, wandering mind, enlarged eye pupils, lack of coordination, craving for sweets, increased appetite.	Strong odor of burnt leaves, small seeds in pocket lining, cigarette paper, discolored fingers.	Damage to liver, inducement to take stronger narcotics.
LSD, DMT, STP.....	Severe hallucinations, feelings of detachment, incoherent speech, cold hands and feet, vomiting, laughing and crying.	Cube sugar with discoloration in center, strong body odor, small tube of liquid.	Suicidal tendencies, unpredictable behavior, chronic exposure causes brain damage.
Pep pills, ups, amphetamines.....	Aggressive behavior, giggling, silliness, rapid speech, confused thinking, no appetite, extreme fatigue, dry mouth, shakiness.	Jar of pills of varying colors, chain smoking.....	Death from overdose, hallucinations.
Goo balls, down, barbiturates.....	Drowsiness, stupor, dullness, slurred speech, drunk appearance, vomiting.	Pills of varying colors.....	Death from overdose, unconscious.

## DEKLE DeLOACH TO LEAVE HIGH FBI POST

### HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

#### DEKLE DeLOACH To LEAVE HIGH FBI Post

WASHINGTON.—Cartha Deke DeLoach, third-ranking official of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a native of Claxton, will retire from the FBI July 20, The Atlanta Journal has learned.

DeLoach, a 28-year veteran of the bureau, has been mentioned prominently as a likely successor to the 75-year-old director, J. Edgar Hoover.

DeLoach's retirement is set to go in effect on his 50th birthday.

The Georgian said Friday he will join Pepsico, Inc., a diversified food and soft drink firm in New York, as a vice president.

His position as assistant to the FBI director pays \$36,000 a year. DeLoach said his salary has not been established but "you can be sure that I will improve myself financially."

Confirming his retirement Friday, DeLoach said, "It's sort of an emotional thing after 28 years."

Pepsico President Donald M. Kendall said in New York Friday that DeLoach will be in charge of a broad range of activities particularly corporate affairs.

He said the company is "fortunate to be able to attract a man of DeLoach's caliber.

As one of two assistants to Hoover, DeLoach supervises the bureau's four investigative divisions: general criminal investigations, special investigations, domestic investigations and criminal records.

He reads and approves scripts for all "FBI" television programs and is generally in charge of the bureau's image-building machinery.

DeLoach was born in Claxton in 1920. He attended Gordon Military College at Barnesville, South Georgia College at Douglas and Stetson University at DeLand, Fla.

In December 1942 he joined the FBI as a special agent, spent 1944 and 1946 in the Navy and then returned to the bureau.

He became an inspector in October 1951 and in 1959 was appointed inspector in

charge of the Crime Records Division of the FBI. He was elevated to his present position in 1965.

DeLoach's retirement is likely to renew speculation on the most likely man to succeed Hoover who is already five years over the mandatory retirement age of 70.

Aside from financial reward, DeLoach gave no reason for his retirement other than he wants to spend more time with his family. He has seven children.

His exit from the FBI coincides with his reaching age 50 when he becomes eligible for pension.

Close friends here in Claxton said that DeLoach has been considering the change quietly for several months. He had been prominently considered as Mr. Hoover's choice to succeed him as head of the federal bureau, should he retire.

DeLoach has visited in Claxton many times in recent years, and has been keynote speaker for many historic occasions here. He was named as a member of the Board of Directors of the Claxton Bank some months ago, and has retained an active interest in his home town.

[From the Savannah Morning News-Evening Press, June 7, 1970]

#### DELOACH TO RETIRE

(By William H. Whitten)

CAXTON.—Cartha D. DeLoach, a top assistant to FBI director J. Edgar Hoover, and several times rumored to be his successor, instead will retire July 20 after 28 years with the bureau.

The youngest of the top men in the FBI (Hoover is 75), DeLoach will retire on his 50th birthday from government service to accept a management position with Pepsico, Inc.

Terming his retirement "an emotional thing," he said, however, in accepting his new job "you can be sure that I will improve myself financially." As Hoover's assistant, his salary is \$36,000 a year.

His FBI duties include supervising the bureau's four investigative divisions: general criminal investigations, special investigations, domestic investigations and criminal records.

He is also greatly responsible for keeping a good image of the bureau before the public. In addition to accepting speaking engagements himself, he reads and approves any television program scripts involving the FBI.

Joining the bureau in 1942 as a special agent, he returned to the FBI after spending two years in the Navy. Named an inspector in 1951, he was promoted to inspector in

charge of the crime records division in 1959. He became an assistant to Hoover in 1965.

He told reporters that he wants to be able to spend more time with his family (he has seven children) and that he also becomes eligible for a pension on his 50th birthday.

An active member of the American Legion, he has held a number of state and national posts. In 1964 he was named Georgia's "Man of the Year" in the Legion.

He was born in Claxton and attended Gordon Military College, South Georgia College at Douglas and Stetson University in DeLand, Fla. He received a distinguished alumni award from Stetson in 1958.

[From the Savannah Evening Press, June 9, 1970]

#### DELOACH To RETIRE

The town of Claxton has long been proud of its native son Cartha D. DeLoach, who rose through the ranks of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to become assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

Now the former Stetson University football star has announced that he is going to retire as an FBI official and enter private business.

Cartha DeLoach first joined the FBI in 1944. He became assistant to FBI Director Hoover in 1965 and has been in direct charge of all criminal investigations and counter spy operations of the agency. He served the FBI and the nation well, and we commend him for his record. We also wish him well as he begins his new assignment in the business world. South Georgians feel that he has been an outstanding credit to our area.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, June 14, 1970]

#### FBI LOSES A GOOD MAN

(By Louis Harris)

So far as I am concerned, the Federal Bureau of Investigation will never again be the same. Deke DeLoach is leaving.

We published a notice of his forthcoming departure a few days ago. Ran his picture, and everything. Even so, the announcement probably raised but few eyebrows and, with the possible exception of his local agents, myself, and some miscellaneous and sundry crooks hereabouts, held little personal significance for Chronicle and Herald readers.

Down the road a few miles—however—down around Evans County, and even Bullock and Candler, in all likelihood—I'd wager the reception of that information was something else again. Around those parts of the state most of the good folks know Deke DeLoach, if not all of them personally, at least by reputation. And they are mighty

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 20, 1970

proud of him. Down there he is more than the man who is third in command of the fabled FBI; he is a neighbor. Moreover, he is to the folks in that area a community product, a man born and raised in Claxton, and a Georgian still happy to call it home.

That is Deke. Or, if one wants to be formal. Cartha D. DeLoach, a most extraordinary fellow who has the happy faculty for getting the job done. That holds whether it is as a football player for Stetson University, which he was; as a Navy man in World War II, which he was; or as a tough, hard-working crime-fighter, trusted assistant to Director J. Edgar Hoover, dedicated family man and fun-loving, constant friend, which he is.

Over the years I am proud to have had him as a warm friend. It has been the sort of friendship a guy like me treasures because, basically, it provides a good feeling. It has been a meaningful one in so many ways, and it's been fun, too. I have proof of the latter.

Deke invited me to his home just outside Washington on a couple of occasions. Upon entering his family room on the first visit I noted a life-like mechanical parrot in a cage on a table, an "on" and "off" button conspicuously showing on the "bird." As you might suspect—and as Deke obviously knew I would—I pressed the button marked "on." Croaked the parrot: "Harris is a jerk! Harris is a jerk! Harris is a jerk!" If I hadn't pressed "off," I guess the darn thing would still be announcing a fact which the discerning G-Man had earlier detected and had dictated onto a tape concealed inside the parrot.

The second time I arrived at the DeLoach home, not only was I greeted by the name of the house and his lovely wife, Barbara—and, as well, by most of their seven children—but by widely displayed and very real looking "Wanted by the FBI" flyers on which were imprinted by picture and description, along with my "criminal record."

As yet another time, at a meeting of newsmen in Washington and just after I had been named chairman of tourism for the Augusta Chamber of Commerce, a huge picture of me standing by a dilapidated wooden shack bearing a sign "Chamber of Commerce Tourist Office" was shown the assembly.

The most outlandish practical joke irrepressible Mr. DeLoach ever perpetrated on me—he denied it, but I never believed him—came when he had someone leave in my hotel bed a real, live chicken. I got rid of the critter by putting it in another fellow's room, and the latter did the practical thing by putting it on the hotel elevator. What happened to it after that probably is known only to a bellboy or the hotel chef.

Playing jokes on friends, however, is far from being Deke DeLoach's only activity.

A Washington Star staffer gave a right good summary of his duties when he wrote the other day that, by title, DeLoach is the third ranking FBI official behind Hoover and associate director Clyde A. Tolson, but in effect the functional chief of four major divisions of the Bureau: Domestic Intelligence, General Investigative, Special Investigative and Crime Records.

In this role, the former Georgian has headed up all criminal investigations and FBI counter-spy operations. He has been one of the chief liaison men between the Bureau and Congress, the White House, other federal agencies, some of the top people in the Justice Department—and with the press.

Deke was a key man in briefings given President Johnson. He played the major role in the FBI probe of the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in Mississippi after the murder of three civil rights workers. He also headed the international manhunt which led in the apprehension of James

Earl Ray, who later was convicted of murdering Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

In the words of the Star reporter, Deke is known as a "Take-charge guy" who has no fear of responsibility, a man perfectly willing to tackle the intricate detailed work involved in FBI cases, yet readily acknowledging the ultimate authority of his two immediate superiors.

In his early years with the FBI—he joined the Bureau in 1942 but was away in WW II from 1944 until 1946—he established a reputation as a hard-hitting, hard-working special agent. He worked on bank robberies, kidnappings, car theft and cases involving national security. He was named an inspector in 1951 and later was promoted to assistant director while still in his thirties.

Since the war, Deke has been active as an official of the American Legion and, in his capacity as first-line public relations man for the Bureau, a public speaker.

Now he is leaving the FBI, a decision—as he said in a letter a couple of days ago—which did not come easy. He must, however, have good reasons for accepting the position of vice president with Pepsico, not the least one of which is that it will undoubtedly allow him more time to be with his attractive family.

So this man, of whom Georgians, specifically, and Americans, generally, can be proud—and to whom they also should be grateful—is turning in his badge and calling quits to an exciting and rewarding crime-fighting career spanning a total of 28 years.

The date set for his retirement from the Bureau is July 20. It is a date which also will mark his 50th birthday.

[From the (Washington, D.C.) Evening Star, June 5, 1970]

#### THIRD-RANKING FBI OFFICIAL RETIRING TO TAKE BUSINESS POST

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

Cartha D. (Deke) De Loach, veteran FBI official and operating chief of the bureau in recent years as assistant to director J. Edgar Hoover, is retiring next month to enter private business.

De Loach, who will be 50 July 20, leaves on that date to become a vice president of Pepsico Corp.

There was no indication at FBI headquarters as to who will step into the post of assistant to the director, although there is speculation that the vacancy will be filled by one of 10 assistant directors.

By title, De Loach is the third-ranking official in the FBI behind Hoover and associate director Clyde A. Tolson, but in effect he has been the functional chief of four major divisions of the bureau: Domestic Intelligence, General Investigative, Special Investigative and Crime Records.

In this role, he has been in direct charge of all criminal investigations and FBI counterspy operations. He also has played a major part in representing the bureau in relations with Congress, the White House, other federal agencies, the Justice Department of which the FBI is part, and with the press.

#### LIAISON WITH WHITE HOUSE

During the five years of the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson, De Loach was Hoover's liaison man with the White House and frequently briefed Johnson and his aides on cases involving national security, racial problems and FBI background checks on potential nominees for high office.

De Loach played key roles in a number of top priority cases, including the strenuous FBI effort to eliminate the Ku Klux Klan in Mississippi after the murder of three civil rights workers in Neshoba County and the international manhunt that led to the apprehension of James Earl Ray, later convicted as the assassin of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

De Loach's office on the fifth floor of the Justice Department building became the command center for hundreds of cases for which the FBI had jurisdiction. Hoover and Tolson, although retaining final authority in all matters affecting administration of the bureau, gave De Loach a long tether in day-to-day operations after he was appointed to his present job on Dec. 31, 1965.

De Loach has been known as a "take-charge guy" with no fear of responsibility, but at the same time reflecting the general viewpoint of Hoover, the man known to De Loach and everyone else in the FBI as "the Boss." His role under Hoover and Tolson was to take on the intricate detailed work involved in FBI cases, with the two older men continuing to exercise ultimate control.

His relations with a succession of Justice Department officials and attorneys general, like those of Hoover, were sometimes less than cordial. Before the CIA and the FBI worked out an amicable division of responsibility, De Loach figured in collisions between Hoover and the CIA over FBI operations overseas and CIA operations inside the continental U.S.

#### JOINED FBI IN 1942

De Loach, a native of Claxton, Ga., and a star football player at Stetson University, joined the FBI in 1942. He was in the Navy from 1944 until 1946, when he returned to the FBI. He established a reputation as a tough, hard-working special agent, working on the whole gamut of FBI cases—bank robberies, kidnappings, car thefts, national security—in several field offices.

In 1951 he was promoted to inspector, transferred to Washington and assigned to the Domestic Intelligence Division. In 1953, he was transferred to Crime Records, the section which not only keeps track of national crime statistics and trends, but also acts as the FBI's public relations and press office. He was promoted to assistant director before he was 40.

De Loach became known as a skilled public speaker and a prominent official of the American Legion. He also holds a number of honorary degrees and awards and is a prominent Catholic layman in St. Mary's Parish, Alexandria, Va.

De Loach and the former Barbara Owens were married in 1945. They have seven children and make their home in Fairfax County, Va.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 15, 1970]

#### FBI'S NO. 2 MAN ENDS PUBLIC LIFE

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON.—Next Monday marks the first day in private life of a good and faithful public servant—Cartha D. (Deke) De Loach, the assistant to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with time out for Navy service during the war, for 28 years.

No doubt he will be a fish out of water for a time—but a goldfish, as a top executive with the Pepsi-Cola Co.—because the FBI has been a way of life for him for so long. He was a son to J. Edgar and a brother to every good FBI man, and there have been few bad ones, largely malcontents.

When Deke announced his impending retirement, which came on his 50th birthday yesterday, there was a splashing of speculation in liberal circles as to what this might mean to the world's No. 1 law enforcement agency. Many of the deep thinkers on the Left agreed that this could only mean that the FBI was turning in their direction, as the Deke were responsible for FBI policy.

Nothing could have been more ridiculous, but this nonsense was widely accepted. So long as Director Hoover runs the FBI—and make no mistake about it, he does—the organization will continue to let none but

Americans stand guard over our safety to the best of its ability. Deke would be the first to say this, but he did not choose to become embroiled with men who are forever lunging into thought and generally missing.

The heavy thinkers said De Loach was ruling himself out as a successor to Hoover. Yet there is no reason why Mr. Nixon or any other President could not pluck De Loach from private life, if he considered his appointment as serving the best interests of the country, and he couldn't be far wrong.

Deke is leaving, as he had planned, for eight reasons—his beautiful wife and their seven children, including one in the U.S. Air Force. One can hardly raise and educate seven children on an FBI salary. So when he became eligible for his FBI pension, after more than 25 years of service and on his 50th birthday, he elected to accept a post which Donald McIntosh Kendall had been holding open for him for some five years.

This day is not entirely Deke's, because much of him will always belong to the FBI and to Hoover. He is the embodiment of the loyalty, the sportsmanship, the personal presence and the devotion to duty that mark the FBI man generally. It is true that he had some fine qualities in a greater degree than his fellows, or he would have gone so far so fast and enjoyed the trust and confidence of three Presidents and any number of Supreme Court justices, members of the cabinet, senators, representatives and a host of lesser officials.

For his farewell salute at the American Legion, where he has been chairman of the national public relations committee since 1959, men came from all walks of life, from all faiths and of all races. In the interests of accuracy it must be noted there wasn't a single Communist present, nor anyone left of center.

Deke is gone but the FBI is carrying on. His post is being filled by William Cornelius Sullivan, another man of ability and charm. And, if Sullivan should go, Hoover has ranks of dedicated and competent men to choose from. This is the way every good organization should be run but too frequently isn't. There is only one indispensable man in the FBI, and he is the FBI. But we can be thankful he is continuing to make so many capable heirs.

#### CAPITAL IDEAS

(By Ray McHugh, Chief, Washington Bureau, Copley News Service)

**WASHINGTON.**—Newsmen are always warned not to become "personal" in their columns. It's a good rule. But today I'm going to break it.

I want to salute the best G-man in J. Edgar Hoover's Federal Bureau of Investigation before he retires July 20.

How do I know that C. D. "Deke" Deloach, assistant to Mr. Hoover, is the best G-man?

Easy.

My daughter, 5, tells me so at every opportunity. Deke is her Godfather. She could be right.

With the obvious exception of Mr. Hoover who looms like a colossus over the agency he has directed for more than 40 years. There are few men who can match the stature of this soft-spoken, fun-loving Claxton, Ga., product, who also can be a strict, no-nonsense disciplinarian.

Even in an organization where excellence is a common virtue, Deloach has stood out.

He ranks third in the FBI behind Mr. Hoover and associate director Clyde Tolson, but he commands four of the bureau's most important and sensitive divisions: Domestic intelligence, general investigative, special investigative and criminal records.

For the last five years he has personally supervised every major FBI criminal, civil rights and counter espionage investigation.

He commanded the trans-Atlantic manhunt that netted James Ray, the convicted

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

slayer of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. He had personal charge of the probe into the murders of United Mineworkers official Jock Yablonski, his wife and daughter, across his desk every day go orders affecting the apprehension of bank robbers, kidnapers, killers, car thieves, civil rights violators, embezzlers, confidence men and spies.

Deloach qualifies for any "10 most unwanted" list in the underworld, but with friends he qualifies as one of Washington's best-liked officials and its most notorious practical jester.

On an airplane trip, complying with law, he will calmly notify the stewardess and the pilot that he is an FBI agent, that he is carrying a gun . . . And that his unsuspecting companion is "my prisoner."

(That does wonders for your personal popularity on an airliner!)

Friends also have discovered that a stay in the same hotel with Deloach can be an ordeal. Some have awakened to find live chickens in their room, some have been rolled out at 5 a.m. by a siren tucked under their mattress and carefully wired to Deloach's room, across 100 feet of hotel front.

A visit to his home is no less risky. With his wife Barbara and his seven children playing willing accomplices, more than one guest, has suddenly been confronted with huge "wanted" posters bearing their picture and a gory criminal record.

Deloach joined the FBI in 1942 after Stetson University where he was a football star and the University of Georgia Law School. He served in the navy during World War II and was called to FBI headquarters in Washington in 1950.

From 1951 to 1959 he was inspector. The rank millions of television fans recognize who follow the Sunday night exploits of Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., on the popular "The FBI" show. (Deloach is credited inside the Bureau with having created the series. He and his associates screen every episode.)

In 1959 Mr. Hoover named Deloach an assistant director, tightening the personal bond between the two men. It won't appear in any official record, but friends describe Deloach's retirement meeting with "The Boss" as "an emotional thing."

"Emotional" is a word they don't like in the FBI. Mr. Hoover's organization is built on loyalty, dedication, performance and the solid premise that the Bureau is bigger than any agent or executive. Its success is based on the ability of well-trained men to move easily, almost unnoticed, from assignment to assignment.

William Sullivan, a competent, professor-like man who has concentrated in the field of Communist subversion, is already slipping into Deloach's duties. Like the tall, raw-boned Georgian, Sullivan is known for his fierce dedication to Hoover and the FBI.

But Washington is going to miss Deke Deloach.

Most of the men in Congress call him by his first name. He is a personal friend of President Nixon. He was a frequent guest of President Johnson in the private Presidential apartment in the White House. He knows virtually every police chief in the United States and his official duties and his work as voluntary national public relations chairman of the American Legion has won him friends in every State of the Union and a score of foreign countries.

Deloach has his critics, too. But they sing in a weak chorus.

Some have tried to brand him as "political" or as "a creature of Hoover." His vigorous stand alongside the Director against policies of Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Ramsey Clark made him a target for some Liberals in Congress. They liked it even less when he developed a close working relationship with President Nixon's Atty. Gen. John Mitchell and Deputy Atty. Gen. Richard Kleindeinst.

Like Mr. Hoover, Deloach for years has been a vehement foe of lax bail bond practices, light or suspended sentences and easy parole policies and he has fought suggesting from any quarter to change the Bureau into a "National Police Force."

If he isn't sympathetic with today's permissive society or the theory that protesters can ignore laws which curb their personal desires, it's not surprising.

There wasn't much room for compromise in the poor Southern red clay country where he was raised by a widowed mother who ran a boarding house to help send her son to college.

And there isn't much room for compromise in Mr. Hoover's FBI.

The law is an impartial thing to men in the Bureau. Their arrest record proves it.

Maybe Deke Deloach isn't the greatest man who ever served under Mr. Hoover. But he's the kind of man who has made every American proud of the FBI.

I didn't think he should leave Washington without a lot of people knowing about it.

Besides, if I didn't write this column, my daughter wouldn't speak to me.

## OUTSTANDING LEGISLATOR

### HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

**MR. HARSHA.** Mr. Speaker, it was with much sadness and a sense of personal loss that I heard of the passing of my good friend and former colleague, Cliff Davis of Tennessee.

Cliff Davis served the people of his district with great distinction as a Member of the House for 24 years. I consider it a great privilege to have known him and to have served with him not only in the House but also as a member of the House Public Works Committee.

Judge Davis was an outstanding legislator, and among his many legislative accomplishments were sponsorship of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the TVA Self-Financing Act, the Federal Interstate Highway Act, and the Tennessee-Tombigbee project.

Although he made outstanding contributions in many areas, he was possessed of particular expertise in the field of public works. As chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control, he was a champion of water resource development and made substantial contributions to water resource development, not only in the Tennessee Valley, but throughout the country. Many of these projects will serve as permanent monuments to his foresight and dedication.

In addition to his legislative ability, the judge had many endearing qualities which made him one of the most genial and popular Members of the House. He was always a most helpful and cooperative colleague, and he will not soon be forgotten by those of us who had the honor of knowing and working with him here in the House.

I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to his wife and all the members of his family in their great loss.

## FUEL CRISIS IN NEW ENGLAND

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to call attention to the critical residual fuel shortage in the New England area. I have received numerous and urgent telegrams stating that unless Federal assistance is secured to procure fuel oil, power shortages will result in many towns in New England.

Not only are there oil shortages but also liquid asphalt, necessary for road building projects, is in low supply in Massachusetts.

In effort to bring relief to Massachusetts and New England, I have contacted the President, Secretary of Interior Hickel, and Gen. George A. Lincoln of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

I am hopeful that these officials will provide prompt remedies to this serious problem.

I submit for the record various news items and communications I have received outlining the fuel crisis in New England:

[From the Patriot Ledger, July 17, 1970]

## AREA TOWNS REPORT FUEL OIL SHORTAGE

A shortage of low sulphur oil, increasingly required in the U.S. and Europe as an anti-pollution measure, and the failure of oil companies to expand production capacities fast enough have caused a fuel oil crisis in New England.

## PRICE UP 30 PERCENT

Several area communities have already reported an inability to get oil companies to bid on heating oil contracts and where bids have been received, the price has gone up 30 per cent.

Nationwide, production of residual fuel oil grades 5 and 6 (the basic heating oils) to running 20 million barrels behind last year's rate.

The major oil companies have cut back the amount of heating oil shipped to New England distributors 20 per cent.

Each oil company took a different tack, some cutting back the quantity shipped to customers by 20 per cent; others eliminated 20 per cent of their customers.

In addition to the oil shortages, liquid asphalt, a key road-building material, is in extremely short supply in Massachusetts.

"What you've got is a real fuel oil crisis," said a Washington spokesman for the oil companies.

The first indications of the problem came when area school systems found it extremely difficult—and expensive—to purchase number 5 and number 6 grade oil.

## NO BIDDERS

The Holbrook, Milton and Randolph school systems have been unable to find anyone to bid on their 1970-71 heating oil contract.

While Milton was seeking to purchase special "anti-pollution" oil with a low sulphur content, the other two towns were seeking only to buy conventional heating fuel. Nevertheless, Holbrook and Randolph received no bids.

Other towns have received bids, but at extremely high prices.

In Hingham, the school system expects fuel oil costs to go up 30 per cent. The town budgeted \$35,000 for heating fuel, and the school department now expects that an emer-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gency transfer from the reserve fund will be necessary.

In Sharon, the bids received for number 5 and 6 oil were so high that they were rejected. The lowest bid was 30 per cent higher than the \$31,200 spent last year. Stoughton reported a similar increase.

## HOMEOWNER PROBLEM

The situation will not hit the average homeowner until fall when he prepares to purchase heating fuel for the winter. Some experts have predicted that many homeowners may not be able to find an oil supplier.

It seems there are two basic reasons for the problem: a shortage of oil with low sulphur content and the failure of the oil companies to expand their fuel oil production capacities fast enough.

Low sulphur fuel is becoming required in both the United States and Europe as an anti-pollution measure.

Most number 5 and 6 oil presently available has a 2.2 per cent sulphur content. Pollution fighters want to cut this back to 1 per cent. This would reduce the amount of sulphur dioxide ( $SO_2$ ) produced by oil burning.

## LARGEST MARKET

New York City is perhaps the largest market now requiring the low sulphur oil.

Massachusetts was to have instituted a 1 per cent sulphur requirement in Boston and suburbs. But, owing to lack of low sulphur fuel, the state Department of Public Health has rescinded the ban for one year in the suburbs. The regulation is in effect, however, in the City of Boston.

The lack of low-sulphur fuel results from the growth of the European market for low sulphur fuel, from political crises in Libya, Syria, and Nigeria, and from the nature of the oil produced in Venezuela.

Venezuela supplies virtually all of the heating oil consumed in New England but the oil is the high sulphur variety.

The lack of import quotas on residual fuels and the expense of U.S. oils have been the cause of this dependence on the South American oil.

Shell and Esso are building plants that will remove sulphur from the Venezuelan oil but they will not be ready until 1971 at the earliest.

As an interim measure the oil companies planned to mix the Venezuelan oil with the sulphur-free oil now being produced in Libya, the Persian Gulf, and Nigeria.

But international crises have virtually destroyed this strategy.

## CUTBACK ORDERED

The Libyan government fell in a coup and the new government nationalized several oil companies. Occidental Petroleum, which has vast oil holdings in Libya, was ordered to cut back its production from 800,000 barrels per day to 500,000. Moreover, the Libyan government has been predisposed to sell oil to Europe rather than to the United States.

The Nigerian Civil War was fought in part over the oil wells in Biafra and production in the war-torn nation has been slow to resume.

The continuing war in the Middle East has further caused a shortage of fuel oil. A major pipeline carrying residual oil was sabotaged in Syria and the Syrian government has not permitted the line to be repaired.

In addition to the international situation, Europe has adopted the goal of 1 per cent sulphur fuel oil for its factories. The demand for the product has increased sharply on the continent.

But the lack of low-sulphur oil is only part of the problem.

## NUCLEAR POWER

In making their projections about oil needs in the seventies, the oil companies assumed that electric generating stations, a major

July 20, 1970

consumer of fuel oil, would be switching to nuclear energy. This, the oil companies reasoned, would reduce the need for residual oil.

However, nuclear power has yet to prove 100 per cent successful and many utilities are returning to oil fueled plants. The consumption of oil for electric generating purposes, in fact, increased nine per cent last year.

Said a Washington official, "We are in for a year or two of a major energy crisis."

The crisis has led Sen. Edward M. Kennedy to call upon the White House and the Department of the Interior to see if anything can be done to ease the problem.

Several people have suggested delaying the start of low-sulphur requirements for at least a year until production capacity begins to meet the demand.

This is, obviously a less than satisfactory solution but no other suggestions have been offered to date.

New refineries producing low-sulphur fuel are now under construction in Venezuela and elsewhere. They will be finished next year. That should bring the crisis under control.

Until, then, however, a nervous—and possibly cold—winter looms ahead in New England.

## PLEA FOR ASPHALT SENT TO NIXON

[From the Boston Globe, July 17, 1970]

(By Paul Sawin and Jack Gallant)

Calling the asphalt situation in Massachusetts "desperate," Gov. Sargent yesterday wired President Nixon to take action that would "avert layoffs of thousands of workers."

Sargent asked that restrictions on imported asphalt be lifted since "domestic suppliers cannot supply" enough.

One of the largest suppliers in New England laid off 250 workers for two days.

Thomas F. O'Donnell, president of Tri-mount Bituminous Products Co. of Everett, said it was the second time in the company's 50-year history that workers were laid off because of a shortage.

"I've been in business since 1920," O'Donnell said "and have never had a situation like this. We had to lay off today. We are going back to work Monday and see how long we can go."

The company is involved in runways, ramps and taxiways at Logan Airport and surfacing on Rte. 2 in Cambridge and Arlington and the Massachusetts Turnpike.

In Washington, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel has been under pressure from the Massachusetts Congressional delegation to ease import quotas.

"There is every hope," a department spokesman said yesterday, "that the situation will be eased in the next few days."

Both Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and Rep. Torbert Macdonald have advised Hickel that Massachusetts' road resurfacing projects are being endangered and have asked immediate release of more oil imports.

After a closed-door meeting yesterday with Commerce Commr. Carroll P. Sheehan, Sargent wired the President:

"I urge your immediate action to lift restrictions on the importation of asphalt, necessary to end critical shortage in Massachusetts and avert layoffs of thousands of workers. Canadian supply available. Lifting these import restrictions will have no adverse effect on domestic oil industry. Vital public and private constructions projects being brought to a standstill."

"If the Government would stay out of it," O'Donnell said, "and let them import crude and finished asphalt we would be all right. We had to lay off one day last week and two days this week."

"I don't know how much that is in dollar value but it means a lot to us."

July 20, 1970

25091

The 72-year-old executive said the shortage of asphalt is the worst he has seen. One of his major suppliers, Humble Oil and Refining Co. presently has some No. 6 fuel oil used in making asphalt. O'Donnell said he is now waiting for his company is directly involved with the shortage of crude oil. This in turn is scarce because of the growing demand for a low-sulphur fuel that will conform to anti-pollution regulations. Oil companies are changing their refining processes and there is less petroleum byproduct for making asphalt.

Warren Brothers of Cambridge is another large asphalt producer feeling the pinch.

A spokesman for the company said there had been no layoff but that the "situation is serious. The oil companies have put all customers on a quota that is 75 per cent of what they bought last year."

QUINCY, MASS.,  
July 17, 1970.

Congressman JAMES BURKE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

Am advising you of potential critical situation in town of Braintree. Desperately need your assistance. Federal assistance is necessary in order to procure necessary supply of fuel oil for Braintree power supply. Braintree contract for heavy fuel oil expires July 31, 1970. At that time Braintree will only have two weeks supply on hand for power. Public safety a necessity demands immediate action from United States Government and your assistance is urgently requested to alleviate serious crisis in Braintree. For further information contact Alban G. Spurrel, Braintree Electric Light Dept., 44 Allen St., Braintree, Mass.

JAMES R. MACINTYRE,  
State Senator.

BRAINTREE, MASS.,  
July 14, 1970.

Congressman JAMES BURKE,  
Washington, D.C.

Braintree Light Department advertised on June 17, 1970, for bids on 350,000 barrels #6 oil. At the bid opening on July 13, 1970, no bids were received. Notices from four suppliers of #6 fuel stated that they were unable to obtain the fuel necessary to submit a bid.

Braintree's contract for heavy fuel oil expires on July 31, 1970, and at that time we will have about two weeks supply on hand. Failure to obtain a fuel supply will result in shutdown of the town generating facilities. Shortage of power in the area is already critical and curtailment of even this small generating system will add to the serious power shortage problem now facing the New England area.

Your immediate attention to this serious problem coupled with firm action necessary for its correction is urgently needed and most respectfully requested.

Respectfully yours,

ALBAN G. SPURREL,  
Manager, Braintree Electric Light Dept.

MASSACHUSETTS TURNPIKE AUTHORITY,  
Boston, Mass., July 9, 1970.

Hon. JAMES A. BURKE,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: As you perhaps know, we have a massive resurfacing and repair program in progress on the Massachusetts Turnpike.

I have just been informed by our asphalt suppliers that, due to shortage of crude oil, there will be only limited quantities of asphalt available to complete our fast-moving and well-organized resurfacing operation.

I am informed that the only way to make this necessary asphalt available is through an increase in import allowances of crude oil.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We will appreciate your assistance in this matter with the President and the Secretary of the Interior.

Very truly yours,  
JOHN T. DRISCOLL.

TRIMOUNT BITUMINOUS PRODUCTS CO.,  
Everett, Mass., July 8, 1970.  
JOHN T. DRISCOLL,  
Chairman, Massachusetts Turnpike Authority, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. DRISCOLL: We enclose report indicating our application for an import quota to relieve the present shortage of liquid asphalt.

Unless the Government allows more asphalt to come in, paving programs are in serious jeopardy.

Very truly yours,  
THOMAS F. O'DONNELL,  
President.

OLD COLONY CONSTRUCTION  
CO. OF QUINCY,  
Quincy, Mass., July 7, 1970.  
Hon. JAMES BURKE,  
Quincy Post Office, Washington Street,  
Quincy, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: Enclosed for your information please find notice regarding Asphalt shortage and possible Oil shortage.

Very truly yours,  
JOSEPH F. CAHILL,  
Vice President, Sales.

EXTRACT FROM PLATT'S OILGRAM, DATED  
WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1970  
INTERIOR DEPARTMENT SEEKS TO RELAX ASPHALT  
IMPORTS

Oil Policy Committee working group plan to liberalize asphalt import controls in effort to meet current supply problems.

Interior's proposal, worked out in Oil Import Administration, is being kept under wraps pending review of several other proposals now before OFC.

Interior's argument reportedly is that imports policy involving asphalt shouldn't be made by Oil Imports Appeals Board which now has before it eight petitions for relief allocations on grounds of exceptional hardship.

At least three petitioners are based in New England. Guyot Co., New Haven, Conn., asked OIAB for "quota" to import 715,000 bbl of asphalt immediately, or its equivalent in crude tickets. Guyot said in 1969 it sold 29.8-million gal asphalt, whereas this year it has been able to purchase only 4.7-million gal.

Guyot said its suppliers—Mobil, Shell and Chevron—have informed company of "an absolute shortage of finished-product asphalt not only in New England, but on the entire Eastern seaboard." Company also said new antipollution ordinances have had "damaging effect" on asphalt supply. Guyot isn't "historical" importer; hence, is ineligible under existing control program.

Trimont Bituminous Products, Everett, Mass., petitioned for 1,600,000 bbl of asphalt immediately, or alternatively its equivalent in crude.

In other petitions, Seroc Inc., Sherbrooke, Que., doing business in Vermont, asked for 5,000 tons of asphalt allocations; Belcher Oil, Miami, 2,212 b/d, and Southern Missouri Oil Co., with terminal at Springfield, Mo., 2,500 b/d.

BOSTON HOUSING AUTHORITY,  
Boston, Mass., June 5, 1970.  
Hon. JAMES A. BURKE,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

Subject: Increased cost of Nos. 5 and 6 fuel oil—Boston area.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BURKE: We wish to report that No. 5 fuel oil has increased five times since our fuel oil contract became

effective July 1, 1969. This increased totalled 67 cents per barrel and this was an increase of 28% above the contract price effective July 1, 1969. The No. 6 fuel oil has been increased six times since July 1, 1969 and the total increase amounts to 73 cents per barrel which is an increase of 40% over the contract price of July 1, 1969.

It is hoped that some relief will be found for residents of the Boston area in the near future to reduce the cost of fuel oil and bring it more in line with other areas of the country.

Very truly yours,  
LEO J. DONOVAN,  
Director of Management.

## MEETING RURAL HOUSING NEEDS

### HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of the bad housing in this country is in small towns and rural areas, the result of decades of neglect by government. The National Rural Housing Coalition is a group of concerned Americans who are attempting to focus the attention of the American people and their leaders on this fact.

Clay Cochran, the chairman of the coalition, recently discussed the role of private and public groups in meeting the housing problem in small towns and rural areas. I commend his speech to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

MEETING RURAL HOUSING NEEDS  
(By Clay L. Cochran)

Casting about for as much cheer as possible last night, it occurred to me that 27 years ago I was a Field Examiner for FEPC under Clarence Mitchell, and one night in Dallas, we skipped dinner so we could continue talking since there was no place in the town to eat where both of us would be welcome. The changes that have occurred since then have not given any of us a fear sensation, like flying too fast, and our achievements leave us somewhere short of utopia, but they are sufficiently tangible to whet our appetites for more and soon.

In the fourth grade in school, I learned that food, clothing, and shelter are the three essentials for human survival. Not a word about conquering the world or dumping \$20 billion into moonshots. Here we are the richest industrial nation on earth, so rich we are polluting the whole planet with our industrial wastes and the carcinogenic gasses that flow from our overpowered automobiles, yet millions of families live in indecent shelter, jeopardizing health and disregarding their sense of personal worth and alienating the children.

We could discuss housing in small towns and rural areas from a dozen viewpoints, but I will dispose of several of them, and get down to what I consider to be most essential.

The NAACP I do not need to amplify upon or prove that all men have a right to decent shelter, including sanitation and clean water.

I assume that I need not spend my time laying out the statistics of need. Two thirds of the bad housing in this nation is in small towns and rural areas, and we need government subsidies to build 7 million dwellings there in the next 10 years. We said that last year, but I can assure you that what has

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

been accomplished since does not alter the figure.

I could impress or bore you with details on the inadequacy of the present housing programs designed to meet the needs of low income people, the poverty and apathy of FmHA, the continuing evidence of discrimination, the appalling failure of public housing to function in these areas, the incapacity of most of the HUD agencies to function in small towns and rural areas because most of the programs are operated to serve existing lending and real estate interests rather than the family that needs a house. Suffice it to say that the existing housing programs, as they are currently financed and operated are not going to come anywhere near meeting rural and small town housing needs.

People do have a right to decent housing; the need in small towns and rural areas is  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the national total; and the Congress, the President, and the Executive Agencies have failed in their responsibilities to get programs under way to meet this need.

So what should we do? First, there is the absolute necessity for an end to the stupid waste of money and human lives in Viet Nam and the callous waste of funds on games like moon junkets for the military industrial complex because decent housing for all Americans is going to call for the expenditure of funds which are currently going to the military and the technology gamemanship of recent years. The housing problem will not be solved without a decrease in military and militarily-justified expenditures as we toy with the "buzz saw of races and hatred" and the intriguing game of empire building.

But more than money is required. We must create the institutions necessary, not just to build roofs and bathrooms, not just housing, but decent communities. These must be activist institutions with participation by those whose needs are to be served. The housing programs we have which pander to the needs of the builders and bankers on an if, as, and when needed basis must be replaced by programs whose operators are expected to serve people. Never fear, the money lenders and builders will not suffer, indeed they will make more money, but they must make it by building more and better housing and communities.

This nation needs a National Housing Bank, financed from tax funds. The function of that bank is to make an increasing flow of credit available for housing on terms which the family needing the housing can pay. For low income people, there should be a Federal representative at the community level, as FmHA has today, so that the person needing the house can deal directly with the bank and not have to go to law school to learn how to hustle the housing racket and then run the gauntlet of contractor, lender, realtor, lawyer, and all of the other hurdles presently in the way. Few people seem to realize the difficulty a poor man with limited formal education has in hustling the housing racket.

We believe that a family should have a right to own its home if it so desires, but that adequate rental facilities should be available for those who cannot or do not wish ownership. This means a tremendous increase in the rental housing program, particularly public housing with the possibility of ownership built in on a strictly voluntary basis. We have no stomach for any program to unload old public housing on the tenants, individually or collectively.

The Federal government has no right, moral or constitutional, to establish programs like public housing and then allow state or local governments to deny the benefits by apathy, stupidity, or bias against race or class. The Federal government must not only be the lender of last resort, and not too far down the hall, but it must also be the builder of decent housing where private en-

terprise and state and local government fail.

In short, we are going to have to make a much more uninhibited and disrespectful and creative assault on the problem if we are to succeed.

There are a great many specific items I wish I had the time to discuss, but I will close by just running quickly through some of them:

Farmers Home Administration's administrative funds must be increased many times over to enable them to do what we insist be done. They not only cannot handle the volume needed, but a shortage of manpower absolutely inevitably results in discrimination against the less affluent and minority groups. In the process FmHA is going to have to recapture its old crusading drive to serve people which it lost, more or less, twenty years ago or it must be replaced by a more creative, forceful agency.

HUD agencies are either going to have to prove they can function, under present policies in rural areas or small towns, or call for new legislation, or just admit that they are not going to serve these areas. We do not need any more task forces or tandem plans or any other gobble-de-gook from HUD. Let's have a program, new legislation, or an honest withdrawal from the field.

We must insist that the Federal government, through public or nonprofit housing prepare to eliminate this problem in the next ten years in a creative, democratic way.

Manpower programs should stress building skills and utilize their training programs to build housing for low income people.

OEO should quit dawdling around, and admit that it has a responsibility for housing the poor. Every CAP agency should have housing as a major item on its agenda and do whatever is necessary to get housing from organizing tenants, to putting a burr under the tail of the housing authority, waking up a sleepy FmHA supervisor—anything the local situation dictates.

HUD, FmHA, and OEO—prodded by the Congress—should establish a major self-help housing program along the lines of the Puerto Rican program so that local people can help themselves if the rest of the machinery grinds too slowly or not at all.

The private foundations should do some real pioneering for people and quit playing the game of nice, safe, overfinanced research programs like cancer research and spend some money getting a roof and clean water for those still alive.

The list is long, but the essentials are clear: Adequate funds at low rates of interest, or no rates at all, or grants to subsidize the cost of housing to the level the family can afford; the creation of people-oriented institutions to furnish guidance, technical assistance, and even housing at the local level; an end to kidding ourselves that technology will provide housing so cheap we all can afford it, without pain; a recognition of the fact that income-support programs are not enough. If we could put money into the hands of the poor, they could buy food—it is there to be bought; they could buy quite a bit of medical care, some of it is there to be bought; they could buy clothing, it is there. But until we do something about the housing supply, the poor could not rent or buy decent housing even if they ceased to be so poor. The additional funds would only provide a dandy fiesta for the speculator and slum landlords as we all bid up the price of the existing supply of houses.

The housing problem is not basically an economic problem; it is not a problem of technology. Basically, it is a political problem, a problem of forcing a commitment upon ourselves and our government to meet this need. To this, we must dedicate ourselves for such time as is necessary for this nation cannot long exist in anything like its present form—the good part—if we insist on segregated slums, ditch bank shacks,

July 20, 1970

dirt mounded, dirt floor Navajo hogans, children infested with worms from human filth, water that infects more people with disease than the medical facilities can cure.

Right On!

## SOME MORE OR LESS RELEVANT NUMBERS

## I. ON NEED

1. '68 sample survey (most recent data) indicated 4.7 million households in substandard units, even by Census' very restrictive definition of the term; two thirds of those were outside the metropolitan areas; one third of them (in both metro and non-metro areas) were occupied by non-white households (though only 11% of all households are non-white).

2. What it boils down to is that over half of all black households living in non-metro areas occupy substandard housing.

3. Looked at another way, if you are a white household living in a non-metro area, you are more than 3 times as likely to be in substandard housing as a white household living in a metro area; if you are a black household living in a non-metro area, you are 5 times as likely to be in substandard housing as a non-white family in a metro area or a white family in a non-metro area, and almost 12 times as likely as a white household in a metro area.

4. One of the few groups blacks might feel sorry for are the Indians, more than two thirds of whose households are occupying substandard units. In the remote areas of Alaska, it is estimated that something over 95% of the native housing is substandard.

## II. ON INADEQUACY OF CURRENT EFFORT

1. Public housing is our oldest, largest, and lowest-reaching program of assisted housing, and it has a pitiful record. OEO personnel have estimated that there are about  $10\frac{1}{2}$  million households with incomes equivalent to \$4,800 less for a family of four. If anything, this would underestimate the need for public housing, but using it as a measure of need, public housing—with less than 778,000 units under management—has yet to meet 10% of that need after more than three decades! In the non-metropolitan areas, it has not met 3% of the need!

2. Other HUD programs of assisted housing are even less in evidence in non-metro counties. Our best estimate is that less than 10% of FHA's assisted units are in the areas with 67% of the bad housing.

3. As a measure of non-commitment, let us look again at the Indians—at the rate of progress made by the BIA in the last two years (and this is spectacularly more than they had made in the decade before), it would take them two to three centuries to eliminate housing need on Indian reservations.

4. Congress set a 10-year goal two years ago, of 26 million units, with 6 million of them subsidized. We think—and Secretary Romney agrees—that the goal is probably too low. But even it is far beyond our present willingness to act. In the first two years of the goal period, total starts were less than 60% of the implied average, and subsidized starts only 42% of the implied average. Since we figure that nearly twice as many subsidized units are needed as the goal calls for, we are only doing one-fifth of the job.

## ITALIAN AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

## HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Italian American War Veterans Association, founded in the wake of the Second

World War, has continued to serve this Nation and its people. At the conclusion of the 22d year of the association, one is indeed impressed with its dedication and service. I congratulate the association for its commendable work in aiding the widows and orphans of war victims and the rehabilitation of veterans which has been expanded to other laudable endeavors such as hospital work, youth programs and many other worthy deeds in the community.

I commend the Italian American War Veterans for serving the human needs of so many in the past and for their continued service to the community.

#### DEALING WITH DEMONSTRATORS

#### HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 20, 1970*

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years this country has seen college campus demonstrations grow from innocent protests to violence-packed riots where lives are lost and buildings are destroyed.

West Virginia University experienced its first serious student disturbance last May 7. State police were called in and some damage was done.

As the enclosed editorial from the Wheeling News Register, edited by Mr. Harry Hamm, indicates, the question of what to do with those demonstrators who took uncalled for action during the protest is still up in the air.

If nothing is done in the end, then West Virginia University should not be too surprised to find itself with similar protest demonstrations on its hands this fall. If violators of university, State or Federal laws are allowed to go free, they undoubtedly will return to cause more trouble. If they are dealt with as dictated by law then students seeking to force their views on others by violence will think twice before acting in a similar vein again.

The editorial follows:

#### DEALING WITH DEMONSTRATORS

U.S. District Attorney Paul C. Camilletti has told West Virginia University officials that federal statutes apparently were not violated during the May 7 campus demonstrations at Morgantown.

Thus the District Attorney advises that further efforts to prosecute participants in the demonstrations "would only dignify an immature and irresponsible test of University disciplinary procedure."

On the basis of what we have read about this incident we would agree with the District Attorney. State Police investigation of the demonstrations found no basis for prosecution and this was the same finding of the Monongalia County prosecuting attorney. Federal officials and Mr. Camilletti were in Morgantown at the time of the demonstrations and reported they found no violation of federal statutes which would lend itself to meaningful prosecution.

Under the circumstances we believe it is up to University officials to take whatever disciplinary actions found necessary against those students who violated the rules and regulations of the institution. Now as for

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"non-students" who participated in the demonstrations, it is the duty of law enforcement authorities in cooperation with University officials to determine whether any state or federal laws were broken. If so, charges should be filed and the suspects prosecuted.

If West Virginia University hopes to prevent future trouble in the next school term officials cannot walk away from the May 7 demonstrations without any action whatsoever. Those who violated University regulations should be dealt with sternly and we mean expulsion from WVU.

#### SPEECH BEFORE RICHMOND MASONIC CONVOCATION AND CONCLAVE

#### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 20, 1970*

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the remarks I was privileged to make before the Richmond Masonic convocation and conclave at Richmondtown, Staten Island, on June 14 of this year:

#### REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY OF NEW YORK, RICHMOND MASONIC CONVOCA- TION AND CONCLAVE

Who first built houses and temples of stone? History does not say, but the early Egyptians knew much of stone building and their art in architecture still influences the world of builders. Freemasonry began with the cathedral builders of the middle ages. Architecture made Freemasonry, but, in its higher form, Freemasons made architecture.

So today, let me humbly pay special tribute to all Masons in the District. And let me just add a special note of praise for Beacon Light Lodge No. 701 which is celebrating its Centennial year with us here today. And I hope that your Masonic Museum and Library will someday rival the George Washington Masonic Memorial in Alexandria, Virginia.

The philosopher Santayana once offered the simple but difficult truism that if democracy is to succeed, the common citizen must be something of a saint and something of a hero. How apropos of today's chaotic clime. For a citizen must be a hero to maintain restraint and a saint in his unlimited patience.

As I gaze across the patriotic portrait of themes presented today, I see more than the colorful costumes of the members of the Empire Chapter of Demolay and two Triangles of young ladies. I see flags—American flags—their banners and standards. What could be more fitting than a Masonic convocation on our official Flag Day?

I see these flags and I think back with pride to only last year when the first moon pioneer—an American—landed on that lonely and forbidding celestial body to plant an American flag—the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought, and our purpose as a nation.

A nation's flag is no more than an emblem, a symbol. It has no other character than that which we give it. Our flag symbolizes the spirit of this nation and its people. As such, it is deserving of the respect we render to it today.

It is doubly fitting, then, that we pause on this special day, set aside each year to honor our flag, to reflect for a moment about the nation it represents.

We are living in troubled and often violent times. The nation is undergoing a pain-

ful and dangerous upheaval, a spiritual upheaval.

Alienation of the young, enmity between black and white, and a weakening of many of our traditional values and institutions all conspire to trouble the spirit of the nation.

This troubled spirit, as we have too often seen of late, has manifested itself in displays of disrespect and scorn of our nation's flag. It provides a convenient way to strike out and show distaste for the direction of our nation.

Our flag is spat upon and shredded while the flags of nations bent upon our demise as a world leader and democratic institution are used as rallying standards by some of our own, misguided or frustrated citizenry.

These kinds of inane and childish actions, whether taken in the name of greater voices for students, peace in Southeast Asia, aid for the impoverished, or civil rights, contribute nothing. You do not build a new and more responsive society by mindlessly demolishing the existing society, vilifying its leaders, and spreading violence and havoc throughout its fabric.

Crimes against the flag are crimes against society, the nation.

Our nation will not solve its many problems and continue to enjoy its many successes if we permit an atmosphere of unreason, violence and fear to persist. We will reap what we sow and a society bred on chaos will live in chaos.

What can we do? There are many of us—indeed most of us here—who still feel a surge of pride and patriotism when we see the flag because we know it represents the most successful experiment in free government ever achieved on this planet.

We can rededicate ourselves to those things which have made our nation great. We are living in a time of heightened awareness and sensitivity to the nation and world around us. So suppose we resolve today to make every time we see the American flag an occasion for reflection and rededication.

Surely the nation that can land a man on the moon, a nation that has defended and fed half the world, a nation that has unbounded technical and educational skills can achieve peace and understanding here at home. We must reflect on our greatness rather than rebel against it.

Let me close by saying that I am greatly honored to be with you on this Flag Day—to salute our flag, the nation for which it stands and all of you Free and Accepted Masons who have helped make it the greatest nation in the world.

#### FLAG DAY IN WEST ORANGE, N.J.

#### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 20, 1970*

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, the West Orange Junior Women's Club sponsored a successful Flag Day rally in West Orange.

I had the honor of attending and speaking on this occasion, which included a combined Boy and Girl Scout chorus, together with Brownies and Cub Scouts, on the program. Additionally, the West Orange Junior Woman's Club Chorus, conducted by Mrs. Francis Montuori, presented selected musical numbers in which the audience participated. Also in conjunction with the rally was a creative writing contest held in the West Orange

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

elementary schools on the topic "What the American Flag Means to Me." Rounding out the program was the recitation by Kenneth W. Robertshaw, commander-elect of VFW Post 2856, of an original writing entitled "The American Dream."

Mrs. John J. Rush, resident of the West Orange Juniors, served as moderator along with Mrs. Michael Degnan, chairman of the day.

I was proud of both the attendance and the spirit of the audience on this occasion, and believe that Flag Day was most appropriately marked in West Orange. N.J.

**CONGRATULATIONS TO RICHARD RODGERS ON 50TH ANNIVERSARY**

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the professional career of Richard Rodgers, one of America's most esteemed and beloved composers.

It was in 1703 that Andrew Fletcher, the Scottish political leader, penned those frequently quoted lines:

Give me the making of the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws.

There is certainly no doubt that we who are concerned with making laws would, to a man, happily echo that sentiment—provided, of course, that the songs would all sound exactly like the ones Richard Rodgers has been making for half a century. These, surely, are the songs of a nation. They have mirrored our hopes and our dreams, our vigor and our sensitivity, our good times and our bad. By their sheer melodic richness and compelling rhythm, they inspire even the most unmusical among us to burst into song. Or at least whistle.

Fifty years is a long time for any man to devote himself to any occupation. In the area of music it is especially noteworthy when changes in public taste make any career lasting longer than a decade seem like a miracle. But quality is always durable. Time never dims true works of art, it only enhances them. The creative output of Richard Rodgers has certainly stood this test; not only does he continue to produce music of unrivaled distinctiveness, his earliest creations still sound just as fresh and as captivating as the day they were first introduced.

Actually, Richard Rodgers has been writing songs for an even longer period of time than 50 years. When a television interviewer once asked him what he had done before becoming a composer, Rodgers replied simply, "I was a baby." At the age of 6, he had taught himself to play piano with both hands, and it was not long before he was able to pick out original tunes. He wrote his first songs at a summer camp in Maine when he was 14. The following year Rodgers composed the score—all 10 songs—for an amateur show. Two years

later he heard his first professional song interpolated in a Broadway musical. Then, in 1920, Richard Rodgers made his official entry into the ranks of composers for the musical theater. Early in the year he had become the first freshman in the history of Columbia University to be chosen to compose the score for a varsity show. This effort so impressed a Broadway producer that he signed Rodgers to write all the music for his upcoming production, "Poor Little Ritz Girl." Rodgers was all of 17 at the time. Even though, at almost the last minute, the producer decided to augment the score with music by a more experienced composer, it was the Rodgers' contributions that caught the attention of both audience and critics.

For the first 40 years of his career, Richard Rodgers had but two lyric-writing partners, Lorenz Hart and Oscar Hammerstein II. Both associations were terminated by death: Hart in 1943, Hammerstein in 1960. Rodgers' "collaborative fidelity," Oscar Hammerstein once wrote, "is significant, I think, because it illustrates a sense of pattern and constructive purpose which never leaves him. This is not just a professional habit but a view of life." Since Hammerstein's death, Rodgers has supplied his own words to his music, as well as writing with such talented lyricists as Stephen Sondheim and Martin Charnin.

The great influence of Richard Rodgers in the development of the American musical theater has been apparent to everyone. Almost from the very beginning of his career he has been an experimenter and an innovator, continually striking out in directions that had never been attempted before. In dramatic subjects, he and his collaborators have been concerned with an almost staggering variety of meaty themes—including the American Revolution, the adventures of a Connecticut Yankee at the Court of King Arthur, the rise and fall of a dancing heel known as Pal Joey, the development of the Oklahoma Territory, wartime heroism in the South Pacific, the need for greater understanding between East and West, and the struggle of an Austrian family to combat the evils of nazism.

These were themes of substance requiring music of equal substance to enhance their emotional appeal. Rodgers has met the challenge of every production with a continuous flow of unforgettable musical expressions. There is, for example, no gapping of generations in the world of Richard Rodgers. When we listen to "It Might as Well Be Spring," it is hard to imagine any other composer capturing so perfectly both the gaiety and melancholy of adolescence. When Rodgers deals with young love, as in the ardent "Younger Than Springtime" or in the bubbly "Sixteen Going on Seventeen," he knows exactly how to bring out the feeling of innocence in his music. When, as in "I Have Confidence in Me" from the film version of "The Sound of Music," he expresses the fear, uncertainty and final determination of the young Marie Von Trapp, we are all completely

under the spell of the spunky girl. And for those who think that doing one's own thing is a relatively recent phenomenon, it may come as a surprise to learn that Rodgers, along with lyricist Hart, created a buoyant theme song for female individualists over 30 years ago. They called it "The Lady Is a Tramp."

Songs of faith and inspiration have been written by many composers for many occasions. Yet when Rodgers and Hammerstein created "You'll Never Walk Alone" and "Climb Ev'ry Mountain" for two Broadway musicals, they produced works of such towering impact that they immediately became accepted as genuine hymns. Today they are part of academic and religious ceremonies all over the country.

Once Richard Rodgers has sung the praises of a particular locale, whether real or imagined, it remains his property forever; anyone else attempting a song about the same territory does so at his own risk. In fact, it probably would not surprise anyone in the least if children in Bangkok paraded to school to the stately beat of the "March of the Siamese Children," or if Tyroleans became misty-eyed over the tender strains of "Edelweiss," or if adventurous souls searched in vain for that hypnotic special island known as "Bali Ha'i." "Manhattan" was first heard on Broadway as long ago as 1925; its lilting theme is still recognized as the unofficial anthem of New York whenever it is played. The rousing, rushing ode to the great outdoors called "Oklahoma" captured the spirit of the Sooner State so perfectly that it is now the official State song. Rodgers has also offered us a highstepping "Kansas City," showed his appreciation for "The Little Things in Texas," confided that "Mainly I Do Like Maine," and happily paid his debt to the Hawkeye State in "All I Owe Ioway." We can almost map our country through the beat of Richard Rodgers' musical inspirations.

It was primarily in his collaboration with Oscar Hammerstein that Rodgers was given the opportunity of creating music that conveyed the wonder and the majesty of nature. A mere line or two is enough to recall the melody and to show how expertly the music evokes the proper feeling. "It's a grand night for singing." "Oklahoma—where the wind comes sweepin' down the plain." "Oh, what a beautiful mornin', Oh, what a beautiful day." "June is bustin' out all over." "The hills are alive with the sound of music."

Few composers possess Rodgers' skill when it comes to giving wings to a romantic emotion. What girl could possibly remain aloof once she is serenaded by a phrase as soaring as "With a Song in My Heart"? Or described in a graceful waltz as "The Most Beautiful Girl in the World"? What boy dares resist so tender a sentiment as "My Funny Valentine"? Or spurn the exuberant declaration, "I'm in love, I'm in love, I'm in love, I'm in love, I'm in love with a wonderful guy." One cannot help wondering, too, how many wedding receptions have been launched to the joyful strains of "I Married an Angel"—followed, of course, by

July 20, 1970

July 20, 1970

25095

a honeymoon at a small hotel and a life of bliss in a "blue room, far away upstairs."

Oscar Hammerstein once wrote:

Rodgers composes in order to make words fly higher or cut deeper than they would without the aid of his music.

That he has been able to do this with such constant brilliance is what makes Richard Rodgers the peerless composer that he is. Fortunately for all of us, the spark of genius that first lit up our musical sky 50 years ago is still blazing—as incandescent as ever.

#### ORGANIZED CRIME

#### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago, at the opening of a new district office, I was visited by Mr. Bjorn Andersen of Norwell, Mass., who is a retired Federal law enforcement official. Mr. Andersen was deeply concerned with the efficacy of our Federal machinery dealing with the threat of organized crime.

At my suggestion, he wrote down his analysis of the situation and some recommendations for streamlining Federal action. Mr. Andersen's comments shed a great deal of light on the current problems in this area of law enforcement. I have brought Mr. Andersen's views to the attention of Assistant Attorney General Will Wilson of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department. In order to share them with my colleagues, I include Mr. Andersen's memorandum at this point in the RECORD, along with Assistant Attorney General Wilson's letter commenting on them:

MARCH 2, 1970.

Hon. HASTINGS KEITH,  
Representative in Congress,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEITH: Thank you very much for your letter relating to our conversation at your Norwell office on February 21st. It was very pleasant to meet with you again and to discuss briefly the increasingly important crime problem and possible means of increasing the effectiveness and overall impacts of federal and local law enforcement agencies.

You request that I reduce my general proposal to writing and I shall do my very best to present my views in a clear, concise manner. However, that is easier said than done, especially in view of the fact that a meaningful presentation must of necessity include some consideration of inter-relationship between the subject matter, the federal court system, present interpretation of federal law, method of imposing sentence, role and function of the attorney general, U.S. Attorneys and Assistant U.S. Attorneys etc.

I simply wish to create a reader awareness that a reasonable evaluation of this proposal is not possible without total consideration of the entire spectrum of criminal justice. I am of the opinion that our court system is deliberately being undermined by people like Kunstler and the Chicago rioters. I agree with Judge Hoffman that these men

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

are dangerous (even vicious). Had Kunstler been in jail, where he belongs, I seriously doubt that the student riots in Santa Barbara would have occurred.

I suggest that the Black Panther Party trial(s) will be patterned along the lines of the Chicago trial, and that underground subversives are in effect testing the strength of the system. The ultimate aim obviously is to destroy the effectiveness of the courts and the law enforcement agencies—the classical prelude to break-down of other government functions. Tactics of present day radicals are very reminiscent of the Roosevelt Regime, when a virtual state of civil war existed at the Kohler and Auto-Lite Plants, and during the Chicago Bus Strike. Will we ever learn?

As I view it, law enforcement is extremely complex and to present an in depth analysis might be very time consuming both for you and for me. If I can work on the premise that the present discussion merely expounds an idea, I would prefer to attach an outline as a document separate from this letter. I only hope that this attempt at brevity will not obscure the intended meaning or becloud the basic thoughts.

Thank you again for your interest in this matter,

Very truly yours,

BJORN H. ANDERSEN.

#### MEMORANDUM

#### SUBJECT

Outline of a proposal for more effective use of existing federal law enforcement agencies in the fight against organized crime and Mafia Syndicates.

#### OBJECT

To stimulate interest in a centrally directed utilization of the full potential of federally controlled law enforcement agencies and through a logical progression of investigative effort, to collect information, intelligence and sufficiency of evidence to convict known racketeers and mobsters.

#### INTRODUCTION

This outline is submitted for information of and evaluation by Hon. Hastings Keith, Representative in Congress. In the interest of brevity, discussion of specifics has been confined to areas necessary to reasonable exploration of the concept presented. If the suggestions presented have any merit whatsoever, the basic outline may be supplemented as required for development of a more detailed plan of implementation.

#### HISTORICAL

Without going into details of the origin of the Sicilian Mafiosi, it should suffice for our present purpose to consider the evolution and development of the Mafia "family" as it existed during the early part of the present century, principally in New York City, and the subsequent branching-out of the organization's infiltration into various rackets such as prostitution, narcotics, bootlegging, labor racketeering and countless other enterprises. World War I and Prohibition contributed much to the rapid development of the Mafia and its control of the rackets.

The social and economic changes which followed World War II, resulted in considerable refinement of the methods used by Mafiosi in conducting their various operations. The climate was conducive to exploitation of completely new and vast sources of revenue such as Union insurance funds, organized gambling, night clubs, motels, call-girls and what not.

Jurisdictional disputes erupted within the various "families", resulting in liquidation of those who did not respect the unwritten "code". These little "family" quarrels resulted in a lot of unfavorable publicity and a few of the better known "Dons" (heads of

families) decided that the Mafia needed a new image. The open war-fare subsidized substantially and territorial disputes were "arbitrated" by a Board of Directors consisting of "family" heads (Dons). The business prospered and some aspects of it assumed an air of legitimacy by establishment of ostensibly legitimate "fronts". Financial control extended into Real Estate Trusts, Motels, the Entertainment World, Automobile Sales, Loan Companies, Institutional Laundries, Service Business, etc.

Production of illicit alcohol continued to be a big revenue producer in certain geographical areas and strange as it may seem, almost every one of the more prominent "dons" have arrest records for bootlegging, mostly during their early careers. Business had never been better, the coffers were bulging and the "Board of Directors" decided to extend their grubby little fingers into the courts, government agencies and local politics.

#### ENFORCEMENT

The principal law enforcement agencies of the federal government are briefly as follows:

1. The Secret Service.
2. The Alcohol & Tobacco Tax Division (IRS).
3. The Intelligence Division (IRS).
4. The Bureau of Narcotics.
5. The Customs Service.
6. The Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The task of developing evidence against criminal violators rests primarily with the six agencies mentioned. To a relatively small degree, some of these agencies have experienced corruption from within, scandal and a few convictions. However, as a general statement of fact, the federal law enforcement agencies have functioned reasonably well in the past and, generally, there has been an absence of direct political interference. However, there are a few well remembered exceptions to this.

Basically, each agency was originally created with a specific function in mind and each agency has attempted to function within its assigned area or sphere of operation. By this I mean that a Secret Service agent, for example, would not normally pursue the investigation of a suspected narcotics peddler, even though the suspect is also known as a "passer" of counterfeit money.

What probably would happen is that information relating to narcotics would be referred for action to the Narcotics Bureau. This gives rise to the distinct possibility that two agencies may conduct simultaneous investigations of the one and same individual. The logic of this contention can be extended to include all of the six agencies mentioned plus the Postal Inspectors and the Internal Security Division of the State Department.

Obviously this situation presents a wasteful expenditure of investigative effort, and much worse, interference by one or more of the agencies concerned. (Note: The writer is aware of the fact that a "coordinator" was created a few years ago, for the purpose of bringing order to the apparent confusion, but there is much disagreement regarding the value of the coordinator's efforts).

Theoretically, the various enforcement agencies are one, big, happy family—all for one, one for all. This is not the fact. Some agencies play their cards very close to the chest and under some circumstances, it has been impossible for two agencies to "work together". Whatever the cause may be, the net result is that the enforcement effort suffers. Petty mid-level management officials who lack the intelligence or experience to really know what they should be doing, have in some instances totally destroyed vigorous enforcement effort. Such men gear their work to filling in the little squares on the "Monthly Statistical Report", which in turn is used

as an evaluation tool by the next management level.

In substance, each enforcement agency tries to sweep its own front porch clean and does not necessarily concern itself with the litter on the adjoining agency's premises. Certainly no one is going to rock the boat by investigating crime areas not clearly defined in the "manual" (of procedure), a document so dear to the heart of the incompetent, the career loafer and the political hack.

#### PROSECUTION

The majority of cases referred to the U.S. District Courts by federal enforcement agencies are substantive violations. Only a very small percentage of federal criminal investigators have occasion to perfect conspiracy cases.

The presumed dedication of Assistant United States Attorneys leaves much to be desired. Preparation for trial very often consists of calling in the agent or special agent in charge of the case and "reviewing the facts", very often a day, or an hour, prior to actual trial.

The roll-call of Assistant United States Attorneys who have utilized the United States Attorney's office for personal gain as opposed to public service, is long and indeed impressive.

#### THE COURTS

The wisdom of meting out suspended sentences and a slap on the wrist to a recidivist or major violator (professional mobster) has always escaped me. I absolutely fail to see the justification for the total effort and expense involved in securing a conviction.

In a very broad sense, the sentence should be in direct proportion to the seriousness of the crime (and the frequency of it).

Sentences which are inconsistent with the nature of the crime, should be subject to review by a higher authority. There may be many reasons for suspended sentences, but I question the legitimacy of some of these reasons.

#### THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

As a cabinet member and highest law enforcement officer of the land, the attorney general has a binding obligation to proceed against violators. The record of organized crime prosecutions initiated by the office of the attorney general's office, is not impressive. If the attorney general is either incapable or unwilling to fully exercise the duties and powers of his office, he should be removed.

#### SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Although this presentation may appear disjointed and very loosely knit, I shall now attempt to join the loose ends together. I address myself primarily to syndicated mob operations, as distinguished from street crimes and subversive activities.

In most instances, mob operations are usually most vulnerable to conspiracy charges. In order to perfect a solid conspiracy case, it may be necessary to tie together a continuing series of related substantive offenses having a common purpose. In some instances, substantive cases may already have been prepared by one or more of the principal law enforcement agencies. It then becomes a question of how to incorporate the substantive violations into the frame-work of the conspiracy and to develop evidence against the principals. To facilitate this work and to make available all information, intelligence and evidence on file in the various agencies, I would partially re-organize some of the agencies and centralize management control.

In a hypothetical case, the sequence of events would run something like this:

The Attorney General identifies the subject(s) of investigation.

A special prosecutor is assigned to the case.

A highly skilled investigative technician is assigned to the special prosecutor.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Collection of basic information begins. An investigative plan is developed.

Investigative plan is implemented by support personnel drawn from participating agencies.

Investigative reports are collated and evaluated by the special prosecutor and his staff adviser.

Collection of evidence is expanded to meet requirements of the case at hand. (This would include substantive case prosecutions, development of informers and witnesses and whatever is required to produce a sufficiency of evidence).

The special prosecutor will have over-all responsibility for conduct of the investigation and presentation of the evidence to the court.

Control of support personnel will revert to the parent agency at the conclusion of the investigation or trial.

All out application of this concept removes most of the inherent obstacles as they exist under the present organization and assures a continuing investigation effort directed toward one objective—conviction.

The writer is well aware that this may be an over-simplification of an extremely complex problem. I contend that there is a solution, but that the solution will NOT come from the breed of law enforcement people who justify their existence (and incidentally salary) by sticking colored pins in large office charts bearing the names of alleged "Principal Violators."

I personally recall a chart on which the same pins were stuck in the same names, over a period of three or four years, indicating that none of the alleged major violators were prosecuted or convicted.

That type of thing has convinced me that the time has come for deft surgery to remove a few cancers and much superfluous fat.

In substance, I am proposing a more effective utilization of existing law enforcement resources and a re-alignment of the tables of organization.

I am sure there will be much wailing and many tears. However, tears do wash the dust out of the eyes.

BJORN H. ANDERSEN.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, June 9, 1970.

Hon. HASTINGS KEITH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your communication transmitting a letter from Mr. Bjorn H. Andersen in which he expresses concern about the activities and statements of William Kunstler, one of the defense attorneys for the Chicago 7, and submits a proposal outlining more effective use of existing Federal law enforcement agencies in the fight against organized crime.

The Department of Justice has a continuing responsibility to be alert to individuals and organizations advocating, encouraging or participating in illegal violence in possible violation of Federal law. You may be assured that in those instances where there is evidence of a violation of Federal law we intend to take affirmative prosecutive action.

On April 23, 1969, President Nixon warned that the threat of organized crime can no longer be ignored or tolerated. He decreed its eventual elimination by carefully conceived, well-funded and well-executed action plans.

The President asked Congress for a substantial increase in the Department of Justice budget to strengthen the effort against organized crime. The Attorney General has been authorized to intercept wire and oral communications in the investigation of organized racketeering and to establish Federal racketeering field offices across the nation. Consideration is also being given to invoking the antitrust laws to discourage orga-

July 20, 1970

nized crime involvement in legitimate business. The Department of Justice has already taken steps to facilitate unprecedented cooperation between state and Federal agencies in the investigation, prosecution and technical analysis of organized crime activities.

In this effort Federal strike forces have been established. A typical strike force consists of attorneys from the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of this Division working in conjunction with investigators from the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Customs Bureau, the Secret Service, the Department of Labor, and the Internal Revenue Service. In addition, we have the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The first strike force was put into operation in Buffalo in late 1966 and resulted in the indictment and conviction of significant Cosa Nostra figures. Twelve other strike forces now operate throughout the country.

Arrangements have been made for Federal financial assistance to the states in order that local agencies can more effectively address themselves to the task.

Congress is considering legislation which would improve Federal investigation and prosecution techniques. In addition, the Congress has been urged to extend immunity laws so that a witness can be compelled to testify in organized crime prosecutions. Legislation which would increase the Federal role with respect to gamblers and provide Federal penalties for the operation of large scale illicit gambling enterprises and for the bribery of local government officials and police officers has been submitted to Congress.

Your constituent's concern in this matter is appreciated. As the President cautioned, the success of such a program will require the help of Congress and state and local governments, but will first depend on the support of responsible citizens.

Please express our appreciation to Mr. Andersen for the interest which prompted his attached outline.

I hope the foregoing information will be of assistance. Your enclosure is returned herewith.

Sincerely,

WILL WILSON,  
Assistant Attorney General.

#### MR. FARMER, TAKE A BOW

## HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLENN OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. QUILLENN. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer contributes a very valuable service to the people of this country, but somehow his efforts are rarely ever singled out for the recognition he deserves.

An editorial concerning the American farmer appeared in the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, Johnson City, Tenn., one of the outstanding daily newspapers in my congressional district, on July 16.

I would like to submit the editorial, which points out some interesting statistics, for readers of the RECORD:

Mr. FARMER TAKES A BOW

The American farmer ought to take a bow. Much of the time Mr. Farmer is pretty much in the background. No press agents herald his achievements. And he is largely taken for granted.

Yet, as Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin said recently, the farmer's productivity has been climbing more than five per cent a year—and that's "roughly twice the rate of industry."

Consider these facts:

In 1969 American farmers produced 20 per cent more products on six per cent fewer acres than in 1957.

At the turn of the century, a farmer produced enough for himself and six others. But in 1968 he was producing enough for himself and 42 others—with the help of supply and marketing industries.

In the latest year for which figures are available, the marketing of farm food and fiber alone provided 5,000,000 non-farm jobs running into payroll and fringe benefits totaling \$25 billion.

Besides being a major supplier of the economy, agriculture is a major customer—to the tune of \$50 billion a year. Farmers buy 6.5 million tons of steel in the form of tractors, other motor vehicles, machinery and equipment—and they use more petroleum than any other single industry and more electricity than Chicago, Boston, Baltimore, Washington and Detroit.

#### NEW TEETH IN POLLUTION LAW

##### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, pollution in all its forms is an ever-increasing problem, and Maryland residents have been particularly shocked by two recent water pollution incidents at Curtis Bay. I have just read a fine editorial in the Havre de Grace record presenting the advantages of Maryland House Bill 882, a bill which contains provisions for reducing the frequency of such occurrences. I should like to share Mr. J. Samuel's perceptive article with my colleagues by including it in the RECORD:

##### NEW TEETH IN POLLUTION LAW

One of the most constructive and far-reaching measures passed during the recent session of the General Assembly was House Bill 882, which called for the strengthening and streamlining of water pollution abatement procedures.

These new procedures, which were effective July first, now enable the Maryland Department of Water Resources to move rapidly to correct many water polluting conditions. These new procedures can reduce from several months to several weeks or days, and in some instances to one day, the time span in which the Water Resources Department can act to enforce water quality laws and achieve compliance.

In the past, we are told, there could be a six or seven month delay between the first issuance of a violation notice to an offender and corrective action. Formerly the department issued a violation notice. A hearing was scheduled. The individual or company notified of a violation had thirty days in which to complete and submit a compliance plan. A method of abatement was worked out between the violator and the department, and finally an order was issued directing the violator to correct the condition. Most steps in the old procedure took thirty or more days each.

Now the department can issue a notice of violation and order simultaneously resulting in corrective measures within thirty days. Accidental oil or chemical spills can be attacked at once.

Violation of water pollution abatement provisions is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment not to exceed one year or both. Each

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

day upon which the violation occurs constitutes a new offense.

With new teeth in the pollution regulations, we may now see speedier results in the state's determination to fight pollution on all fronts.

#### MEDICARE WOES

##### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over the fact that uncertainties surrounding the eligibility of medicare patients have prompted a number of extended care facilities to pull out of the medicare program altogether, including some in my own community of Philadelphia.

It is hard not to believe, in view of the recent Presidential position, that the basic motive is not a budgetary decision by the Nixon administration to hold down medicare spending. Just how medicare is being denied many people is set forth in the very illuminating article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Wednesday, April 8, 1970, which follows:

**MEDICARE WOES—ELDERLY PATIENTS FIND NURSING HOME BENEFITS GROW HARDER TO COLLECT**

(By Jim Hyatt, Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal)

Mrs. Henry Nelson, 77, spent 31 days in a Milwaukee hospital last year undergoing treatment for a stroke. Medicare paid the entire bill.

Then a social worker at the hospital suggested that Mrs. Nelson be moved to a nursing home where she could receive round-the-clock nursing care and the therapy she needed to learn to walk and talk again. Medicare can pay for up to 100 days of such "extended care."

But it didn't work out that way for Mrs. Nelson. "After she was there two months, Medicare wrote me and said they weren't going to pay the bill," says her husband, a retired foundry worker. "I owed them \$1,616.75."

The Social Security Administration, which administers the medicare program of national health insurance for the elderly, had decided that Mrs. Nelson needed only custodial or minimal care rather than skilled nursing care. Mr. Nelson, who receives \$130 a month in Social Security benefits, is paying the bill off at \$50 a month. His wife, still a convalescent, is now at home.

##### AN ABRUPT CRACKDOWN

Unpleasant shocks like the one received by the Nelsons are becoming increasingly common among elderly patients who had thought all the financial woes associated with illness had ended when they became eligible for medicare. They're learning that an abrupt crackdown on claims payments has made the widely heralded 100 days of extended care after hospital treatment far from an automatic benefit.

What's more, there's no way for a patient to learn for certain whether he will qualify for medicare extended care benefits when he seeks admission to a nursing home. A medical panel at the home gives an initial judgment, but this may be rejected later by medicare authorities. Consequently, some families have been billed unexpectedly for thousands of dollars weeks after patients

have been dismissed or have died. Other patients wind up in second-rate homes with minimal or clearly inadequate care because they can't afford private rates for better equipped homes.

In the long run, some critics contend, the crackdown on extended-care benefits may be costing Social Security taxpayers more. Many doctors are keeping patients longer in expensive hospital beds, where medicare coverage is almost certain, rather than risk rejection of extended-care claims. Hospital care can cost up to six times as much as treatment in an extended-care facility.

##### SURGE IN REJECTIONS

The crackdown is reflected in Social Security records. They show that rejections of extended care claims more than tripled to 7.2% of all claims filed in the last quarter of 1969 from 2% during 1968. Some nursing home operators say, moreover, that their own rejection rates are much higher than this.

Nursing home operators say Social Security rejection figures also don't reflect the numbers of patients who don't even bother to submit claims now because they don't want to take a chance on being rejected and stuck with a large bill. Nor do the figures reflect the fact that even when claims are accepted, the length of time medicare will pay for extended coverage has been shortened in many cases.

"In the early days, a fractured hip would be covered for 70 or 80 days," says an official of Nationwide Insurance Co., which processes some claims for medicare. "Now that's down to 30 or 40 days." He estimates that tighter rules have pared the average covered length of stay for all illnesses by 25%.

The reasons behind the sharp increase in rejected claims are a matter of dispute. The insurance concerns that actually process the claims as agents for medicare say the denials are due to more stringent medicare regulations aimed at weeding out abuses. Social Security officials insist, however, that the rules haven't changed but are merely being applied more carefully. "We have gotten better understanding of what an extended care benefit should be," says a spokesman.

##### A BUDGETARY DECISION

But some nursing administrators insist the basic motive is a budgetary decision by the Nixon Administration to hold down medicare spending for political reasons—an accusation that's categorically denied by Social Security officials.

Whatever the reason, some observers find the situation ironic in light of a widespread belief in Congress that it had arranged the ideal marriage when it joined low-cost, skilled extended care with hospitalization under medicare. The aim was to eliminate the high cost of unnecessarily intensive hospital care for recuperating patients while insuring that they would nonetheless receive skilled attention as long as needed. (Extended care benefits were never intended to pay for long-term custodial care of elderly invalids.)

To qualify for extended care benefits, a patient must spend at least three days in a hospital, then enter a Government-certified extended care facility within 14 days after hospital discharge. The patient must require skilled, round-the-clock nursing for a condition related to the illness for which he was hospitalized. medicare will pay a maximum of 100 days for each "benefit period," though after the first 20 days the patient must contribute \$6.50 a day himself.

Conflicts arise chiefly over the question of whether a patient's condition requires the skilled, round-the-clock care of a nursing home. In February, for instance, an Indiana insurance company denied a medicare claim for a 90-year-old man on grounds that he didn't need extended care. The action drew a heated protest to the Social Security Ad-

ministration from a doctor familiar with the case.

The doctor wrote that the patient "was seriously ill and needed continuous skilled nursing care. He was, in other words, ill enough to die and in fact died on Feb. 10." The claim finally was accepted two weeks after the death.

David A. Jones, chairman of Extendicare Inc., a Louisville, Ky., nursing home chain, says 61 Medicare claims were rejected at one time for two of his company's homes. One of the patients had terminal cancer and died at the nursing home four days after leaving a hospital. Medicare allowed only one day's coverage.

"We got up on our hind legs and raised holy hell," says Mr. Jones. Eventually, all 61 claims were approved.

"The pendulum has swung too far," says an Ohio internist. "We're asked to get people out of this hospital as quickly as possible and then we find they aren't covered."

To avoid paying high bills for extended care out of their own pockets, some patients denied Medicare prevail on their doctors to readmit them to a hospital, where their bills almost certainly will be covered by Medicare.

Critics of Medicare's extended-care program say the crackdown on claims has been facilitated by a lack of flexibility in Medicare regulations. They say the rules often fail to allow coverage where it would seem to be clearly indicated.

Besides barring payments for mere custodial care, Medicare won't cover care that could be provided by nonprofessionals. A senile elderly diabetic might need regular insulin shots, but he wouldn't qualify for extended care benefits because the regulations assume a non-skilled person could give the shots. The fact that the patient is incapable of giving himself shots and hasn't any relatives to help wouldn't change the ruling.

James Halick, an 83-year-old immigrant from Czechoslovakia, was hospitalized in Cleveland last year for fluid in the lungs, heart trouble and diabetes. Later he entered a Cleveland nursing home on his doctor's advice. Medicare paid the hospital bills but cut off extended care coverage after two weeks on the ground that Mr. Halick no longer needed the continuous attention of skilled nurses.

Mr. Halick paid for two more weeks as a private patient, then left the nursing home to live with friends. Last fall he suffered a relapse, reentered the hospital, then again sought nursing home benefits. They were denied.

A family friend, Mrs. Marie-Anne Frindt, bristles when she describes Mr. Halick's lengthy correspondence with Government and insurance officials over the case. She's particularly upset, she says, over a letter from the Social Security Administration suggesting that Mr. Halick appear in person if he wants to make an appeal. "How can a man who is already half dead go to an office?" she asks.

Mr. Halick has moved to a less expensive nursing home, where he pays \$375 a month out of his savings. But the savings soon will be exhausted, and he expects to seek Medicaid, the Federal-state program of health care for the poor, as an indigent.

One reason nursing home operators are bitter about the crackdown in Medicare payouts is that it has reduced the number of their patients. Many have made large investments in modern facilities and highly trained staff to gain accreditation as extended care facilities under Medicare.

A recent tour of Pavillion Nursing Home, a modern \$1,250,000 extended care facility in Cleveland, found only 104 of the 150 beds occupied, down sharply from an average of

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

around 140 last year. Administrator Peter Sukeknek says the home can't break even at the present level. In February Pavillion had 31 Medicare patients, compared with 74 in October 1968.

Mr. Jones of Extendicare, the Kentucky chain of nursing homes, says his firm's Medicare cases have dropped by half in the past year and now amount to only 17% of the patients.

The uncertainties surrounding the eligibility of Medicare patients have prompted a number of extended care facilities to pull out of the Medicare program altogether. Some 750 Medicare-certified homes have dropped out so far, including 460 last year, and hundreds of others have practically stopped accepting Medicare patients though they retain Medicare extendedcare certification. Just last Saturday 40 of the 45 extended care homes on Long Island announced they would no longer accept Medicare patients because it's too much trouble trying to collect payment after patients run up bills and then learn they're not eligible for Medicare.

### THE CADILLAC IN THE SKIES

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 16, 1970*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, July 12, 1970, edition of the Washington Post carried an informative editorial reviewing the conflicting views surrounding our national space program. This editorial does much to place in perspective the overriding need to support our national space program because of its technological potential and long-term benefit to mankind. The editorial follows:

#### THE CADILLAC IN THE SKIES

Just a year ago, the manned space program was riding high. Apollo 11 was waiting on the launch pad at Cape Kennedy for its crew and the world was waiting for the most spectacular trip in history to begin. The excitement and the glamor passed quickly and the manned space program is now in trouble. It came within a handful of votes last week of being strangled by the Senate and if the debate there is any indication more troubles are ahead. The psychology that sustained the program during its heydays of the 60s has been reversed and manned space flight is now regarded by many people as the Cadillac in the skies.

This psychological shift is understandable. To many of those who are deeply concerned about the quality of life at home, about the educational level of our children, the housing conditions of our poor, the pollution of our surroundings, supporting manned space flight is as provocative as riding in a chauffeured limousine through the slums. The country has so many problems, the argument goes, that it must divert the money that might be spent on manned space flights to programs that will aid more directly and more quickly the people who now inhabit the earth.

This is a hard argument to answer for to answer it fully and logically (or, for that matter, to make it fully and logically) requires a prescience that none of us has. No one really knows what is to be gained by going on with manned space flights and no one really knows what is to be lost by stopping them. There is a universe out there that we don't know about. There is, of course, the argument that unmanned space probes

*July 20, 1970*

can tell us all we need to know about it for as far into the future as we now care to think. But it is difficult, if not clearly wrong, to accept the idea that machines can totally replace men in so delicate a task of exploration.

We raise this now because the debate in the Senate last week, while cast in terms of merely slowing down the pace of the manned space program, was in fact a debate over halting it. The cuts already made in NASA's budget have built in a halt to manned space activities from 1975 to, probably, 1978. To expand that period of inactivity to four or five years, it seems to us, is to kill the program. So long a pause would mean the dismantling of the teams of experts and probably of the equipment that put Apollo together and controlled its flights. Rebuilding those teams would be a long, arduous and costly process.

Thus we were pleased that the Senate did not go along with its liberal bloc which voted almost to a man to curtail NASA's funds even more. Many of the arguments made by NASA's supporters seem to us quite irrelevant—curtailment would mean unemployment in the aerospace industry, the Russians will be out there, and so on. But so did the basic argument made by the program's critics—that the funds should be used at home. We all know that cutting NASA's budget by \$100 million or \$500 million or \$1 billion does not mean that the government is going to spend that much more on pollution control, education, housing, urban renewal and all the things that we ourselves place high on the list of national priorities. The fact is that if Congress really wanted to do all the things its members talk about, and postpone each year because of fiscal restraints, it wouldn't have turned last year's tax-reform bill into a tax-reduction bill.

The basic issue involved in NASA's appropriations this year, as it will be next year and for many years to come, is whether this country should give up something it has done and which is going well, something that has brought it great international prestige and internal pride, and something that we believe may well hold the key to man's future.

### HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

#### HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 15, 1970*

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, when Cliff Davis passed away, I lost more than a close personal friend. I lost a most helpful colleague who went out of his way to befriend me when I came to the House of Representatives 16 years ago.

Cliff and I were members of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee. As chairman—and as many of the older Members know—Cliff had a lot to say about what projects were approved.

I was having difficulty winning approval of a worthy project in my district. Cliff not only helped get it through for me, he came to my district and attended a hearing on the project and boosted my candidacy for reelection.

He always had time to listen to the problems of others and to try to help solve them. He was always pleasant and affable. He will be sorely missed by those who knew him well.

July 20, 1970

25099

MANPOWER INC.'S SUMMER ACTION  
1970 COMPETITION STIMULATING COMMUNITY BETTERMENT  
THROUGH CREATIVE YOUTH ACTION

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Manpower's Summer Action 1970 is a national competition designed to achieve community betterment through creative action by young people.

A description of this worthwhile project by Elmer L. Winter president of Manpower, Inc., follows:

STATEMENT BY ELMER L. WINTER, PRESIDENT,  
MANPOWER, INC., ANNOUNCING THE SUMMER ACTION 1970 COMPETITION

We at Manpower, Inc. well realize that this summer will be a difficult one for young people looking for summer work.

Traditionally, we have helped young people in their summer job search through our free Youthpower program. In the past six years, this program has placed young people in almost 50,000 summer jobs. This effort will continue this summer in 17 cities across the country.

We are cautiously optimistic about the ability of our Youthpower program to again place thousands of young people in summer jobs, despite the recent downturn in the nation's economy. We say this because our Youthpower offices depend for their job orders, in large measure, upon the small businessman and the homeowner who often rely on young people to perform chores during the summer months.

While our Youthpower program will continue full throttle, we are not unmindful of the fact that many, many youngsters across the country will not find jobs as easy to come by this summer as they have in past years. From the reports we have received from our 468 offices across the country, there is every indication that there is a very serious shortage of jobs in the private sector, as well as in the public sector. These reports are based on such indicators as a sharp drop in "Help Wanted" newspaper ads, a jump in the number of applicants for civil service jobs, and the availability of workers for jobs hard to fill in the past. Layoffs and cost-cutting programs in industry are taking their toll, particularly on young people seeking summer employment.

I think all of us have to be deeply concerned with the increased needs of young people for jobs and the diminishing number of jobs available for them to fill.

It is because of this concern that we at Manpower, Inc., while continuing our sponsorship of Youthpower this summer, feel that even more must be done in summer, 1970. We are convinced that new encouragement is needed to stimulate desire on the part of our young people to find or create their own meaningful summer activity and not rely as heavily as before on government, business and industry.

We think we have just such an incentive in Manpower's Summer Action '70, a nationwide competition, offering \$10,000 in cash prizes, designed to achieve community betterment through creative action by young people.

The competition offers a first prize of \$3,000 for the top community action program organized this summer by young people, aged 21 or under, working either as an individual or as a member of an organization or informal group.

Also to be awarded are a \$2,000 second

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

prize, a \$1,000 third prize and 40 \$100 merit awards.

An independent panel of recognized authorities in such fields as education, business, government, natural sciences and human resources will judge the competition.

Evaluation of entries will be based upon (1) community need and benefit, (2) demonstrated initiative of participant(s), (3) originality of project and methods, and (4) the project's potential for application elsewhere.

At the conclusion of the contest, Manpower, Inc. will assemble a record of the best programs that are entered and make this information available to interested groups throughout the country. We believe that we can perform a real service to the public by disseminating information about programs that have worked—programs that have benefited individual communities.

We believe that the youth of America will respond to Manpower's Summer Action '70 and put any idle hours they might have to constructive use. The country certainly can use their efforts this summer in the areas of anti-pollution, assisting the handicapped, cleaning up central city areas, to list only a few of the many, many areas of possible community action.

What makes us think that the youth of America will respond?

Last summer alone, young people volunteered a total of more than 45,000 hours of time to make our Youthpower program work. As a result, it became a valuable and enriching experience for them, which is documented by the many letters of appreciation we have received. These young people could not have been more pleased at the chance to become meaningfully involved in solving serious community problems.

I could cite numerous examples of youth involvement in meaningful community action programs. Such efforts, we feel, should be rewarded. We at Manpower, Inc. plan to accomplish this through our Summer Action '70 Youth Awards.

Entry forms for this competition are available at all Manpower offices throughout the country and can also be obtained by writing Manpower, Inc., Summer Action '70, 820 N. Plankinton Ave., Milwaukee, Wis. 53203. On a nationwide basis, we have also asked our local managers to contact key area youth groups and urge their members to enter the competition.

Not too long ago, I read an article in the press which quoted Vince Lombardi as saying, "We publicized dissidence too much, and here I think we're greatly at fault in the media. We've got too much sympathy in this country for the misfit, for the maladjusted, for the criminal and for the loser. I'm not saying we shouldn't try to help them. But we no longer recognize excellence. I think it's time for a pat on the back to someone who goes out and does something, the achiever."

We at Manpower, Inc. also believe such pats on the back to achievers, backed by cold, hard cash, will be very welcome to our young people this summer. We intend to do our part through Summer Action '70 to see that they are given.

HUNTLEY EXPLAINS

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a final bit of help to his liberal cohorts, Chet Huntley of the Huntley-Brinkley propaganda show took off on both the President and the Vice President.

Perhaps the most important thing Mr. Huntley said in his diatribe was in comparing himself to the Vice President. He said, and I quote, "I've had more cow manure on my boots than he ever thought about."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make two points. First, I am glad the Vice President has more important things on his mind. And, second, Mr. Huntley's remark explains now why we have been getting all that stuff in our living rooms.

HEROIN EPIDEMIC

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a problem that is of vital concern not only to New York City, but to the entire Nation. I am speaking of the heroin epidemic, which is rapidly ravaging our American society, especially the Nation's youth. Most shocking is the evidence that narcotic abuse is the greatest single cause of death in the 15 to 35 age group.

Our citizens cannot escape the effects of addiction; the cost to the individual and to our society is unmeasurable. It is well known that in order to support the fabulously expensive narcotic habit, the addict is forced to resort to crime. Mayor Lindsay has stated that heroin is chiefly responsible for the majority of muggings and burglaries in New York City. Perhaps it is an even greater tragedy that many addicts spread their disease through pushing drugs to innocent people, especially children in our schools.

As drug abuse has been brought to the attention of a great number of Americans recently, many theories have emerged regarding which area of attack should receive the greatest concentration. With a view to New York's particularly serious problem with heroin addiction, it is my feeling that all of these must be given due consideration and financial assistance if the victims of narcotics are not to be forgotten and are given every opportunity to be rehabilitated.

New York has taken great strides in providing public facilities for its vast addict population, with the establishment of addiction services agencies and State sponsored methadone maintenance programs. But more effort and money is needed if these programs are to be sustained and expanded.

Leonard Victor, Long Island Press national award-winning writer, in an in-depth analysis of methadone treatment, brought this issue before the public. In a series of three detailed articles, he has probed the terrifying world of the addict, and has revealed the vital importance of immediate action to help the many thousands in New York alone in desperate need of aid. As a public service, this series is noteworthy in its attempt to turn the public on to the pressing situation and I feel that this commendable effort should be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## METHADONE FOR ADDICTS: HOPE OR DISILLUSION?

(By Leonard Victor)

Methadone is one of the most controversial drugs in medicine today.

Many doctors are dead-set against its use. Others say treatment with it should be swiftly and widely expanded. Still others are for expanded, but restrained, use.

This may bewilder the layman who has read of wonderful successes with the drug in such projects as the pioneering five-year test program at Beth Israel Hospital in Manhattan.

In that program, which is constantly under intensive, expert outside evaluation, methadone has turned many hardened heroin addicts from anti-social individuals into useful members of society.

If it works what's the fuss about using it?

Dr. Henry Brill, a world-famous expert on narcotics addiction and head of the Pilgrim State Hospital in Brentwood, is chairman of the independent Columbia University blue-ribbon panel which checks Beth Israel's program and issues twice-yearly reports on it.

He says that "I am completely convinced that a properly run methadone maintenance program like Beth Israel's—with the full backup of social and therapeutic services that must be part of such a program—is of tremendous value for many heroin addicts."

But he also warns: "An improperly run or incomplete program without rigid controls and constant evaluation would be extremely dangerous."

Why? Methadone, like heroin, is an addicting narcotic. "Mainlined" into a vein like heroin, methadone can produce that temporary "high" the addict craves.

But properly given—a daily dose dissolved in orange juice and drunk under a doctor's or trained nurse's eyes in an expert treatment center—methadone does not produce a high.

The man or woman who gulps down the dose is usually in a hurry. Most have a steady job, school or housework waiting for them.

Despite these successes which have returned many hard-core addicts to a useful place in society, there are serious medical men who object to the treatment. They say "it is no cure, merely the exchanging of one addiction for another."

Dr. Brill—long-term adviser to Gov. Rockefeller on narcotics problems—and many other medical men fear immediate widespread expansion of the treatment system would lead to these problems:

A flood of the substitute drug onto the narcotics market. There have already been reports of this in connection with some loosely-run experimental methadone treatment centers.

A discrediting of the carefully-checked, long-term results of the few highly regulated well-run treatment centers that have proved the drugs so valuable with certain types of heroin addicts.

A new wave of methadone addicts resulting from inadequate or inexpert medical examination before treatment.

The Federal Government agrees with Dr. Brill's and other medical men's fears about the loosely regulated use of methadone.

Recently proposed new regulations encourage methadone maintenance by organizations willing to follow stiff standards, continue research and allow impartial scrutiny of the results.

The same new rules will also make it impossible for those clinics without expert staffs and on-going research and evaluation to operate.

Methadone, synthesized in Germany during World War II as a substitute for morphine, has been used by doctors here for many years to ease the agony of a patient's withdrawal from heroin.

A dramatic breakthrough in its use began seven years ago. That was when Dr. Marie

Nyswander, a psychiatrist trained in narcotics addiction treatment, joined Dr. Vincent Dole, an MD famous for work in metabolic research, in the hunt for a heroin addiction cure.

They found, not a cure, but a remarkable substitute.

Their work at Rockefeller University led to the discovery that a carefully controlled dose of methadone blocked the addict's craving for heroin without getting him high. It also prevented the ex-junkie from getting a "high" if he did try heroin again.

They also learned that once a "stabilized" dose point was reached, no larger amount of methadone ever had to be used.

This stabilized dose is a dramatic contrast to the evergrowing "habit" of the hard-core junkie—like the six volunteers in the original cautious Dole-Nyswander methadone tests.

These six, like any "heavy" addict, needed more and more heroin all the time to reach that brief period of Nirvana for which the junkie steals and even murders.

With their two years of carefully documented results, the research team went to Dr. Ray Trussell, then New York City's Commissioner of Hospitals. He became enthusiastic and got Mayor Wagner's help to enlarge the program, at Beth Israel Hospital.

That was five years ago and much has been learned as the program was enlarged, re-enlarged and expanded first to Harlem and Cumberland Hospitals and then to area clinics.

In the beginning only "tough cases," those over 21, with an addiction record of five years or more and a long arrest record were accepted. And at the start, all patients spent a month living in the hospital before being allowed to come in once a day for their methadone, medical questioning, counseling if needed and to leave a fresh urine sample.

Lab tests of that urine sample quickly show if the patient has tried heroin again, or is using any other drug, since mixing other narcotics with methadone can be dangerous or even fatal.

Today, the admission rules have been eased as the result of the years of experience. Those down to age 18, with only a 2-year addiction record, are now being accepted.

Half the new patients start "on their feet" without spending any "build-up time" in the hospital's special methadone section. That's especially true of those who have jobs, are in school or have someone at home whom the center considers responsible.

One thing hasn't changed: The vast string of back-up social services that everyone agrees are so vital to the success of methadone maintenance.

If a man or woman needs schooling to get a job, or needs help getting back into his old school, he gets it. Social service workers see to family problems, such as getting a patient and his family on welfare until he gets work.

Counseling is always available to the patient. Parents, wives or husbands are brought in for sessions to help them understand their part in helping the former heroin addict.

Sincere critics of the methadone maintenance program say that the test and its exceptional results at Beth Israel are because the program is too specialized and too selective to be proof that it will work elsewhere.

Dr. Brill differs. "It will work elsewhere, in the right hands—and with patients who can't take the nightmare any more and want the monkey off their back."

How do the methadone addicts themselves feel about being addicts, perhaps forever?

"Look," he said. "Make believe I have diabetes and need insulin every day. I wouldn't gamble and quit using it."

"For the first time since I was a kid I have a steady job and no parole officer on my back. I'm married and have a lovely kid. And I own my own car—not one I stole."

"For all of this, I'm ready to stay a methadone addict for the rest of my life!"

July 20, 1970

## LONG ISLAND METHADONE CLINICS FOR AT LEAST 35,000 ADDICTS

(By Leonard Victor)

The heroin epidemic has spread across the length of Long Island. In this second of a series on methadone—a hopeful weapon against the junkie's plight—Press writer Leonard Victor tells of the few facilities using the new treatment and of the army of hardcore addicts who need help.

How many hard-core heroin addicts—many of whom might benefit from methadone maintenance—are there on Long Island?

The most conservative guess for the addict population from Brooklyn to Montauk is 35,000.

A veteran narcotics detective—who doesn't want his name published—thinks that guess is far too low. But he's far more interested in a simple piece of arithmetic he figured out after studying the outside evaluation reports of the methadone program at Beth Israel Hospital, Manhattan.

He said, "Look, let's suppose they keep a heavy addict 'clean' (free of his heroin craving) for a year before he leaves the methadone program. (So far, only about 12 per cent of those accepted have dropped out or been expelled from the 5-year-old program).

"If he is a heavy junkie roaming the streets, he has to do a lot of stealing to pay for those nickel (\$5) bags of heroin he needs for his habit.

"Let's assume he has a \$50 daily habit—and what with time in court, jail, hospitals and some free fixes from friends, he only steals 100 days a year.

"The junkie gets 20 to 25 cents on the dollar from fences (who buy stolen property) or street peddling. So he has to steal \$200 a day from stores, cars and homes. Multiply that \$200 per day by 100 days and it comes out to \$20,000. And you've still got to add to that the cost for police and parole officers, courts, jails and hospital treatment.

"It's a helluva lot cheaper to keep him on methadone. 'For God's sake, give it to those who will take it!'

Methadone doesn't work for all hard-core addicts, the experts know. The junkie, though there have been a few notable exceptions, must be at the point where he or she honestly wants to get off the dizzying spiral staircase of the habit to become a successful methadone patient.

What do we have on Long Island for the man or woman who wants the help of methadone maintenance?

Suffolk, according to police estimates, has at least 3,000 hard-core heroin addicts. To serve them, there is just one walk-in methadone clinic in Bayshore.

The director of the program, Dr. Julius Rice, is no complete convert to methadone, though he concedes that "we may need it for about 25 percent of our toughest patients."

As "the word" of success at Beth Israel got around among Manhattan's addicts a few years ago, applications soared to a flood, with a current waiting list of two years for some patients.

That may be why Suffolk's Narcotics Commission has plans "in the early stages" to set up two more small ambulatory methadone clinics, one in the east, the other in the west end of the vast county with a million population.

Nassau police won't even make an estimate of the heroin addict population in the county. But Mrs. Lois Blum, acting director of the county program says that "a guess of 5,000 to 7,500, probably nearer 7,500, would be pretty accurate."

There are now absolutely no methadone treatment clinics in Nassau, though plans are in the works for one center that could handle a maximum of 150 patients.

The tiny program planned calls for early "in-house" treatment and an experimental

attempt to slowly wean patients off methadone over a period of several years.

How many heavy junkies are there in Queens? One index is the Health Department's Narcotic Registry. The latest figures available—for 1968—show 3,000 listed addicts.

That was a 49 percent increase from 1967!

The rule of thumb is to triple the registry figure for a reasonably accurate number. How much higher has that 1968 addict number of 9,000 soared since? No one knows, but one frightening index is that police made more than twice as many narcotics arrests in April of this year than they did in the same month last year.

For all these potential methadone candidates, Queens has one walk-in clinic for 100 patients, just going into use now under control of Beth Israel in-quarters at the Tri-Boro Hospital, Jamaica.

Since the State Legislature and Gov. Rockefeller are giving the Beth Israel program \$6 million for expansion this year, there is some hope for another small Queens clinic, perhaps at the Elmhurst General Hospital.

Brooklyn fares worst in the number of addicts, with few methadone treatment facilities. The Narcotics Register for '68 showed close to 10,000 addicts listed in Long Island's westernmost county.

With that three-time multiplication index, that meant 30,000 hard addicts then. No one can guess how many more there are today.

Between a clinic at Cumberland Hospital, operated in conjunction with Beth Israel, a controversial new program called The Addiction and Treatment Corp., and a few walk-in clinics, Brooklyn has facilities for less than 1,000 methadone walk-in patients.

The New York State Narcotics Commission is opening one hospital in Howard Beach for in-patient treatment leading to methadone maintenance. It now has 70 patients, according to a commission spokesman.

But these patients are from all over the state, not just Queens, and any who are in the Metropolitan area will have to go to a clinic in the Bushwick section of Brooklyn daily once they become walking patients.

Dr. Philip Kaufmann, chairman of the Narcotics Committee of the Queens Medical Society, thinks the Howard Beach arrangement for walk-in patients is "a perfect example of why the state's own program was such a failure."

He says, "Let's assume that a family man from Laurelton goes through Howard Beach and becomes a walk-in patient. That man may be lucky enough to get a job at Grumann's Calverton plant, nearly a four hour a day round trip.

"How can he be expected to travel to Bushwick five mornings or nights a week for a dose of methadone? It's ridiculous."

Mayor Lindsay—who recently had another narcotics commissioner resign from city service—also recently announced that he expects to get \$9.7 million in state funds for expanded addict treatment facilities. But no one in his organization could give any specific details about what kind of facilities are planned, or where they will go.

It was also impossible to get an immediate explanation of how he expects to get \$9.7 million out of the state's total methadone allocation of \$15 million, since \$6 million has already been committed to the Beth Israel program and other areas from Nassau to Buffalo will demand their share.

Long Island's police are hoping that many clinics will spring into being.

New York Police Commissioner Howard Leary points out that "there is no doubt that law enforcement is only a partial answer to drug addiction. "We have doubled our arrests without any sign that the problem has lessened," he said.

That's why he firmly believes that "one area that should be explored more thoroughly is the use of methadone."

Nassau police are for methadone treatment

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

too—and any other program that will lessen narcotic crime.

Suffolk Police Commissioner John Barry also thinks that methadone maintenance should be expanded, "but with extreme caution so we don't start a new addiction."

Controversial though it still is, the impartial Columbia Medical College evaluations of Beth Israel's methadone program has led to many converts.

The continuing studies show that men who have stayed in the program four years show a current near-zero arrest record. These twice-a-year compilations also show that employment soared from a "before" point of 22 per cent to 84 per cent now, while cases on welfare dwindled proportionately.

Roughly the same figures hold true for women who have been in the program for three years.

Those figures were the reason Gov. Rockefeller rescued the Manhattan program with a \$1.8 million grant when the current administration's next-to-last narcotics commissioner disapproved of it.

And that is why the Governor is suppling the addiction of more clinics, which will benefit Manhattan and the Bronx the most, Brooklyn to a lesser degree—and even provide a clinic on Staten Island. Mayor Lindsay promises more of the same.

But, as Dr. Ray Trussell, director of Beth Israel, points out, "Our problem is trained people. We're rushing everyone we can find that is suitable into courses and practical training. But we can't rush the training, because methadone maintenance depends as much on the right backup people as it does on the drug."

The question now is, will the help ever catch up with the still-growing epidemic? For Long Island, the picture isn't good.

### PRIVATE DOCTORS HANDCUFFED ON METHADONE TREATMENT

(By Leonard Victor)

Long Island's doctors want to help in the war against heroin addiction, but federal law prevents them from providing methadone maintenance treatment, a proved-out aid to some addicts. In this final article of a series, Press staffer Leonard Victor—who has won many awards for his articles about medical fields—tells of the doctors' offer of help and a change of heart by some of the top specialists in the field.

Each week-day morning at 7 a.m. a Long Island doctor risks his license when a young man sneaks through his back door for a dose of methadone.

The physician takes no fee for his services, which include the measured dose of methadone in orange juice, the taking of a fresh urine specimen (to check for any drug use) and a question and an answer session about matters physical and emotional.

The list of questions is almost identical to the one a doctor might ask at the Methadone Clinic in Beth Israel Hospital, Manhattan.

That's the place where a five-year research program—checked by impartial outside expert—has proved methadone in many cases can be used as a harmless substitute that allows some types of hardcore heroin addicts to return to a normal life.

It is a violation of an archaic Federal law, the Harris Act, which says an MD may use a sustaining narcotic drug only for a "reasonable" period of time "until proper treatment is available."

"Reasonable time" has been legally construed as no more than two months.

Beside the legal aspect, some experts in methadone treatment fear that the heroin addict would be too dangerous in the private office, though the Beth Israel program accepts only those who are already completely off heroin.

Others, like the famed narcotics abuse ex-

pert, Dr. Henry Brill, warn that the ex-addict is such a superb con man and Grade-A liar that it takes a treatment expert or ex-addict to spot him.

Waiting time at Harlem Hospital ran four months or more for ambulatory methadone patients—until the project was closed for lack of nurses.

That MD with the 7 a.m. patient—whom he had known since he delivered him into the world almost a quarter-century before—would have settled for four months as "reasonable time." But he couldn't find any methadone maintenance to fit his patient's needs, because there is virtually none on Long Island, as detailed yesterday, and the young man lives outside New York City.

Since the young man had been in jail twice, "flunked out" with both a good psychiatrist and group therapy and been thrown out of one of the sheltered addict rehabilitation dwellings, the doctor reluctantly tried methadone maintenance.

At the same time, he got his patient into the hands of a psychiatrist again.

Results: The young man's back in college trying to make up his lost years—has stayed out of trouble and got decent marks this past semester.

Another result: The doctor, who has been "maintaining him for a year and a half, is a criminal in the eyes of the law.

He's even turned two other doctors into Federal offenders so the student can always get help, even if his own doctor's ill or on vacation.

There are some clear signs that others in practice, unable to get urgently needed help for their patients, are reading texts, asking medical questions and taking the "reasonable" methadone law into their own hands.

The feelings of many medical men—though there are others who disagree strongly—can be summed up in an angry question from Dr. Phillip Kaufman, chairman of the Queens Medical Society's Committee on Drug Abuse.

"We can treat lepers, walking tuberculosis cases and we'd all be called to help if a typhoid epidemic swept Long Island. Why can't we help clean up the heroin epidemic," he asks.

Dr. Kaufman's is not a voice crying in the wilderness.

His demand that the general medical profession be allowed to treat ambulatory methadone maintenance patients has the full official backing of the more than 2,000 doctors in the Queens Medical Society.

And the 2,200 physicians who make up the Nassau Medical Society's membership have also fully approved the idea. Their Drug Abuse Committee chairman, Dr. Leonard Brahen, says that, like Queens, the Nassau group is willing to help with doctors' training and "do anything we can to help set up clinics—and man them."

Dr. Stanley Stark, president-elect of the Kings County Medical Society, says his group hasn't gone as far, but that "I'll be very surprised if we don't join the ranks this year. The private doctor should be involved."

The Suffolk Medical Society, for now, has adopted a "wait and see" policy. But Dr. Hyman S. Barahal, their Drug Abuse Committee chairman and director of the Hempstead Psychiatric Hospital, speaking as an individual, says that he "believes the general practitioner is needed to help now."

Every one of the medical men mentioned earlier insisted on two identical things: Good training for the MDs willing to handle methadone maintenance and a string of real back-up programs, like the Beth Israel system of social services for patients.

Dr. Mandel Weinstein, chief surgeon of Boulevard Hospital, Astoria, and chairman of Queens DA Thomas Mackell's Physician's Task Force on Narcotics, pointed out that "we physicians are always in the learning process.

"There are new drugs, new techniques, turning up every day and we have to cope

with and master them. Give us the texts, the right instructors and we can handle methadone maintenance the same as any other medical problem."

He emphasized that the medical man knows better than most professionals "not to always be positive," adding that "If we run up against a puzzle, we are not proud about consulting—asking for help."

"We know we're dealing with human lives."

Dr. Weinstein used virtually the same language as most other physicians interviewed when he stressed that the physician "Can't go it alone with methadone" any more than with many other medical problems.

He said that it was up to New York City, as well as the other counties of Long Island, to provide those ancillary services that make methadone treatment such a hopeful program.

"Promises, promises, won't do it," he warned. "We'll need nurses and social services in neighborhood clinics to handle the non-medical problems."

Two men vitally concerned with the progress of the pioneer Beth Israel methadone program are reluctant to see the general practitioners of medicine rush into the treatment field.

But both have veered from the Columbia Medical College evaluation report which says it is still premature for the man in private practice to become involved.

Dr. Vincent P. Doyle, discoverer of the treatment method along with Dr. Marie Nyswander, now says that "in view of the long waiting periods for admission to a treatment program, the G.P. who is willing to train should be allowed to administer blockage doses."

Dr. Ray Trussell, director of Beth Israel Hospital, has changed his viewpoint too. Also because of the backlog of people waiting for room in the program, he too feels that men in private medicine should be allowed to administer maintenance doses.

And he goes one step further. Dr. Trussell believes that the mass of the medical profession could serve an important function with Phase III methadone patients.

These are the ones who have been on the program without trouble for at least two years and have a record that proves they can be trusted with a week's supply or even larger dosages for vacations.

New, stiffer methadone use regulations are being proposed.

Vast sums are being poured into new methadone clinics—only on Long Island almost all the money is going to Brooklyn.

With changes in the offing, it now remains to be seen whether the doctor in private practice will be allowed to train and join the battle against the heroin epidemic.

The waiting time for many types of patients seeking to enter the Beth Israel methadone maintenance program—as mentioned before—is still two years.

#### TRIBUTE TO MIKE GRILIKHES

#### HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 20, 1970*

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, Mickey Mouse, Pluto, The Three Little Pigs—they have all become a beloved part of America. You might call them American folklore. Now these lovely Walt Disney characters, whom we have all met on the screen and some of us have seen in person at the Disneyland Kingdom, are traveling to our homes and cities across America through the efforts of one of our current

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

great showmen, Michel M. (Mike) Grilikhes.

As the executive in charge of production on a giant entertainment spectacular called Disney On Parade, Mike Grilikhes is bringing the wholesome Disney characters to families all over our country. Thousands of youngsters are thrilling to the live show, one of the biggest spectacles ever to be staged out of Hollywood.

The show is typical of the work of Mr. Grilikhes who, along with his actress wife Laraine Day, has been a stalwart producer of family entertainment. Through his efforts, beautiful nature works of the Polynesian cultures have been brought to our country. He has won a Peabody award for his stirring television special, *Let Freedom Ring* and has been involved for more than 15 years in film, television and stage projects aimed at bettering the education and communications needs of the public. Miss Day, for instance, is currently the ambassador for the make America better project, for which she travels throughout the Nation to present awards to communities who have made strides toward providing their citizens with a better environment.

What should, additionally, prove of great interest to the entertainment industry itself are the employment benefits of a show such as Disney On Parade. Grilikhes and his company offer long-term employment to more than 100 performers, as well as dozens of technicians and behind-the-scenes people, providing another and important service to industry as well as to the community.

#### THE CAPTIVE NATIONS—A WEEK TO REMEMBER

#### HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, July 15, 1970*

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, for too many years, it has been our custom here to take note, during a specified week, of the continuing repression affecting the peoples of countries in which the light of freedom is in eclipse.

It is important that we continue to do this, even though the annual recollection of the cruel realities must suggest to us that we should be doing more.

During Captive Nations Week, the Iron Curtain comes first to mind, and we think of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. We need to remember, also, however, that the freedom of dissent so vigorously exercised in our country is denied not only to the formerly free peoples of Eastern Europe but also to the many millions living under Communist dictators in the Soviet Union, Red China and—close to home—in Cuba.

It has proven easy to lapse into acceptance of the status quo in some of these situations—to observe that strictures seemingly have been relaxed and that the people appear to be leading reasonably relaxed lives. Then, as in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, events have forced us against the bitter realization

*July 20, 1970*

that the dark shadows have not dissolved and that attempts at free expression are rewarded still with prison or death.

The National Captive Nations Committee, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and the individual nationality organizations of the countries under dictatorial regimes of the Communist bloc merit our ear, therefore, more regularly than once a year. What has happened and is happening to less fortunate peoples must remind us that we have no perpetual immunity from aggression.

#### NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS ORGANIZATION

#### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 20, 1970*

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the National Welfare Rights Organization has prepared a critical analysis of President Nixon's latest version of welfare reform. They have also developed their own alternative proposal which would establish a national income floor at the \$5,500 per family of four level which the U.S. Department of Labor considers to be the minimum income necessary to meet the basic requirements of health, safety, and decency.

Since our colleagues in the Senate are apparently going to pass legislation in this area substantially different from our own, welfare reform cannot be considered a "dead issue" in the House. I include, therefore, NWRO's analysis and legislation in the Record for the consideration of my colleagues:

#### NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS ORGANIZATION

BACKGROUND: THE NIXON PLAN

The Nixon Administration has just proposed a series of amendments to its Family Assistance Plan. The bill passed the House of Representatives, went to the Senate Finance Committee and was sent back to the Nixon Administration because the Senators wanted some changes made in it. The bill is now back in the Senate and hearings in the Finance Committee will begin again soon.

The Senators wanted the bill changed because it did not succeed in forcing people to work and this upset the Senators to no end. The version of the bill that passed the House really did not have any provisions that made it worthwhile for people on welfare to go to work.

The Nixon Administration could solve this problem in two ways. It could increase benefits for people who work and thereby encourage people to get jobs, or it could reduce benefits for people who are on welfare and force them to find work. Nixon's crew at HEW proposed to make a few things better for working people, but for the most part it hurt welfare recipients.

Here are some of the things the Nixon Administration amendments propose:

(1) The AFDC-UP program would be cut out. AFDC-UP aids families where there are two parents who are unemployed or work part time and it operates in 23 states. By eliminating welfare benefits for these families the unemployed father would be forced to work. This is what Nixon and the Senators wanted to do. But since families receiving regular AFDC would not be cut off, the families on AFDC-UP might switch to AFDC and stay on welfare. This could happen if

the father leaves the home since AFDC is a program that benefits mothers and children. Therefore, the government may try to force people to work, but it may actually force families to split up.

The Nixon Administration could have kept AFDC-UP for unemployed parents and increased benefits for working parents, but Nixon rejected this idea because it would cost one billion dollars—we spend \$25 billion a year in Vietnam but \$1 is too much for working poor here.

(2) Rents in public housing would be raised. Under the present system if your income goes up above a certain point you can become ineligible for public housing. You can be forced to move to private housing where the rents are higher. The administration proposed to solve this problem by making the amount of rent you pay a percentage of your income: 25% for people above the poverty line and 20% for people below the poverty line. There would no longer be a point when you would be forced out of public housing.

But there is another problem. Rents in public housing now are only 16 to 19% of income on the average. Since the lowest rent level under the Nixon plan is 20% many if not most people would be paying higher rents.

(3) Emergency grants would probably be eliminated. Under the new Nixon amendments grant levels would be frozen at their present levels except for the seven southern states where payments would rise to \$133 a month or \$1600 a year for a family of four. The definition of present grant level would supposedly include some determination of how much a family gets a year in emergency grants. But since the amount of emergency grants would be spread out over all recipient families, those recipients who know their legal rights and get emergency grants would get less money than they get now.

(4) The administration proposed to eliminate the surplus food program which poor people prefer and make food stamps more automatic thereby moving away from the idea of giving people cash instead of bits of funny colored paper which brand recipients as "poor, uneducated" and imply that recipients can not be trusted with real money.

Recipients will be given a form they can sign which would mean stamps would come automatically and the cost would be deducted from the regular welfare checks. One positive change is that recipients could sign up to buy a smaller amount of stamps than the maximum. Under the present system recipients must buy a fixed amount of stamps each month if they buy at all.

(5) Under the so called Family Health Insurance Plan, people who now get medicaid would have to pay some portion of their medical bills and the cost would be deducted from the welfare checks, whether the family wants the health insurance or not. This violated and would abolish, the present money payments principle.

(6) States would no longer be required to set a standard of need. If this were approved by Congress the number of working people who would be eligible for benefits would be reduced in those states that set high standards of need above the welfare payment level.

These changes are happening—and it looks like they will happen if any bill is passed—because no one except poor people is interested in making life better for poor. Nixon and the Governors of the states are concerned about the rising costs of welfare and Congressmen are worried about welfare cheaters.

No one knows that people are on welfare because they have no other choice. No one knows that recipients cheat less than income tax payers. No one thinks about the fact that welfare recipients cannot work.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It is up to the National Welfare Rights Organization to make people understand the truth about welfare. It is up to NWRO to convince people that the solution is ADEQUATE INCOME NOW and not forced work and lower grants. This is why NWRO is fighting for \$5500 a year for a family of four. This is why we have our own bill, the Adequate Income Bill, which was introduced into the Senate by Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota. This is why when we have local demonstrations to get our rights we should also talk about adequate income, \$5500.

\$5500 is not just an amount of money. \$5500 means changing the welfare system from repression to freedom for poor people. \$5500 means decency, dignity and democracy for all Americans, not just those able to support themselves.

### S. 3760 A BILL TO PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE INCOME FOR ALL AMERICANS: INTRODUCED IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE BY SENATOR EUGENE McCARTHY

Section 1. Short Title. This Act may be cited as the "Adequate Income Act of 1970".

#### Sec. 2. Findings and declaration of policy.

(A) (1) Approximately three-fourths of the people receiving welfare today are either children, the aged, disabled, or blind. Few of the rest can become self-supporting.

(2) Employment does not provide adequate income for poor people.

(B) Congress must ensure every poor person adequate income so he may freely express his Constitutional rights and liberties.

(C) (1) The Poverty Line is an inadequate objective standard of measure in determining real need.

(2) The Agriculture Department's Low-Cost Food Plan must also be rejected as a reasonable standard.

(3) The Moderate Food Plan is the minimum standard from which to determine adequate income.

(4) The Bureau of Labor Statistics, using the Moderate Food Plan demonstrates that a family of four needs \$5,500 a year for food, housing, clothing, and other basic necessities.

(D) Therefore this Act shall guarantee a minimum income of \$5500 for a family of four.

(E) Programs known as Public Assistance shall be replaced with an Adequate Income Plan. They shall not:

(1) deny benefits through harassment.  
(2) interfere with legal rights and entitlements.

(3) exclude categories of people from receiving benefits.

(4) fail to provide adequate income.

#### Sec. 3. Appropriations:

A sum is authorized sufficient to carry out the Act.

#### Sec. 4. Right to Adequate Income:

Anyone who is eligible may file.

#### Sec. 5. Eligibility:

Any resident of the United States who is not confined to a penal institution is eligible.

#### Sec. 6. Filers and members of unit:

A family unit is one or more individuals. The person who files a claim for benefits is called a filer.

##### (A) Male Filers:

(1) At least 18 years old or married.  
(2) Must include wife, or woman with whom he is living and is the mother of one or more of his children.

(3) May include any person living with him under 18 years of age.

##### (B) Female Filers:

(1) Must be at least 16 years old and a mother, or at least 18 years old.

(2) Must include in unit any man living with her and the father of one of her children.

(3) Must include husband under (E) (1).

(4) May include any person living with her under 18 years of age.

#### (C) Informal separation defined.

(D) A person responsible for the care of incompetents, stepchildren, children confined to public institutions, etc., may file claims and receive benefits in their behalf.

#### (E) Miscellaneous provisions.

(2) No person may be a member of more than one unit.

#### Sec. 7. Benefit Level and reduction rate:

(A) (1) The amount paid to each filer shall equal the amounts prescribed in 7(B) and 7(C) or subsection 7(A) reduced by two-thirds of the positive net income of all members of the unit.

(B) (1) Without reductions by virtue of income each unit will be entitled to payments at the following rate:

(a) for the filer, \$2000.

(b) for the second member of the family unit, \$1500.

(c) for each additional member of the unit, \$1000.

(2) Amounts shall be increased or decreased by the same percentage as the increase or decrease in the median family income.

(3) Amounts shall further be increased or decreased according to the local cost-of-living index.

(C) In addition to amounts determined under subsection 7(A), each unit shall be entitled to amounts necessary to meet basic needs of a unique or non-recurring nature, such as furniture, special medical, nutritional or instructional needs when they become eligible and in the event of fire, flood or other disaster.

(D) In lieu of amounts determined under 7(B), a unit may establish a benefit level based upon an itemized statement, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

#### Sec. 8. Definition of Income:

(A) A person's available income shall be his adjusted gross income, as defined in section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with the modifications provided by subsections (B) through (H).

(B) Amounts added to adjusted gross income. (There follow 24 categories to be included in the computation of adjusted gross income.)

#### (C) Deductions Allowed.

Adjusted gross income may be reduced by the amount of the items under this subsection.

##### (D) Losses.

Losses defined in this subsection may be deducted from adjusted gross income.

##### (E) Interest.

Deductible and non-deductible interest defined.

(F) Depreciation and Depletion. Deductions defined.

#### (G) Deductions Disallowed.

Deductions not specifically allowed in this section are disallowed.

##### (H) Subchapter S Corporations.

(I) Internal Revenue Code Applicable.

#### Sec. 9. Reporting and Accounting:

##### (A) Definitions.

(B) Accounting Period. One calendar month.

##### (C) Reports. Beginning of each month.

(D) Payments. Semi-monthly, based on net income for the preceding period.

##### (E) Filer's accounting method.

(F) Allocation of items computed yearly.

##### (G) Positive carryover defined.

(H) Negative carryover defined.

##### (I) Use of carryover.

(J) Latest carryover used first.

##### (K) Unit Membership.

(L) Initial enrollment and new units.

##### (M) Payment and Recovery.

Sec. 10. Records, Information and Returns. Determinations and Review by the Secretary.

(A) Information required to determine eligibility shall be supplied on such forms as may be provided by the Secretary, without violation of the right to privacy.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(B) To verify the accuracy of reports the Secretary may conduct audits and investigations on the basis of random selection. The Secretary may audit when he has reason to believe that the filer is not entitled to receive the allowance for which he has applied.

## Sec. 11. Procedural Rights and Review.

(A) All Rules and Regulations shall be made on the record, and they shall be reviewable in a Federal court.

(B) Organizations with a membership of more than 50 filers shall have standing to participate in any public hearing held to review a rule or regulation or challenge a proposed rule in a Federal court.

(C) The Secretary shall publicize the provisions of this Act, and fully inform all applicants and filers of their rights.

(D) The Secretary shall afford an opportunity for a full due process hearing before an examiner with respect to any action of the Secretary denying, withholding, or modifying a person's allowance.

(E) The Secretary shall establish a Board of Appeals which shall review the decisions of the examiner upon the request of any party thereto.

(F) Decisions of the Secretary, denying, withholding or modifying allowances shall be reviewable by a civil action commenced in the United States district court.

(G) If the Secretary fails to commence a hearing, the aggrieved individual shall be entitled to the allowance or may commence a civil action in the United States district court.

(H) All persons shall be entitled to reasonable expenses incurred in any administrative or judicial hearing.

(I) The Secretary shall establish a Complaint Review Board to review complaints against an employee of the Secretary who is not performing his functions properly.

(J) All records kept by the Secretary shall remain strictly confidential.

## Sec. 12. Claims Against Allowances Prohibited.

## Sec. 13. Administration of Adequate Income Plan.

(A) Administration shall be performed under the supervision of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, using where possible the administrative and technical facilities of the Internal Revenue Service.

Sec. 14. Reports, Evaluation, Research and Demonstrations, and Training, and Technical Assistance.

time. Today we should pause to remember the spirit of world brotherhood kindled by Apollo 11.

One of the aims of the American space program is to encourage greater international cooperation in space. Unfortunately, the history of the American-Soviet race into space is filled with excessive nationalism and chauvinism, and is marked by far too few periods of international cooperation. Hopefully, this trend will reverse itself as we continue our efforts, and space exploration will indeed become "an investment in tomorrow" both in technology and in human relations.

I would hope that as we Americans mark the first anniversary of the moon landing, we will share not only our achievements but all our findings in the space field with the nations of the world, and as we extend our efforts towards international cooperation in space we also encourage greater cooperation in other areas of foreign relations.

July 20, 1970

## JAKE HERSHLEY SPEAKS

## HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, Jake Hershey, president of American Commercial Lines, Inc., has sent me a copy of a speech which he recently delivered before the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners.

Although the speech was given before the Penn Central crisis broke, it was somewhat prophetic and remains timely for those of us charged with the task of legislative oversight of railroad regulation. As Mr. Hershey points out, reasonable return on investment and profitability are essential if our Nation's railroads are to continue serving the public adequately in the years ahead.

His is a fresh point of view, and I commend Mr. Hershey's speech to my colleagues:

SPEECH BY J. V. HERSHLEY BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION PRACTITIONERS, JUNE 17, 1970

"Conglomerate" is, of course, a dirty word. So dirty in fact that a reader of reports issued by business enterprises has about as much chance of seeing it in print as any of the four-letter words only recently accepted into the vocabulary of the modern writers. It is, of course, derived from the Latin *conglomerare* which means "to roll together", a fitting meaning in the context of today's discussion of transportation. Webster defines the noun "conglomerate" as "that which is heaped together in a mass or compacted from various sources". It would be hard to find a less definitive word in the English language. At the risk of drawing criticism from so erudite an assembly, I shall try to be more specific as to the term for the purpose of this discussion, and use it as its meaning here "a group of business enterprises, substantially dissimilar in functions under common ownership and management".

In examining this type of corporate creature as it relates to transportation, we discover that there are two fairly different types, or perhaps more accurately, two separate paths which have led to the construction of the conglomerates which embody one or more transportation enterprises. The ones which have received the most attention are those in which the course has been to use the resources of a transportation enterprise as a means of entering a completely different kind of business either through acquisitions or promotion internally. The resources may include cash flow from operations, surplus cash accumulated during the past, balance sheet strength resulting in borrowing power, and management teams with substantial depth which can undertake the expanded executive and administration functions. Among those who have elected this route toward formation of a diversified company from the base of transportation, the railroad companies are the outstanding examples, and I think it is fair to say, the principal cause of concern among certain elements in the public sector.

A partial list of activities of railroad companies and their holding companies not directly railroad-related include operations of television stations, investment services, life insurance companies and banks, oil producing companies, timber and lumber activities, airmotive services, hotels, pipe lines, motor

## FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF MOON LANDING

## HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the historic flight of Apollo 11 and the "giant leap for mankind" by astronaut Neil Armstrong, the first man to walk on the lunar surface.

During the past year the Apollo 11 crew, Commander Armstrong, command module pilot Edwin E. (Buzz) Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins have appeared before millions of people around the world. Their activities in space and their appearance on earth brought the world community closer together for a brief

## THE GLORY CLOTH

## HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Stars and Stripes all too often in recent years have been the subject of incredible disrespect on the part of a small segment of American citizens. All of us have been shocked and saddened by the mockery some would try to make of our Nation's flag. I think the views of most all Americans are well expressed in a splendid poem written by Mr. Ernest R. Kubasek of Parma, Ohio, whose unabashed patriotism shines through every line. I most earnestly associate myself with the sentiments he expresses so eloquently and would like to share his work with my colleagues in Congress:

## THE GLORY FLAG

(By Ernest R. Kubasek)

I see her there high overhead  
wondering where she has bled;  
wondering her silence there,  
wondering—I stand in prayer  
for this Glory Cloth.

I see her there, she's really mine  
flying on the end of line,  
fastened from the reckless winds,  
waving off the thoughtless sins,  
of this Glory Cloth.

I see her there, this treasured cloak,  
her strongest seams will lift our yoke  
and she will free the last of us,  
standing high—or in the dust.  
This lovely Glory Cloth.

I see her there, red, white and blue  
she's sure to stay though others who  
would rip her into strands of rags  
and plunge her into dirt-filled bags  
or toss her to the fire's wrath  
or trample her beneath their path.

I see her still, high over head,  
she's really mine—I'm what she's bred,  
this lovely Glory Flag.

carriers, foundries and a great variety of real estate developments. They manufacture steel, chemicals, shoes, underwear, shirts, hydraulic and electric controls, electric motors and a variety of industrial hardware.

The other path to involvement of transportation in a diversified corporate family is in the reverse direction from the course originating with transportation. There have been a number of instances of so-called conglomerates acquiring or pursuing carriers, especially air lines and motor carriers. The recent activities of International Utilities, a diversified company, in acquiring Ryder Truck Lines and through them a large auto transporter, coupled with a substantial purchase of the shares of Pacific Intermountain Express, reflects a desire to include transportation as a major part of its corporate operations. Chromalloy Corporation acquired The Valley Line, a major water carrier, another example of a transportation company being the object rather than the source of expansion. In reverse direction is the expansion of Pott Industries, whose resources were originally limited to barge transportation and shipbuilding, now expanded into non-transport related fields.

If any general underlying pattern can be discerned from this fence jumping to greener pastures, (frequently illusory), it is a movement away from capital intensive transportation enterprises which during the recent era has produced a low rate of return on investment into fields where reasonable profits have been the general rule. To test this conclusion it is worthwhile to examine some numbers.

During 1969 the fifty largest transportation companies included 21 railroads, 14 air lines, 10 motor carriers, 3 steamship companies, 1 bus company and 1 motor vehicle leasing company. The aggregate profit after income taxes of the group equalled 3.8% of its total equity; that is, total capital plus surplus plus retained earnings. Nine of the fifty posted losses for the year. All of the domestic carriers were regulated by either the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board. Turning our attention to another group of regulated enterprises, the statistics for a group of the fifty largest utilities, 48 in electrical or gas energy and two in communications, the rate of return is 10%. For the fifty leaders in retailing and commercial banking, the comparable figures are, respectively, 11.4% and 12.0%, with no losers. On a much broader comparison, the transportation leaders as a group looked just as bad, for the 500 largest industrial companies produced a combined profit of \$24.7-billion on equity capital of \$214.7-billion, or 11.3%. Eleven of these 500, or 2.2%, posted losses versus 14% for the transportation group.

One year's financial results are admittedly inconclusive. However, Forbes magazine in January of this year published average rates of return on equity for 566 major corporations over the preceding 5-year period, listing them in order of declining yields. They included 24 carriers. The mean position of the transportation companies was 491 out of 566. Twelve carriers were above 491 and twelve below. Of the last 6 places, 5 were carriers. The poor showing of carriers, though worse in 1969 than the previous year, is nothing new.

The explanation for the extension of a conglomerate's activities into the transportation field lies in the fact that selectively there are some carriers which have been consistently making profits comparable to other industries. Included in the top 50 transportation companies are four truck lines whose return on equity averaged 18%. These performances make selected carriers just as tempting to acquisition-minded conglomerates as an industrial company would be since the return is considerably higher than the

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

industrial mean of 11.3%. Another factor which in my opinion makes well managed truck lines attractive as acquisitions is the long term pattern of past growth in revenues which have increased over the past 10 years from \$31.6-billion to \$54.8-billion. Another consideration enhancing the desirability of motor carriers is the short economic life of its rolling assets. In periods of abnormally high interest rates and a high degree of inflation this factor becomes one of pressing importance, as it facilitates debt financing.

Barge lines, though not attaining the profitability of the star motor carrier performers, show growth of 5 to 6% annually in tonnage, and being the lowest cost bulk carriers serving the principal industrial and agricultural areas of the nation have a fairly secure service market and demonstrate increasing economy of scale. Moreover, significant expansion of the waterway system such as the Arkansas River and Cross-Florida Canal will accelerate the growth of this mode. These factors have led to several important acquisitions such as that of my own company, American Commercial Lines, which is now a subsidiary of Texas Gas Transmission Corporation.

There does not appear any conflict with the public interest in this type of conglomerate activity in the field of transportation. I know of no cases where diversion of resources out of transportation for the benefit of another member of the corporate family has taken place following an acquisition of a carrier by a multi-industry company. On the contrary, the tendency seems to be for the superior financial strength of the parent, or group as a whole, to be employed for the benefit of the acquired carrier. Certainly, since carriers are generally not cash-heavy, they do not tempt the corporate "raider" for liquidation purposes.

The other type of so-called conglomerate activity, the use of a transportation business as a base from which to build a group of enterprises outside of transportation, has implications of a different order and raises questions which urgently require answers in the nature of public policy. Transportation as represented by all modes, if considered as a single economic activity, is the biggest business in the nation. If, as was the case during last year when our G.N.P. reached its highest to date, it returns in earnings only one-third as much per dollar invested by its owners as industry generally, the expectation must be for removal of capital resources and re-dedication of cash flow into investment areas of more fertility. Any alert manager will exert every effort in this general direction. His first duty is to the owners of the business, not to tradition. He knows that if he can convert the resources of his pipeline company, railroad, or other carrier to a pharmaceutical company of average profitability, he can expect 18% instead of 3.8%, or to an industrial machinery company, 12%. Even the relatively poorer textile industry averaged 8% on equity in 1968 and 1969.

However, the manager in the predicament of achieving only the average transport profits for his company has a rather unsaleable item. In the case of railroads, the depressed earnings in many instances have reduced the public's valuation of the company as measured in the market for its shares to less than half of their book value. Nevertheless, he must use the resources with which to spring into another pasture. In fact, he may well be propelled over the fence by determined and vocal stockholders.

He has the strongest imaginable motivation to diversify. In many instances, particularly in the case of railroads, the size of the company and the magnitude of cash flow aided in the past by investment credit tax relief, and currently by accelerated depreciation, makes possible the acquisition of important units in the industries which I mentioned earlier, or provides the initial capital

for the formation of a holding company which can grow to a full-size conglomerate. The development of this trend to its ultimate conclusion can be observed in the case of Northwest Industries, Inc., which is perhaps the most widely diversified railroad-based conglomerate. It proposes to sell the railroad properties to its own employees, thereby making the metamorphosis complete.

The phenomenon of the creation of transportation-based diversified companies is, therefore, a logical exercise in the traditional deployment of capital when its rewards can be improved. The only surprising thing about these occurrences is that they have been so long coming. When one considers that the railroads were granted nearly 180,000,000 acres of lands by Federal and State Governments, containing substantial quantities of oil, timber and minerals, in addition to 660,000 acres of right-of-way, there has been a base of non-railway operating assets on which to build ever since 1874. Their earnings have been unsatisfactory for at least twenty years. One can only admire their endurance.

I have spoken of the deployment of capital from one area to another as a natural development. Generally it is. It customarily reflects a reduction in the demand for the goods or services into the production of which capital has been dedicated. In some instances the product becomes obsolete requiring the capital to be shifted to an enterprise needing it. This clearly is not the case with transportation of goods. The profit deficiency does not result from lack of demand. So we finally arrive at the question which I am sure each of you have asked yourselves many times—"How can the business of transportation be managed so as to produce a profit sufficient to justify retention of invested capital in the enterprise?" What is wrong? Is it the level or relationships of freight rates? It could be. Is it unusually severe labor problems? This certainly is a factor. Is it improper regulation? Many think so. Is it in part due to the refusal of shippers, including the United States government itself, to pay a fair price for transportation? Probably; the shippers are certainly organized as the greatest protest group still considered respectable. I don't know these answers, though naturally I have my own opinions.

I do strongly feel, getting to the matter of the public interest in transportation-included conglomerate formation, that the incentive for carriers to go afiel must be removed. This can only be done by insuring that there are opportunities in all essential modes of transport for equivalent profit measured against returns in other industry of similar risk. Privately owned transportation, whether by pipe line, railroad, truck or marine vessel, can not survive if its profits are not generally equivalent to that of business generally. It is obvious that the removal of capital from a needed carrier is not in the public interest. But what is a needed carrier? One which works for 3% return on its owners investment? Is the same carrier needed at rates which produce 10%?

There has been talk among legislators of prohibiting or limiting the free flow of economic resources out of carrier operation into another enterprise, commonly held. Nothing could more quickly destroy private ownership of carriers. Investors do not put their financial corpus behind bars. Slave capital is incompatible with our system, and any hint of it drives capital away. Since investment funds must remain fluid, it can be controlled only by insuring a satisfactory relationship among its users, and this is measured by profit.

In my opinion, the possibilities of avoiding government ownership of important segments of our transportation systems have become less favorable during the past several

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

years. Unless private and government attitudes affecting freight rates and regulation change in favor of improving the rate of return in the transportation industry, the public treasury will be called upon first to supplement, then supplant private investment. The handwriting is on the wall in a language we can all understand.

## THIS RIVER COULD DIE

## HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, Kentucky has been well known for the beauty and purity of its mountain streams. However, many of them are in danger of being destroyed.

Many of the streams are polluted, and within the near future headwaters of the Kentucky River and the river itself may lose the purity and beauty for which it is noted.

Unrestricted strip mining, unregulated timber cutting, and failure to properly dispose of the liquid and solid wastes are causes of the present polluted state of the upper reaches of the Kentucky.

John Fetterman recently wrote an excellent article, entitled "This River Could Die." I enclose it for perusal of the Members of this body:

## THIS RIVER COULD DIE

Is it too early to be concerned about the Kentucky River?

The Kentucky is a "clean" river as it winds through the booming Bluegrass region of the state, a river steeped in legend and history, holding the key to bold industrial hopes, offering a unique scenic playground.

In this nation suddenly awash in curb-stone ecologists it is fashionable to join in mass hand-wringing and wailing over already degraded streams—the Cuyahoga, the Hudson, the Potomac.

But the Kentucky? Should we concern ourselves with a river which is not yet degraded?

The heart of the Kentucky, as in all rivers, lies in its headwaters and the watershed which they drain. There lie the hundreds of tiny streams and rivulets which make up the three main forks of the Kentucky and which will ultimately determine its character. I have just traveled for many miles up those creeks, across the ridges of the watershed, and looked at the many secret places where the river is born. I have talked with people who are supposed to know what happens to rivers and why.

The stewardship of those who watch over the headwaters is not all good. There are scars of abuse and the seeping of mistreated water into the streams.

But that is not yet evident when you observe the mainstream of the Kentucky down in the Bluegrass. One can only wonder whether someday the Bluegrass will have to pay for the negligence far upstream in the headwaters, negligence which is largely concealed by folded mountains and almost inaccessible hollows.

Down in the Bluegrass, the heartland of the commonwealth, the river, which is the product of all those tiny beginnings in the mountains, is a vital force. Without the river, the booming population and industrial growth would stop in cities such as Frankfort and Lexington. The latter, one of the nation's fastest-growing towns, draws its water from the river, and needs more and

more water of good quality. Lexington now has a population of some 154,000, including unannexed suburbs. Ray Gillespie, executive director of the Greater Lexington Area Chamber of Commerce, says that estimates of a population of between 230,000 and 260,000 by 1980 are "extremely conservative."

The area is going to need a river of dependable flow and quality to survive. Water for the Bluegrass was one of the arguments advanced for the controversial Red River Gorge dam. Such impoundments, as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and others insist, may someday be necessary to save the Bluegrass. But the Red River is far downstream from the vital headwaters. The more the headwaters are abused, the more often such attempts will be made to heal the river elsewhere. When you look at the whole length of the river, there is a tendency to agree with the critic of downstream impoundments who said, "It is like trying to cure diarrhea with a band-aid."

But the Kentucky River mainstream appears healthy. The U.S. Geological Survey checks the water regularly at Frankfort. Its findings show that the river carries safe levels of all chemicals measured, amounts far below U.S. Public Health Service standards. The amounts are increasing very slowly over the years—but nothing to worry about yet. It is only one of the subtle changes that occur over the decades.

The total of all dissolved solids in the river, for instance, has risen from 104 parts per million in 1907, to 150 parts per million in the "water year" ending in October of 1968. The U.S. Public Health Service says 500 parts per million is acceptable under its drinking-water standards.

The river does seem to get "muddier" from time to time. At Frankfort, it has drained a watershed of around 5,412 square miles. The muddy water is caused by the 1.9 million tons of sediment the river carries past Frankfort in the average year. That average varies widely, depending upon the relationship of rain, mining, timbering, farming and road building upstream. The flow of the river is measured in "cubic foot per second days." That means the total water flow for a year is expressed as cubic feet per second.

The flow, then, has a bearing on the sediment, and sediment may be regarded as the initial signal of malfunction of the watershed somewhere upstream. In 1954, the cubic foot per second flow fell to 892,417, and 317,000 tons of sediment were measured at Frankfort. The year 1962 was a year of heavy flow—more than 3 million cubic feet per second and nearly 3.5 million tons of sediment washed by.

The sediment load is one symptom of the high vulnerability of the river to what happens upstream.

The amount of water moving in the river at any one time is vital. And the even flow of a river depends largely upon the condition of the intricate network of streams which make up its headwaters and which give it life. A good watershed holds back heavy rains, releasing the water later in what otherwise could be disastrous droughts.

Lexington now takes some 31 million gallons of water a day from the Kentucky. Estimates are that by the year 2000 the city will require 140 million gallons a day. At least six times since 1960 the flow of the river at the point where Lexington takes its water has been below that projected requirement. And this does not take into consideration all the other communities which use the Kentucky, including Frankfort, Richmond, Winchester, Nicholasville, Lancaster, Harrodsburg, Versailles and Lawrenceburg.

The estimates are that in the year 2000 all these communities will require some 200 million gallons of water a day. The total water-needs estimates and the water available are converging at an alarming rate.

Fewer than 700,000 people now live in the

counties which use the three main forks and the mainstream of the Kentucky. State population projections put this figure at 1.2 million in the year 2020.

Looking at what is happening upstream makes one suspect that the planners in the Bluegrass should be doing likewise. All is not well. And since water always runs downhill—in this case from the mountains to the Bluegrass—any problem in the watershed is germane to the future of the Bluegrass.

The Kentucky is formed by three large forks—North, Middle and South—which meet at Beattyville. Here is a sampling of what goes on up there:

## NORTH FORK

This long leg of the Kentucky meanders past Hazard and begins in the northern corner of Letcher County near Jenkins. It long has been the eyesore of the mountain river system, long dead from mine acid and other pollutants. It and its tributaries are festooned with defiant banners of toilet tissue and the almost indestructible plastic containers for food distributed under the surplus-commodities program. Robert Collins, supervisor of the Daniel Boone National Forest calls it a sewer with a mud bottom. Bernie Carter, director of the division of fisheries in the Kentucky Department of Fish & Wildlife Resources, says the "North Fork has been completely degraded."

The extent of the degradation was driven home on a recent warm day when Sam King, ranger of the Boone Forest's Red Bird Purchase District, and I began looking for a "nice" spot to eat a lunch brought along in sacks. After an hour or so of easing a Jeep past sullen outhouses, creeks stained by acid and iron precipitate from mines, stream beds littered with refuse and junked autos, we gave up. It is not the way it appears in the tourist guides—all mountain streams and flowers and serene vistas. The North Fork is an unholy mess. And it represents one-third of the beginning of the Kentucky River.

King, as ranger of the Red Bird District, heads a Forest Service program aimed at buying tracts on the Middle and South Forks to be put under management. The primary concern, King says, is to protect the watershed. The Forest Service has no holdings on the North Fork and after this, his first look, King said wryly: "It's the first river I ever saw I'm not sure I want."

Tributary after tributary bears witness to this despoiling. On Potters Fork, the stream begins in a once-wooded cove which has become the city dump for the town of Jenkins. Refuse smolders and smokes and rots and stinks and eventually is washed into the watershed. Local people find it a good place to hunt rats with .22-caliber rifles.

Millstone Creek, a larger tributary, is no better, despite roadside "experimental" plantings by a firm which has strip mined much of it. Things are little better on the other creeks which ooze into the North Fork above Hazard: Thornton Creek, for instance, where refuse and silt vie for space in the limited stream bed.

Below Whitesburg, in the area where the Carr Fork Dam is being built, the creeks fairly shout their outrage as they run yellowish orange or black, depending on the whims of the coal operators who work at the headwaters. Montgomery Creek is yellow and a creek aptly named Yellow Creek lives up to its name admirably. Both contribute to the ruin of Carr Fork, in turn passes the pollution along to the North Fork.

## MIDDLE FORK

This fork, formed by the junction of two of the best streams in the mountains, still shows signs of how a good mountain stream can look. One leg, Greasy Creek, is considered by many to be the last clean stream of any size in all of Eastern Kentucky. It is a wide,

July 20, 1970

July 20, 1970

25107

beautiful creek and few people live along it, since much of the watershed is owned by large companies and the U.S. Forest Service. Of Greasy Creek, Carter says flatly: "Greasy is the only really good stream in East Kentucky from the Big Sandy to the Tennessee line . . . everything else is degraded."

But disturbing things are beginning to happen to Greasy. There is talk of stripping the hills to get at the coal and on at least one tributary, Laurel Fork, muddy water pours into the stream with each rain, water laden with silt from the scars left by timber cutters. The silt sweeps down the hillsides along the bare "skid roads," the routes used for dragging down the logs.

There are wild and beautiful stretches along the Middle Fork—occasionally marred by the scars of forest fires or the creeping pollution of a strip mine.

On Rockhouse Creek, a clumsily constructed haul road to a strip-mine site gushes silt, and the creek at spots has become a dump.

#### SOUTH FORK

This fork is formed by two long streams, the Red Bird River and Goose Creek. The Red Bird begins with two trickles called Mud Lick Branch and Cow Fork, both of which are devastated by stripmining. On lesser tributaries such as Blue Hole Creek, Ashers Fork and Darbs Branch, the silt is delivered to the larger streams in steady doses, much of it from fireravaged hillsides and from the sites of logging operations. Elk Creek strives to disgorge a gulf of garbage and refuse into the Red Bird—and sometimes succeeds with the help of a heavy rainfall.

Silt streams down the beds of Blue Hole Creek and Phillips Creek. Part of the watershed in Phillips Creek still suffers the effects of a devastating forest fire in 1963. The cover is gone and the hillsides can no longer check the rapid runoff from heavy rains.

The Forest Service is studying the streams in all of Appalachia and headquarters for this project, called Strip Mine Area Restoration Project, is in Berea. There, Great Davis, the project leader, and Willie Curtis, a hydrologist, discussed the Kentucky.

They say that most streams in Appalachia are acid and if enough goes into the headwaters it can change the total watershed.

"How much it will change the whole stream life we really don't know yet," Davis said. "That is what we want to find out. We don't know much about long-life effect."

The Berea scientists made measurements in three small watersheds in Breathitt County, each about 1,500 acres. One was about 50 per cent disturbed by stripmining, and was being mined at the time. It was mined earlier, in 1968, and the suspended sediment in the stream rose quickly during that mining period from less than 200 parts per million to above 46,000 parts per million. The mining stopped and the stream cleared, with the suspended sediment dropping to around 200 parts per million again. But a heavy rainfall came one day and the sediment load leaped above 4,000 parts per million. Tons of dislocated earth lie there now, awaiting the rains to flush them into the streams.

Curtis also checked the erosion rate in two small watersheds of similar size and characteristics. One was partially stripped. The average erosion rate there, he found, was 5.9 tons of sediment per acre per year. In the second watershed, which had not been mined, the average rate was .7 of a ton per acre per year.

The picture on all the watersheds studied was similar. During mining, the sediment load skyrocketed and headed downstream. Later rains produced new flows of silt and mud.

Silt, Collins says, is the most insidious pollutant there is. The rocky shoals become mud slicks, game fish leave, the entire char-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

acter of the stream changes. And it all gradually inches downstream. Stream beds filled with silt become swamps and their ability to hold floods is impaired. Sediment increases the cost of filtering water for use in the towns. It interferes with the efficiency of hydroelectric plants and industries.

But all of this is far from the Bluegrass. Is it too early to be concerned?

Carter says, "What happens in the headwaters will happen downstream. We already have had complaints in the Irvin area. It will be here (Frankfort). You can't stop the river." Carter says the primary problem is siltation, which destroys the aquatic environment. "Fish and plants have no place to live."

Collins calls the Kentucky the "lifeline of the Bluegrass region" and points out that benefits of protecting a watershed are reaped downstream. But protecting a watershed to benefit someone else downstream does not always appeal to landowners in the headwaters.

The forest soil, or "duff," built up over thousands of years of natural organic deposits often is destroyed by stripping, fire or timber abuse. The duff then is no longer there to retain water from the rainy seasons and release it gradually during the dry season, thus protecting the even flow of streams. Collins thinks that it is going to cost more to restore the watersheds than the amount of profits which are being realized by their exploitation. "But the taxpayers are going to have to pick up the tab someday if they want to keep on drinking water."

What, then, should we do to insure that such rivers as the Kentucky do not become the cesspools that many other rivers have become?

First, we must have effective, rigidly enforced laws to protect the rivers. Second, we must revise our own attitudes toward the rivers.

We need a sweeping federal watershed law that would supersede and replace the confusing and inept maze of local, state and federal regulations, directives and decrees. Such a law would stop pollution abuses by industry, municipalities, even individuals. In effect, the law must provide that whoever uses the river must leave it in the same condition in which he found it. Industry could not unload its chemical and thermal pollution; sewage plants could not discharge into the rivers; agriculturists could not contribute pesticides, soil from improper cultivation and animal wastes. Such a federal law also would make up for a political reluctance to act, as in the case of the Kentucky General Assembly which refused to stop logging operators from overcutting and from leaving roads which become silt-laden gullies.

We must develop a more intelligent and wholesome attitude toward the rivers.

We all live on one watershed or another and depend upon that watershed as the life-blood of commerce, health, recreation and general well-being. We must rethink our traditional "right" to do what we please with our own land and water. All the land in a watershed and all the streams which flow through it carry a responsibility to all the people in the watershed. We must abandon the colonial philosophy that if we ruin one stream we can move on to another. There are no more streams. Increasing population intensifies the urgency.

There is a saying among the folks who live in the mountains of East Kentucky:

"Everybody can't live at the head of the creek."

In other words, only one fortunate person can put his outhouse there, dispose of his garbage there, begin the pollution there. The rest of us must live downstream, hope for the best, and join the voices raised in protest along the filthy streams.

We need the law; we need the change in attitude; we need the rivers.

#### THE RISKS OF ATOMIC POWER

##### HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

MR. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the increasing possibility of power blackouts and brownouts makes apparent the woeful inadequacy of our national power resources. The problem demands immediate congressional consideration. Many still regard nuclear power as the panacea to our national power ills. In committee, on the House floor, and in previous statements to the RECORD, I have outlined the reasons underlying my opposition to this essentially erroneous premise. It is my firm belief that hydroelectric plants present the most viable solution to our Nation's power crisis.

Although the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project for northern Maine was denied the requested \$807,000 for pre-construction funds in the House, I am confident that the Senate Appropriations Committee will reinsert that amount and that this action will receive full Senate endorsement. In conference, however, Dickey will encounter private power's all too familiar arguments, arguments that have been refuted by the Army Corps of Engineers, scholastic specialists, journalists, and private utilities' past record. The evidence overwhelmingly favors hydroelectric power as the most feasible and pragmatic solution.

Recently, Anthony Lewis, writing in the New York Times, described the dangers involved in the "peaceful" uses of atomic energy; that is, its potentially disastrous effect upon the environment. In the hope that my colleagues find it both interesting and informative, I am submitting Mr. Lewis' article for the RECORD:

#### THE RISKS OF ATOMIC POWER

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON.—Scientific administrators are not immune from the hucksterism that seems to afflict so many bureaucrats—the urge to promote their specialty. Just as airport authorities think more and bigger airports are man's most urgent need, and the road people consider highways more satisfying than cities, so those who administer atomic-energy programs have been powerful advocates for the wider use of atomic energy in society.

In the United States and Britain, especially, atomic power has been promoted as a conservator of scarce fuel resources and an economic boon. In Britain, plans call for nuclear plants to produce nearly a third of the country's electricity by 1985. In the United States, the Atomic Energy Commission has been a Babbit booster of nuclear power, brushing aside concerns about health and safety in its zeal.

Only now have we begun to appreciate how valid the expressed concerns are. Fission as a source of power for ships or for the production of electricity carries risks that rank high among all the terrible things we are in danger of doing to ourselves and our surroundings.

A new British magazine called The Ecologist—a most informative and unhyberbolic publication—gives a graphic picture of the problem in its first issue. It starts by explaining the extreme sensitivity of all living beings to radioactivity, and showing how radioactive versions of such elements as zinc and iodine and strontium can become incredibly concentrated by nature.

A study of the Columbia River, for example, indicates how radioactivity multiplies alarmingly as it progresses up the food chain. In the water itself there were low concentrations of radioactive substances. The amount in the river plankton was 2,000 times greater, in ducks feeding in the plankton 40,000 times, in young birds fed by their parents on insects from the river 500,000 times and in the egg yolks of water birds one million times.

The Ecologist magazine tells of a Nevada nuclear test in 1962 that sent a radioactive dust cloud over Utah, introducing large amounts of radioactive iodine into milk. Worries about health effects were waved aside, but in fact thyroid disease of children—and death from congenital malformations—have markedly increased.

The dangers of so-called peaceful uses of atomic energy stem from two sources: the possibility of accident and the disposal of nuclear waste products.

Accidents, with serious release of radioactive material into the atmosphere, have occurred at one nuclear power plant in England and one in America. The loss of the nuclear submarine Thresher in 1963 had its radioactive effects.

An American doctor and physicist, Jerold M. Lowenstein, said at the recent Malta conference on pollution of the seas: "With ships, accidents are inevitable and can be expected to become increasingly frequent as more and more vessels are nuclear powered." Dr. Lowenstein noted the inadvertent irony of one nuclear ship booster who, writing in 1965, said the discharge of atomic material into the sea would appear to be a hazardous possibility, but "similar problems concerning the discharge of fuel oil have been faced with considerable success."

The handling of atomic waste products is already a serious problem. They have to be buried far underground or held in tanks as corrosive liquids that will boil for more than 100 years. The Ecologist notes that, of 183 atomic waste storage tanks in the states of Washington, South Carolina and Idaho, nine have failed so far.

"These failures have occurred after less than twenty years," the magazine says, "and yet the contents of the tanks are utterly lethal for thousands of years."

At the very minimum, without any doomsday visions, all this advises caution in the use of nuclear power. For while the evidence of damage has grown, scientists have progressively lowered their estimates of the amount of radiation to which humans can safely be exposed. It appears that there is no absolutely safe dose: the risk is proportional to the dose.

"What is an acceptable risk?" Dr. Lowenstein asked. "It seems to me that there is a critical difference between a risk which one chooses in order to get a larger benefit, such as having an X-ray, and (the risk of having) every living thing poisoned with radioactive wastes because some decision makers, in some countries, have decided that their people must have . . . atomic power regardless of the consequences."

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

#### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week was proclaimed in 1959 in order to "show American solidarity with their captive brethren in eastern and

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

central Europe." This expression serves a dual role. It allows Americans to re-acclaim our own liberty and to express our concern for those who remain in subjugation throughout the world.

Captive Nations Week also demonstrates to those people who live under Russian dominion that their plight does not go unnoticed in the West. The annual broadcast of the Captive Nations Week message over Radio Free Europe is, we trust, a source of hope and support to those behind the Iron Curtain.

Captive Nations Week messages have brought, in the past, angry responses from the Russian Government. They have answered our condemnation of "Soviet colonialism" with countercharges of what they term "American imperialism" in Southeast Asia and elsewhere. It is noteworthy, however, that this form of accusation and counteraccusation seems to be diminishing of late. Perhaps we are entering a period of more reasonable discourse in our diplomacy than has been the case since the cold war has raged.

Nevertheless, Captive Nations Week will always serve an important purpose. It stands a reminder that the overriding goal of American foreign policy must be to establish an atmosphere for peace in a world in which the people of both Communist and Western nations will have the right of self-determination in establishing their government and in choosing their life styles.

#### PRIDE IN AMERICA

#### HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. C. L. Jackson. Rarely have I read a simpler or more eloquent expression of patriotism than this letter. I think the thing that impresses me most about this letter, Mr. Speaker, is that it does not shout its conviction. It states it plainly, but firmly, and with the absolute assurance that comes from faith in the inner goodness of one's country. I strongly recommend it to my colleague's attention:

DEAR MR. GRIFFIN: It is with regret that I look upon the youth of our nation. Surely these children do not come from Christian homes, or homes where order and discipline were a part of their lives. I have five children, one son who left three weeks ago for Officer's training at Lackland A.F.B., Texas. Since he is an only son our hearts were sad that he was leaving (as all separations are sad) but we are proud of him and of our country. My husband served 12 years with the Air Force through two wars and we are grateful to our country for all it has given us. I believe this feeling has overflowed to our children. For we have a married daughter whose husband will probably be drafted this summer. They are both working and planning for the time he will be gone, not fussing about the job he'll have to do. I have three teenage daughters. One will enter college in the fall. The other two will go to public school. If this sounds like I'm rambling, it's just to let you know that there are still

July 20, 1970

people in these United States that haven't lost their heads and are proud to be Americans and to serve our country as best we can.

Mrs. C. L. JACKSON.

#### WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR AMERICAN PRISONERS IN VIETNAM

#### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Louis R. Stockstill has done much in behalf of our servicemen who are prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

It is imperative that the American people unite in an effort to get these patriotic men released or at least get the enemy to stop its inhumane treatment. I don't see how any American could object to such a cause.

Mr. Stockstill wrote an article for the Air Force and Space Digest on the subject, and it was condensed and used in Reader's Digest.

I want to insert the condensed version in the RECORD for every American to read. The article, which speaks for itself, follows:

#### WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR AMERICAN PRISONERS IN VIETNAM

(By Louis R. Stockstill)

Once a month from her apartment in Arlington, Va., Gloria Netherland walks down a long hallway to the mail chute and deposits a letter. She watches it drop from sight on the first leg of a journey into an unknown void halfway round the world. The letter begins "Dear Dutch." Whether Dutch will receive it is impossible to say.

Gloria and Dutch have been married 18 years, but she doesn't know whether he is alive or dead. For more than two years she has written the monthly letters—six lines each, according to current communist rules. None is answered; none is returned. But, in the pattern of "dreadful uncertainty" that characterizes her life, she never fails to write.

Capt. Roger M. Netherland, shot down over North Vietnam in May 1967, is officially "missing in action"; fliers reconnoitering the site where his plane plunged to the ground believe they heard his voice, but no word has come through since.

Gloria Netherland is but one of hundreds of American wives and parents whose husbands and sons are the forgotten men of the Vietnam war—approximately 1400 men captured or missing and possibly in enemy hands. Most of the known captives are imprisoned in North Vietnam. Others are held by the Vietcong in the South. A few are interned in Laos and Red China.

On the shoddy pretext that these captives are "criminals," not POWs, Hanoi will not allow neutral inspections of its prisons—inspections required under the Geneva Convention, ratified by North Vietnam in 1957 and by 119 other governments since the origination of the Conventions in 1949. In blatant disregard of international rules, Hanoi refuses even to identify the prisoners it holds, to release the sick and wounded, or to allow proper flow of letters and packages, though the Red Cross has tackled the problem again and again.

Evelyn Grubb's only knowledge of her husband, for example, has come from a Hanoi propaganda gesture. An unarmed reconnaissance aircraft, piloted by Maj. Wilmer "Newk" Grubb, was shot down in January

1966. Hanoi gloatingly publicized his capture. Each time Evelyn writes, she sends photographs of their four sons—stapled to the letter so that Newk will know if they have been removed. She doesn't know whether he has received a single photograph or letter. In almost four years, she has received no further official word of her husband.

Until recently, the American public has been provided scant information about American POWs in Vietnam. Now, for the first time, our officials are waging an open fight for the prisoners. The diplomatic maneuverings which previously shielded many aspects of the situation from public view—although perhaps right for that period—have been partially cast aside. The United States is speaking out. Yet, in order for the tough and forthright new policies to produce desired results, citizens must join the attack. Our assistance could be crucial.

Here, then, are the sobering facts about the prisoners—the way they are used and abused by Hanoi.

#### MISERY AND MALNUTRITION

The armed forces have been able to positively identify 401 men as captured (Air Force, 192; Navy, 140; Army, 46; Marine Corps, 23). Some intelligence about these men must be kept secret or couched in guarded language to protect them. Nevertheless, accounts of inhumane treatment have emerged. Consider Navy Lt. (j.g.) Dieter Dengler, who was taken by the Pathet Lao in 1966 and turned over to North Vietnamese soldiers. He was spread-eagled by his captors and left at night to the mercy of jungle insects, repeatedly beaten with sticks for refusing to sign a statement condemning the United States, and tied behind a water buffalo and dragged through the bush. The once 157-pound flier weighed 98 pounds following his escape and rescue.

Other escaped prisoners have told of similar maltreatment in Pathet Lao and Vietcong jungle camps. Prisoners are fed little but rice, and many suffer from malnutrition. Some are afflicted with intestinal parasites. Except when allowed out to empty toilet pails, prisoners are confined in huts, often locked in wooden foot blocks or handcuffs. Barbaric treatment is not unusual. In Hanoi's prisons, men have been kept in a pitch-black room for more than a year, hung from ceilings by their arms, tied with ropes until they developed infected scars, and burned with cigarettes. At least one has had his fingernails ripped from his hands. The broken bones of another, set by communist doctors and still in casts, were rebroken by guards.

Prisoner treatment varies, of course. North Vietnam operates its best-known prison camp—known as the "Hanoi Hilton"—in central Hanoi. Here prisoners are wakened between 5 and 6 a.m. by a gong, followed by a 30-minute Radio Hanoi English-language broadcast of propaganda piped into their cells. At mid-morning they are taken out to empty toilet buckets. At 11 a.m., as much as 19 hours after they last ate, they are fed. Food—picked up on a wooden tray and eaten in the individual cells—consists mainly of pumpkin or squash, pork fat, a vegetable resembling wild onion tops, and bread or rice. Then, prisoners may "nap" on their bare board bunks until two in the afternoon, when their cells are flooded with another half-hour Radio Hanoi broadcast. Between 4 and 6 p.m. they are fed the second and final meal of the day.

Prisoners generally are isolated from communication with more than one or two other prisoners. Many are kept in solitary. Certain prisoners have been allowed on occasion to write to their families, but few letters ever reach home. U.S. officials, with reasonable suspicion, regard the "Hanoi Hilton" as a propaganda showplace. It is the lone prison that foreign journalists have been allowed to enter.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

##### PATTERNEED RELEASE

To date, only a handful of Americans have been released: 16 by the Vietcong, nine by Hanoi. The releases by Hanoi—on two occasions last year and one this August—have all followed a disturbing pattern. First, just three men have been let out at a time, and always accompanied by blatant propaganda. Second, the names of the men to be freed have been withheld for periods of more than a month after the intention to release was announced, thus creating untold agony for thousands of hopeful next of kin. Third, releases are carried out via dissident Americans instead of through the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The release last August illustrates how completely Hanoi milks the prisoner situation for its own purposes. To begin with, it was carried out via a group of eight dissenting Americans—a pacifist, two members of the Students for a Democratic Society, a member of anti-war organizations, a man who had served a stockade sentence for refusing to fight in Vietnam, and three cameramen from an underground movie-making outfit. All but one went to North Vietnam, where they were solicitously entertained for a couple of weeks.

Finally, on August 4, Hanoi named the men who were to be freed. Two were Navy men (Lt. Robert F. Frishman, captured 21 months earlier; and Seaman Douglas B. Hegdahl, imprisoned for two years and four months); the third was Air Force Capt. Wesley L. Rumble, a prisoner for 15 months.

At an airport press conference in Vientiane, Laos, U.S. newsmen described the men as "pale and gaunt." Lieutenant Frishman, acting as spokesman for the prisoners, selected his words carefully. He said only that he was "happy to be returning home."

"How was the treatment you received while a prisoner?" he was asked.

"I received adequate food, clothing and housing," Frishman replied.

**View From the Side.** When the three men arrived at Kennedy International Airport in New York, I was there to see them for myself. To television audiences, the returning prisoners may have looked reasonably well cared for. But their appearance as they disembarked was deeply saddening. Frishman and Hegdahl were first off the plane. Rumble, ill, stooped, pale, was assisted down the steps, helped into a police car, and rushed to a waiting medical-evacuation plane.

The two Navy men were ashen. Their eyes were deep, hollow circles of darker gray, much like the exaggerated eyes of starving children. Frishman had been seriously wounded. The North Vietnamese doctors had removed his elbow and tied the muscles together. "I am glad to still have my arm," he said. It hung at his left side, the loose sleeve of his jacket emphasizing that the arm was terribly wasted.

A reporter asked Hegdahl how much weight he had lost. He had "no comment." But then Frishman addressed the microphones: "I lost 45 pounds. Seaman Hegdahl lost 60 pounds."

What about the welfare of the other prisoners still held by Hanoi?

"No comment."

As Frishman turned to leave, I saw him for the first time from the side. His shoulders were incredibly thin. The collar of his shirt hung loosely about his neck. The lines of his nose, his cheeks, his chin were sharply drawn, haggard. So were Hegdahl's. Their tightly stretched, almost translucent skin had a corpse-like pallor.

Their "escorts" had nothing but praise for what they had seen in North Vietnam, including Hanoi's "humane" treatment of prisoners. "How many prison camps did you visit?" I asked. After repeated evasions, their leader admitted that he had "no information at all" about any of the prison camps. Nor had they brought any hint that North Vietnam might consider changing its policy on prisoners.

**The Prisoners Talk.** Twenty-five days later, I saw Frishman and Hegdahl at Bethesda Naval Hospital in Maryland. Sunshine had improved their color; they had regained some weight. They were ready to open up.

Frishman recounted how he had been blindfolded after his capture and despite serious injuries, driven in a truck to other locations, where he was stoned by the populace. When he reached the prison, he was refused medical treatment and told he was "going to die in four hours" unless he talked. When he passed out, he was taken to a hospital. "Then, even with my bad arm, they tied me up with ropes."

Doctors operated on his arm, but failed to remove missile fragments; so it was six months before the incision healed over. "I would wake up and find my arm stuck to the blankets . . . The scab would come off . . . The wound would drain again."

Hegdahl, too, had been subjected to solitary confinement for more than a year. He was permitted occasional mail, but the letters were rifled of enclosures (including money) sent by his parents. The lone package he was allowed had been plundered before he got it. For propaganda purposes he was photographed "reading" a U.S. magazine which he was allowed to hold "just long enough for them to take the picture."

Frishman was cautioned before his release not to forget that "we still have hundreds of your buddies." But those still imprisoned want the facts out in the open, he said. As one prisoner said to him, "Don't worry about telling the truth. If it means more torture, at least we'll know why we're getting it. It will be worth the sacrifice."

**Plan for Action.** Hanoi's continued lack of compassion has brought rising anger in Congress. In August, 42 Senators banded together in a strong statement condemning North Vietnam for its cruel treatment of the prisoners and their families. The declaration, sponsored by two opponents of our Vietnam policies, Charles Goodell (R., N.Y.) and Alan Cranston (D., Calif.), says that if North Vietnam thinks it can "influence the policy of the United States toward the Vietnam conflict" through its intransigent position on the prisoners, it is "doomed to failure." Those signing the statement included both Democrats and Republicans, and represented 33 of the 50 states.\*

This sort of initiative is helpful, but only full and continuing exposure of the plight of the prisoners and their families, together with relentless public pressure at home and abroad, is likely to produce action. A business-as-usual attitude on the part of the American public can only indicate to Hanoi that these men who have given so much to their country have indeed been forgotten.

In my interviews with numerous government officials, with representatives of the Red Cross, members of the armed forces and next of kin of the prisoners, I have asked each person what would be the most effective attack that could be launched. They agreed that dramatic results could come from a vigorous letter campaign directed to 1) representatives of foreign nations and the press of those nations; 2) your Congressmen; and 3) Xuan Thuy, chief North Vietnam negotiator in Paris.

The mail to the foreign nations should urge that pressure be brought to bear on Hanoi to live up to the "spirit" of the Geneva Conventions by putting into practice the Conventions' rules on the treatment of war prisoners.

The letters to Xuan Thuy should make the same demands. And those individuals who are not in sympathy with the war itself should make it clear that proper treatment

\* On August 21, the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris vehemently rejected the protest as "slander" and an attempt "to deceive public opinion."

July 20, 1970

of the prisoners is an overriding consideration. All should note that continued intransigence on the part of Hanoi will stiffen the resolve of the American public, not weaken it.

Letters to members of Congress should call for a joint resolution demanding proper treatment for the prisoners and missing men.

There is a chance—possibly a good chance—that world opinion might force Hanoi to honor basic codes of human decency.

"By any human standards" the position of North Vietnam is "totally inexcusable," says Secretary of State William P. Rogers. "I don't understand why we have not become more excited about the prisoner question."

The Secretary is telling the people of the United States that their concern is important. The rest is up to you. If you want to help the men whom many Americans have forgotten, you can. Your letter could be the one that spells the difference.

#### SAN PEDRO: NEW SEASON FOR AN OLD SALT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, San Pedro, Calif., a bustling community of 85,000 citizens, is renowned for its productivity. This beautiful seaport is the leading west coast port in terms of tonnage and proudly claims to be the largest tuna cannery center in the world.

In addition, San Pedro is a tourist center. While the seaport activity continues, the tourists and vacationers come to delight in this unique city.

Mr. Robert Bobrow, however, complains with a hint of nostalgia that—

They're making a dude town of San Pedro . . . They are sissifying what used to be a hard, crusty old sailors' town . . .

To an "old salt" who remembers one of his favorite places as it used to be, San Pedro's transformation is regarded with mixed emotions.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Bobrow's delightful and enlightening article from Westways magazine, entitled "San Pedro: New Season for an Old Salt," in the RECORD:

SAN PEDRO: NEW SEASON FOR AN OLD SALT

(By Robert Bobrow)

They're making a dude town of San Pedro. Turning an Old Salt into a Fancy Dan. They're giving it that sexy, touristy, come hither look and dressing it long, lean and hungry. They're manicuring its fingernails, restyling its hair and, not to be half safe, they're spraying it with rosewater to take the worry out of being close. In plain words, they are sissifying what used to be a hard, crusty old sailors' town, where, if you walked two blocks up Beacon Street and made it back with anything resembling your original features, you proved you were a man!—unless you happened to be a woman, in which case your chances were approximately 60-40.

Since San Pedro has always been one of my favorite places, I reserve the right to regard its transformation with mixed emotions. It may boggle the mind of an old San Pedro lover like me, but the town seems to like its new image.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

On Harbor Boulevard (which once was plain old Front Street), a leathery ex-seaman explained it this way: "The stuff they used to preach in the old Missions must have gone to the town's brain." Indeed, that's the impression you might get on your own, the way San Pedro keeps eyeing itself in a full-length public relations mirror. Its biggest problem these days appears to be deciding what new refinement is likely to go best with what old refinement—say, a Cabrillo Marina with a Cabrillo Museum; a freeway access with a Terminal Island bridge; a New England village with a Ports of Call; a Northwest Village with a Princess Louise. A Princess Louise? Yes, sir, it certainly does look as though San Pedro has undergone a change. At least, that's how it looks on Harbor Boulevard.

On Seventh near Gaffey I heard a different theory, however. Here, a solid-citizen-local-booster type told me that San Pedro, a crafty old bachelor town, was just making a grandstand play for that ever-popular dowager, the Tourist Buck. "Apart from that," he said, "nothing basic has changed. San Pedro is still the leading West Coast port in terms of tonnage. It is still the largest tuna port in the country and the largest tuna cannery center in the world. Get beyond the tourist frippery, and you can still smell honest salt and taste the flavor of a seaport's hurly-burly."

Thus reassured, I made the rounds and here is how Mod San Pedro seems to shape up.

Ships still sail into port the old way, through Angel's Gate and, usually, up the Main Channel. In 1967, for instance, 3,807 vessels called at San Pedro (and its neighbor Wilmington). Of these, 2,260 vessels arrived under foreign flags.

With few exceptions, though, they are not the old ships. Nor are their cargoes, generally speaking, worked in the old way. The longshoreman with the broad back, a baling hook in his hand and sweat on his brow, has gradually given way to automation. Today, gantry conveyors, great mechanized monsters of steel, reach into the bowels of specially designed ships, snatch out their cargo and never even show the strain.

Another innovation of recent years is the shipping of fully loaded truck trailers. When these arrive at their destination, they are wafted off by massive cranes, hooked onto waiting trucks and sent on their way.

Finally, some modern ships couldn't make it up the Main Channel if they wanted to, owing to their size. Designed for bulk loading of either liquids (oil, etc.) or solids (iron ore, etc.), they tie up in the Outer Harbor, where their cargo is simply pumped or dumped. Fantastic amounts of tonnage go in and out this way—or equally fantastic ships. Some supertankers, indeed, exceed three football fields in length and have displacements greater than any passenger liner afloat. So, change is the underlying factor. But though shipping techniques have changed, San Pedro has changed with them, and therefore retains its preeminence as an international port of call.

What may have changed more than shipping techniques is the eye of San Pedro's beholder—perhaps even the beholder himself. The boy who used to daydream on a greasy piling, spinning fantasies of perilous voyages to far-off places, has grown into a man (not that much of a change, really) who now spins more or less the same fantasies from the comfort of an upholstered bar. Along the Main Channel there is no end of comfortable places wherefrom to fashion dreams of romance.

There is, for instance, the Princess Louise on the Terminal Island side. (Easy, mate! In some quarters, Terminal Island is now called East San Pedro—mostly, I suspect, in West San Pedro.) The Princess, a one-time Canadian Pacific steamship (which was

finally deactivated by means of a total mechanical hysterectomy) is tied up at a berth between the old Ferry Building and the Bethlehem Shipyards. A plush old scow, she now caters to a distinguished clientele, especially to daydreaming boys grown affluent. Its gallery can serve practically anything a boy can name, from Murghi Curry (\$5.25) to Bosun's Steak (\$6.45), not excluding continental ecstasies like *quenelles en brioche*. Best of all, when a boy boards or leaves the Princess, he hears the eerie creaking of the gangplank, a nostalgic reminder of the sound of the tide against a greasy piling. . . .

Back on the mainland (I just can't bring myself to say West San Pedro again), there is something for everyone, whatever his nautical bag may be. Norm's Landing, for instance, is for deep-sea fishermen and would-be fishermen. There is also a boat hoist for folks whose thing is keeping their boats locked in garages. Strung along the edge of the Channel, south of Norm's Landing, are the Ports of Call and the New England village. Here one can browse for hours—days, in fact—among antiques and boutiques, crocks and clocks, maps, books, decanters and the like, not to mention the assorted calories. If it's calories one is after, this is certainly the place to get them, whether the plan is to carry them home in a sack or on one's person. Smoked cheese, candy-coated almonds, waffles, imported hams and frogs' legs are only a few of the goodies that can be purchased here. Besides, there is the usual array of hot dog, hamburger and pizza stands (some located on a former San Francisco Bay ferryboat), as well as such classy eateries as the Ports of Call Restaurant. Here, as on the Princess Louise you dine graciously to the music of passing foghorns, spinning gossamer dreams while imbibing a Passionate Virgin which, you discover when the bubble bursts and you pay the bill, is only a \$2.00 drink. What all this has to do with San Pedro's intrinsic character, I'm at loss to explain.

Adjacent to Ports of Call, across what only seems an endless parking lot, is Berth 73, or as it is better known, Fisherman's Wharf. Since word has reached uptown about the New San Pedro, a couple of Scandinavian furniture companies have opened posh retail shops in nearby warehouses—but I don't know how to explain that either. I only know that between the tourists and the dudes, the comparison shoppers and the miniskirts, it is a wonder that the hardworking fishermen can get their nets mended and their decks swabbed.

To be sure, San Pedro is still the largest tuna port in the country, though only a fraction of the actual fleet is based at Fisherman's Wharf. Most of it is based in San Diego. But nearly all the tuna caught by this fleet is deposited at Fish Harbor, on Terminal Island. To cite 1967 statistics again, 203,572,000 pounds of tuna, representing about 70 percent of the fleet's total fish catch, was delivered to the processors along Terminal Island's Cannery Row. And if you can stand some more statistics, in 1967 the processors turned out over 10 million cases of canned fish—48 cans to the case!

As in the shipping business, however, the fisherman's trade is undergoing changes. Despite a general upswing in commercial fishing, a perceptible decline has set in locally. The interplay of various factors is responsible. For one thing, sardines in California waters used to be highly important to the fisherman's livelihood, but their schools have been diminishing of late and they have been put under temporary restriction. Then there is the intense international competition. Peru is the chief competitor in the fish meal market, while Japan is a strong adversary in the tuna market. To these and other factors must be added the rising costs of commercial fishing. Nowadays, a tuna boat has to be a purse seiner with large, refrigerated

holds. Each boat goes out on the high seas for periods averaging 20 to 40 days, and each carries a crew of between nine and 12 men. It takes a bountiful catch, indeed, to pay out worthwhile shares to all concerned and make the voyage profitable, too. Still, men continue to cast off for the high seas; they continue to return loaded, and, despite the gawkers, they even manage to get their nets mended while in port.

It is a wonder to a lot of people, myself included, that tourist San Pedro and workaday San Pedro manage to keep out of one another's hair while coexisting cheek to cheek. No sooner does a new Customs House come into being on Terminal Island than someone gets a brainstorm for a new Space Needle. No sooner is the Vincent Thomas Bridge constructed to replace the old ferry than the pressure comes to restore the ferry, in order to take the strain off the bridge traffic, and to provide an additional kick for tourists. The bridge, by the way, was originally expected to have about 6,000 daily crossings. It now has upwards of 12,000—at a quarter a throw. For every natural waterfront enterprise—for instance, a kelp processing plant—there is a reflection of affluent leisure—for instance, a pleasure boat harbor, where scores of would-be sailors seem headed for the day when they bring the business of the port to a complete standstill.

The pressures of the times seem to have their own logic. To drum up more trade for the *Princess Louise* (which is doing over \$2 million business a year!) the owners are planning to construct a Northwest Village on their outsized parking lot, a Village to compete with the Ports of Call complex. And that's only the first phase of the plan. The second is to construct a sightseeing monorail, which will enable tourists to look over cannery workers' shoulders and to eavesdrop on the ten-minute breaks of shipyard workers, machinists and others.

One waterfront installation that happily combines business and pleasure is the Catalina Island Terminal, at the foot of the Vincent Thomas Bridge. The new, all-encompassing terminal is now home for four companies engaged in helping folks leave their hearts in Avalon; the MGRS Company, which used to run the Big White Steamship (soon to be replaced by two smaller but speedier ships); the Avalon Navigation Company, which carries 350 passengers at a clip; the Catalina Motor Cruises, which runs four boats with an average capacity of 85; and for people in a hurry, the Catalina Seaplanes Company, which carries 11 passengers to Avalon in something like 12 minutes.

But there comes a time, alas, when even a confirmed wool-gatherer, to do right by his favorite town, must temporarily abandon the waterfront and check out the new uptown scene.

One of the wildest discoveries I made was a comparatively new enterprise in San Pedro, doing business behind a modest storefront on Seventh Street. The Blue Engravers is run by Bill Marron, a former machinist for the Shell Oil Company; it is in the business of making square dance badges, and, what is more, has cornered practically the whole world market! It started as a favor, several years ago, when Marron was asked to make identification tags for the square dance club a friend of his belonged to. Pretty soon, word got out to other square dance clubs in the community. It got out all over California, all over the 50 states, in fact, and to some 20 foreign countries! Now Marron's company turns out over 15,000 pretty plastic badges a month, and has 9,000 square dance organizations as customers. At an average of about \$1.50 a badge (depending on cuteness), that's not bad for a business that didn't exist before 1955! The badges come in all sizes, shapes, colors and inscriptions—from "Bucks & Does, Fayette, Mo." to "C'est Magnifique, Fontainebleau, France." In a way, business has gotten too good. Marron, a

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

portly, middle-aged man who seems happiest at a pantograph or tool grinder, has even had to take up square dancing himself to keep up his public relations!

At this point, I feel I should digress to correct what may well be, by now, a wrong impression. I've been blithely calling San Pedro a town, when it really isn't that at all. (Nor should anyone be misled by its fierce sense of identity, which would do credit to any proper town.) Strictly speaking, San Pedro is a part of the city of Los Angeles and has been since 1909, connected to the central core by a long, thin umbilical cord. It is a moot point, however, whether the umbilical cord is Los Angeles' or San Pedro's. As a matter of record, there was a San Pedro before there was a Los Angeles, Father Serra's cohorts having established an embarcadero there as early as 1769. On the other hand, it was San Pedro that joined Los Angeles, not vice versa. So, have it your own way.

But here's the upshot. Never, until now, has San Pedro shown a hint of the Los Angeles influence. I'm referring to character, of course, not economics, politics and the like. Even today, San Pedro remains choosy as to which of the Big City's customs it will adopt, and which it won't.

San Pedro is (as far as I can say from personal observation at this writing) the most happily integrated community in Los Angeles. No fuss, no fanfare, just mutual respect among men. The Yugoslav fisherman has come to regard the Italian fisherman as his brother (which may be the greatest integration feat of all). Scandinavian seamen seem to get along with Mexican and Negro cannery workers. And I don't mind saying that it warms my heart to see, on a typical San Pedro street overlooking the harbor, a bunch of neighbor kids—black, white, brown—playing, not as white or colored, but as kids, and apparently enjoying themselves thoroughly.

To a large extent, this is probably an outgrowth of San Pedro's strong union tradition. San Pedro was a union town when labor organization was still regarded as subversive in Los Angeles. Much of its tradition arose in the bloody battles of the 'thirties. Some San Pedrans, like realtor Al Atchison, still remember what the town was like before the unions. "A seaman's life was rough—and rough is a mild word for it," he told me. "Since San Francisco used to be the home port for most shipping companies, such outrages as shanghaiing occurred mostly up there. But if a ship still needed crew members by the time it hit Pedro, men could easily be shanghaied in the dives on Beacon Street. Sailors and longshoremen would shape up in fink halls, and the apple polishers would get what jobs there were while the rest went hungry. Kickbacks and discrimination were the rule, not the exception." The wave of union organization that swept San Pedro in the 'thirties, with seamen and longshoremen in the fore, put an end to the fink halls and the shape-up. It put an end to favoritism and discrimination in hiring.

A man can do a lot of gracious living in San Pedro and without a lot of accompanying pretensions. I pulled my car up, as I usually do when I am in the neighborhood, on modest Bluff Place, where simple, ordinary homes look out over the whole Port of Los Angeles. I could see all the seaport hurly-burly, as well as all the tourist frippery. Directly below me were the Cabrillo Museum, Cabrillo Beach and the San Pedro breakwater, which stretched out in the haze to Angel's Gate and beyond. What a great place to live, I mused, if only the sordid considerations of livelihood did not dictate that I live elsewhere. I'd even gladly put up with a Cabrillo Marina (about which there are differences of opinion in San Pedro), since it seems to be the consensus that relocating small boat harbors in this fashion would keep Sunday Sailors from gumming up the operations of the port. Yes, mates, San Pedro, for all its changes, is still a town to daydream in....

But progress calls!

As new developments take shape on high, along San Pedro's side of the Palos Verdes hills, older, lower-class blights are becoming meat for the bulldozer. Some 65 downtown acres, including the riper blocks of Beacon Street, are in the process of redevelopment, and the password nowadays among the hock shop men is Urban Renewal. This is also the password among bail bondsmen, Rotarians and other hall-fellows-well-met. Nobody seems to know, as yet, what will replace the derelict old buildings whose sagging walls no longer can contain the romance, intrigue, debauchery and plain, unvarnished tragedy they've seen.

On the corner of Fifth and Centre, across the street from where San Pedro keeps its one and only (so far) high-rise building, the town is about to get a new courthouse. When I last saw it, the courthouse was just barely not ready, though the judges, dedicators, public personages and ribbon-cutters were. What is important is that the courthouse could easily have turned out to be just another courthouse—square and mundane—if not for its courtrooms, which happen to be round.

From what I have been able to learn, the round courtroom idea (with the judge right in the middle of things) was imported from Fresno, a comparatively sedate city, where it seems to be working out nicely. But in San Pedro, such an innovation is bound to stimulate a lot of lively, active interest. I wouldn't be surprised, in fact, if there occurs a sudden rise in harmless misdemeanors among normally law-abiding folk who merely want to get into a round courtroom, one way or another. With justice coming full circle, as it were, one can only hope they remember to provide a swivel chair for the judge.

I regret to report that in my wanderings about San Pedro, I was able to find only one remaining old house with a genuine, honest-to-goodness Widow's Walk. For those who may not know, a Widow's Walk once signified more status than inside plumbing in a seafarer's home. A special sort of attic enclosed by a small porch and always facing towards incoming vessels, it used to be the place from which a sea captain's wife (or, at least, a first officer's wife) would first greet the return of her husband's vessel. I couldn't find out how many Widow's Walks San Pedro had when the vogue was at its height. But the Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Board may consider its attention called to one of the last of the breed, at 324 Tenth Street, San Pedro.

I always leave San Pedro with reluctance, vowing to come back next week. The last time (a month ago) was no exception. Coming off the hill, I drove down Sixth Street, past shlock stores and Antique Shoppes—one needs a printed guide to tell the difference. Turning on Front Street—pardon, Harbor Boulevard—I drove past berths that looked embarrassingly new and efficient. I drove past newer berths, still under construction, past warehouses and lumber yards, past the sprawling Todd Shipyards. I drove under the Vincent Thomas Bridge and, stalled in creeping traffic, I turned around to ask San Pedro a final question: What else was new, besides the square dance badge business? How, after all, was it *doing* in its courtship of the Tourist Dollar?

But, looking rather like Popeye in a nance's costume, San Pedro only winked.

---

THE LATE HONORABLE  
CLIFFORD DAVIS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share the many good things that have been said

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

about our departed friend and colleague, the late and lamented Clifford Davis of Tennessee. He will be remembered as a man of the highest honor and integrity. He was a great orator and was a very able legislator. His contribution to the cause of good government will long be recognized and appreciated.

Always affable and friendly, Cliff enjoyed life and he thoroughly enjoyed his friends—of whom he had many. The country has suffered a great loss in the passing of this good man. I extend to his surviving wife and to other members of the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

---

A GI'S LETTER TO THE FOLKS  
BACK HOME

---

**HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG**  
OF WISCONSIN  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, a young soldier in Vietnam, Sgt. Winter S. Hess, whose parents live in Lake Geneva, Wis., recently wrote them a graphic letter giving his strong views on the division existing in our country over the Southeast Asian involvement.

The sergeant's comments on the war, the campus disorders and the need to support our President, are worthy of further attention.

I insert a portion of his letter in the RECORD:

A GI'S LETTER TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME

Everyone is following the Cambodia push in the newspapers and on radio. We all are cheering Nixon on and the troops as well. It is really the best thing that has ever been done over here. The Dinks are really in a world of hurt. The Cambodian troops and Vietnamese troops are combining their forces and efforts against a common enemy. The Dinks won't be able to fight or resupply for a long time due to the Monsoon season in the south. It is just so great to know the war is really not in vain. It really makes me sick about all the demonstrations and protesters and Congress trying to cut off the funds. I can't believe that the country can't see and understand the tremendous significance of the Cambodian Invasion. It seems that they all would have us stand up and say, "Peace, Brother" to Charlie while he blows your head off. It truly scares me that my Countrymen are trying to get me killed by giving aid to the N.V.A. and V.C. I am almost afraid to come home for fear of being confronted by some long haired guy who carries a V.C. flag or tears down the Stars and Stripes. I think I'd become involved in a situation that would only turn out bad.

Honest to God, it is too bad that the N.G.'s at Kent or Madison didn't have a mini gun like is used over here. They would have gotten about 400 instead of only 4 b-----

How dare one of those punks think they are so right and headstrong that they can sit 9000 miles away, read a newspaper, hear a speech, or imagine what the world is all about, and then demand the world be run as they dictate.

God Bless Nixon for having the sheer guts to do what he knows is right and stand by his beliefs. I believe all the service men and Viet Nam are behind him and wish that somehow the country they fight for would come to its senses. I find it hard to believe that

the majority of the country is so sick that it can't control the demonstrators. Is the whole country against winning this war or is the majority being led around by the nose? I am astonished that you and others like you would allow the demonstrators to go unchecked. If my kid was part of a demonstration I'd jerk him out of school so fast his head would swim. The bum could then try to make a go of life without the one big thing the country offers—education. When they take life so much for granted, then maybe the loss of that life means very little. Their only justification for existence is the mere fact that they exist. They offer nothing, give nothing, and take all.

Another thing, taking for granted that the U.S. is still run on a Democratic system, that Congress represents the people, and does what the public majority want, I must assume that the majority of the public is against providing funds for the Cambodian Offensive. I realize that it hasn't passed yet, but, if it does, am I to assume that you, the majority, don't support Nixon and us in Viet Nam, or is it that the Congressmen and Senators just never got the word? I think it is most likely the latter, and, if so, damn everyone of the "silent majority" for being so complacent if the funds are cut off.

I really get worked up over this thing but I mean exactly what I say. I don't mean to vent my anger on you but at the United States that I knew back in the mid-sixties which you happen to represent and be a part of. They say that your generation gave us the world such as the mid-sixties and it was good. Who the Hell gave us this world we have now. I think my generation. Makes me sick.

I'll write a nice, friendly letter another day. Have a nice Memorial Day and keep that flag out in the front yard. . . .

---

PUT NONE BUT AMERICANS ON GUARD

---

**HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER**  
OF KENTUCKY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday afternoon, I was sitting in the yard back in Kentucky reading a Sports magazine when my father—who lives up the road—came down and handed me a periodical entitled "The Bible Friend" and suggested that I read an article therein entitled "Put None But Americans on Guard."

I believe the material would be of value to my colleagues:

PUT NONE BUT AMERICANS ON GUARD

"Put none but Americans on guard tonight." This command of General Washington to his officers at Valley Forge echoes and re-echoes down the corridors of time, but never so clearly as today.

All of Washington's army were Americans. What did he mean? Twenty miles away in Philadelphia was Gen. Howe's army of English and Hessian troops, quartered in the warmth and comfort of American homes and public buildings, well-fed by American farmers driving in herds of cattle, sheep, hogs, along with wagonloads of grain, fruit and vegetables at considerable profit to themselves; however General Washington's patriot army was starved, half-clothed, without shoes, in huts hastily built in the snow-covered woods and open spaces of Valley Forge, disheartened, some ready to go home. Washington knew that he had two types of

Americans to deal with—one willing to sell their country to England for money; the other ready to die to hold it.

We have two types of Americans today; the one willing to sell our birthright inherited from those men who offered their lives, their fortunes, that this nation might live, with a heritage of freedom for the future. They would sell it for what? These Americans who have had the opportunity to develop every God-given talent they possess, in the free-est country ever dreamed of throughout the ages, built upon the foundation of Christian civilization, under a Constitution five centuries ahead of its time, with individual responsibility, the test of good citizenship—these Americans would sell out to a United Nation's World government, a combination of governments and lack of them, all stages of civilization and lack of it, with cannibalism rampant in Congo "states" with fewer inhabitants than Columbus, Ohio, each holding one vote as do we, the U.S.A. with 200 million people.

Russia's three votes plus seven satellite votes, all Communist, all atheist, dominate this police-State. When will our turn come?

Shakespeare's lines best describe our plight: "Ingratitude, stronger than traitors' arms, quite vanquished him.—Great Caesar fell.—Then you and I, and all of us fell down, whilst bloody treason flourished over us." Is such to be our fate?

These salesmen of America can be found, not only in Washington, but in our colleges, schoolrooms and pulpits. In instructions to his Reds, Lenin said: "These people are the most gullible of all. Work with them for best results."

Members of Congress, voting for disarmament in a sovietized armed world; for foreign aid to our Communist enemies; Federal aid to schools, the better to control them; reciprocal trade and not protective tariff, placed in the hands of the president, not the Congress where it was placed by the Constitution; income taxes to pay for these evils; welfare rackets, formerly called socialism, to undermine individual responsibility—these are the types of Americans Washington had in mind when he said: "Put none but Americans on guard." By their votes ye shall know them.

We have no room in this country for 50-50 Americans. He who is not with us absolutely, is against us and should be treated as an alien and sent out of the country."

These professors, instructors, ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ, who preach and teach our students the virtues of an atheistic United Nations with its goal—world government, are pleased to be referred to as "intellectuals," the "intelligentsia." Both terms imply intellect, the ability to think clearly. Will Rogers dubbed them "intellectual illiterates." These men who see nothing to lose in a national sell-out, are not thinkers—they have merely been to school, a counterpart of the European School-men centuries ago. Of 401 petition signers to abolish House un-American Activities Committee, 81 were prominent clergymen, 135 were the great—near great in our colleges and universities totaling 216 or 54 per cent.

Our Constitution says: "No titles of nobility shall be granted." But instead of a caste system based upon titles, we make gods and half-gods of these un-American schoolmen and pulpit orators who tell the "masses" what to think. Did they ever fight for the liberty they enjoy? The question answers itself. No one ever gives away what he has offered his life to possess.

Washington, the founder of this nation; Dr. Franklin, Constitution builder, acclaimed a doctor of philosophy in European capitals; Lincoln, who saved the nation from fragmentation, "writer of the greatest short speech in the English language" the Gettysburg address; Edison, creator of this push-

button age thru discoveries and inventions in electricity; Wilbur and Orville Wright who conquered air and space with the airplane, when scientists proclaimed that nothing heavier than air could fly—none of these great Americans had degrees—they had brains.

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to free government, schools and means of education shall forever be encouraged," said our Founders (but not abused). Freedom of religion is guaranteed by our Constitution, but not to teach disloyalty to the giver, the nation.

Let us not be confused by the confusions of such as these. Lincoln once said, "No one ever got lost on a straight road." Our straight road is mapped out for us in our Constitution, which, when followed, produced the most advanced nation in moral and economic standards, the mightiest the world has ever known. Why not go back to our own thinking with the Constitution for guide?

To the would-be salesmen of our country, whether they sit in the White House, on Capitol Hill, on the Supreme Court Bench, wherever they appear, let us follow the order of our first great commander, George Washington. Henceforth "Put none but Americans on guard."

Do you recall the memorial engraving by the artist, John McCrea, of a scene at Valley Forge, witnessed by the Quaker, Isaac Potts, depicting General Washington, with his horse tethered to a nearby tree, on his knees in the snow in prayer to "God, who governs in the affairs of men", through Whose guidance he and his patriot American army defeated the most powerful nation of his day?

While following Washington's orders to "Put none but Americans on guard" at our Capitol on the Potomac, we, his countrymen would serve our country best, by turning for guidance to God Who gave victory to him, for we fight not only communism embodied in the strongest nation in the world today; but godless communism within our gates, whose World Capitol is the United Nations.

#### RESOLUTION OF ALLEGIANCE

#### HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. MOLLOHAN.** Mr. Speaker, the Loyal Order of Moose is an organization dedicated to "purity, aid, and progress," three words which are aptly expressed in a resolution unanimously passed at the Moose international convention last month.

As Carl A. Weis, supreme secretary of the Moose, said in a recent letter to me, the resolution "expresses a few principles which not only touched the hearts of our members of the order in attendance at the convention, but prompted them to a unanimous action acclamation."

Carl said that since the convention, he and other Moose officers have "had an abundance of favorable comments reflecting considerable credit to and respect for the order."

The resolution expresses the feeling of all freedom-loving men: a love of country, a belief in the worth of fellow men, an abhorrence of violence, a respect for law, and a "dedication to the means

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

through which we can achieve universal peace."

I present the resolution at this time in the hope by colleagues in the House and in the Senate can profit in some measure from its message:

##### RESOLUTION OF ALLEGIANCE

Be it known that the members of the Supreme Lodge of the World, Loyal Order of Moose here assembled for the Eighty-Second International Convention of our order, do hereby publicly proclaim and reaffirm our allegiance to God and to the country in which we live.

Whereas, our fraternity demands of us a life of faith and instills within us the desire to strengthen and preserve that for which our forefathers have died and,

Whereas, the principles of our fraternity, those being, "Purity, Aid and Progress" have historically become the means through which the greatest of free nations were conceived and have grown, matured and abundantly prospered and,

Whereas, we presently recognize the potential destructive consequences of both a domestic and international nature which tend to destroy and eventually devour nations which are less than strong and,

Whereas, we are a patriotic and humanitarian fraternal order comprised of American and Canadian citizens and subsequently recognize that our loyalties far exceed those owed to our families and our fraternity.

It is our desire, and we firmly resolve, that our energies, both individually and collectively as gathered through the Loyal Order of Moose, are dedicated to and aspire to remain dedicated to God, to our brotherhood and to our respective countries.

Henceforward therefore, be it known that as members of a fraternal order consisting of God-fearing, dedicated citizens:

We firmly believe in the dignity and worth of our fellowman.

We believe in the history and traditions of our country and in the solidarity and unification of local provincial, state and federal governments.

We openly and voluntarily support the constitution and the civil laws which govern our homeland and we stand behind those entrusted with their enforcement.

We have great faith in the honesty and integrity of our selected public servants and support fully the policies adopted by our legislative bodies.

We abhor violence, civil disobedience, anarchy, desecration of our national flag, willful infringement upon the rights of others and all factions who advocate the overthrow of our governments.

We respect law and order and endeavor to instill within others the desire to maintain that respect.

We are dedicated to the means through which we can achieve universal peace but we shall always, above all else, honor our freedom.

As member of the Loyal Order of Moose, these things I do solemnly resolve.

Be it further resolved, that this resolution be distributed to all lodges of our Order where it shall be read on the floor of the lodge at an appropriate session, posted on the lodge bulletin boards and reproduced in lodge bulletins. It may be given publicity through the local news media so that not only we the members here assembled, but other citizens of our countries will know that the Loyal Order of Moose respects and openly gives our allegiance to God and the Country in which we live.

Adopted by acclamation, June 18, 1970 at Chicago, Ill.

CARL A. WEIS,  
Supreme Secretary.

#### U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR

#### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. MONAGAN.** Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters expressing concern over the treatment of Americans held as prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese. I have been deeply moved by all these letters and appreciate just how much some news of the condition of American prisoners would mean to their wives, children, parents, and friends. On September 17, 1969 I cosponsored House Congressional Resolution 360 calling upon North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to comply with the terms of the Geneva convention relative to the treatment of U.S. prisoners of war. The substance of that resolution was adopted by the House on December 2 as an amendment to House Resolution 613, supporting President Nixon's efforts to obtain peace with justice in Vietnam. I would again urge the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to show compassion in this most urgent matter by releasing the names of Americans now held as prisoners.

On July 5, 1970 the following article by Ethel Beckwith appeared in the Connecticut Sunday Herald and eloquently expressed the pain and sorrow which constituents of mine, Mr. and Mrs. LeGrande C. Cole, Sr., of Danbury, have endured for 3 years because of inability to learn the condition of their son.

The article follows:

**Son Missing in Vietnam, They Ask All To Write**

(By Ethel Beckwith)

DANBURY.—Because it is three years, exactly, since their pilot son in the Viet war was shot down and taken prisoner, Mr. and Mrs. LeGrande G. Cole, Sr. are making a new request of good Americans everywhere:

"Send letters to Hanoi. Plead with them to reveal at least one thing—whether our son is alive."

Scores of strangers and friends have done so in the past. Mayor Gino Aronti wrote. It hasn't worked. Nor has the Balmforth Ave. family's walled-in grief been lessened.

The not-happy anniversary finds, however, that new and active today is the League of Families of Prisoners of War. Wives and sweethearts of missing men—missing, but believed to be on the Vietcong POW list—have found their way to television and press. Recently they learned that 1,500 Americans are on that list. Like Danbury's Coles, their first concern is to know that their men are alive.

The Herald will do its part on behalf of the Coles, although to date all the effort has been along a path of oblivion.

Three years ago this week, two officers rang the Cole doorbell. Gently as possible they recited these statistics: that on June 30, 1967, at Vinh in North Vietnam, a bomber jet was shot down and its pilot, Navy Lt. Le Grande Ogden Cole, Jr., was captured.

The same news shocked the pilot's wife, with his little son who is four years old this month at her home in Florida.

The boy is Kenneth Mark Cole. Nine months old on his father's last visit, Ken-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

neth can hardly recall his father's face, but he constantly studies every photo, and unfailingly asks "When is my daddy coming home?"

Two days after the fateful June 30, the Danbury Coles had their last letter from the pilot. He was to make a bombing mission, he wrote, flying an A-4 Skyhawk off the USS "Intrepid". By then he had vanished.

Then came a wire from Vice Admiral B. H. Semmes. He advised the Coles against discussing their son's capture publicly. "The area in which your son became missing," he said, "presents the possibility he could be held by hostile forces against his will." Since then, the League, and the Coles, have decided to talk. The League's meeting was held in Washington's Constitution Hall.

"Lee" enlisted in '61, after graduation from Abbott Tech and after receiving an applied science degree at Wescon. While training at Pensacola, he met and married Billie Joe Botts of that city.

The bombing mission he wrote his parents about occurred during his second tour of duty. During the first, he had flown 100 missions. His second tour was only 10 days old when he was shot down. Six months before, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Flying Cross for combat duty over Phu Ly in North Vietnam.

Now 28, the Navy pilot is the oldest of three children of Le Grande and Hazel Tilquist Cole. His father is employed at Fairfield Hills Hospital. "Lee" is the brother of Donald, with the phone company, married to Jill Rowland and father of Don, Jr., and of Cynthia Cole, a junior at Danbury High School.

"In the name of human decency and justice", wrote Mayor Arconti in his letter addressed To The President of the Republic of North Vietnam." There was no reply. If Lt. Cole is alive, he is not allowed to write.

At the Paris conference, when next of kin make their appeals for news or release or both, the Danbury pilot's name is listed.

The Coles' own church, St. James Episcopal, in Danbury, was first to send letters to Hanoi. Abbott Tech students filled a large mailbag with their letters. So did Bethel's Methodist Church, The Navy Mothers, Legion and VFW, and many others. The Coles ask them: please write again. It is their one hope. The Cole telephone is 748-7347.

In the letters the Coles suggest this phrase: "We ask only for recognition of the commitment made by both our nations at the 1957 Geneva Convention regarding treatment of prisoners of war." Postage to Hanoi is 25 cents.

## EFFECTS ON PENNSYLVANIA OF SECTION 225 OF H.R. 17550

## HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 17550 contains the Social Security Amendments of 1970. Many provisions in the bill are commendable in their purpose and effect, however, section 225 could have a disastrous effect upon Pennsylvania and other States as well.

Section 225 is intended to provide incentives for the States to emphasize outpatient care under medicaid programs by increasing the percentage by 25 percent. According to the formula of this section, the Federal percentage for acute hospital care after 60 days is reduced 33 1/3 percent, the Federal percentage for

skilled nursing home services after 90 days is reduced 33 1/3 percent, the Federal percentage for mental hospital care after 90 days is reduced 33 1/3 percent, and the Federal percentage is eliminated totally when 275 benefit-days have been provided during a lifetime. Section 225 also authorizes the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to reduce the Federal payment to the States by an amount which is equivalent to the difference between the State intermediate care rate and the amount of the rate if there had been a reasonable differential between the rate of skilled nursing home services.

The effect of this provision on Pennsylvania in fiscal year 1970-71 will be a reduction of Federal participation of \$13,000,000. The reduction will increase to \$21,000,000 in fiscal year 1971-72. This may result in needed health care services being denied to between 10,000 and 15,000 elderly and chronically ill persons in Pennsylvania.

Gov. Raymond P. Shafer has obtained appropriations for assistance amounting to \$308,000,000 in fiscal 1970-71. The department of public welfare had requested \$338,000,000. This means that we must be prepared to experience a cut-back of services and no growth in our program, due to this \$30 million slash.

When this \$30 million deficit is added to the reduction of \$13 million under H.R. 17550, a total deficit of \$43 million will befall the poor and needy of Pennsylvania.

The corrections in the social security system sought under H.R. 17550 can be effected in other and sounder ways, through utilization review, implementation of levels of care—under title XIX—and proper classification and assignment of patients to proper facilities.

## SOUTH BAYANS SAIL THREE SEAS

## HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this summer, as millions of young Americans left their classrooms to work and to travel, I am reminded of a unique adventure undertaken last summer by 20 youths from the Los Angeles area, a trip which took them around the world and aroused the admiration of our entire community.

I believe that my colleagues in the House of Representatives would be interested in reading of these young men and their adventures crossing the seas in the *Prince Louis*, a 96-foot three-masted square-rigged schooner.

The two owners, Charles Arreola and Eugene Klakovich, both of San Pedro, selected and purchased a 1921 schooner built in Marstel, Denmark. Outfitting the ship took another 6 1/2 weeks.

Friends from the South Bay area were invited to sign on as volunteer crew and, finally, a total of 20 persons were enlisted for the voyage. After paying their own plane fare to Denmark, the youthful sailors cast off anchor and be-

gan their historic voyage, which was to take 2 1/2 months.

Learning, they quickly discovered, is not only confined to land. As they departed from Denmark and separated themselves from the 9-to-5 society, the newsreading, television-viewing civilization of Los Angeles, they learned to extract their food from the waters and to survive the elements and the ocean.

A description of their perilous adventure and triumphant arrival in Los Angeles Harbor is given in an interview appearing in the South Bay Daily Breeze by staff writer Jonathan Beaty:

## BAYANS SAIL THREE SEAS

Early morning fishermen and dock workers shook their heads in disbelief as the *Prince Louis* sailed majestically into the Los Angeles Harbor, completing a two and a half month transoceanic voyage.

Proudly coming in under full sail, the 96-foot, three-masted, square-rigged schooner—manned by a bearded, ragged crew of South Bayans—looked as if it had just sailed in out of another century.

With her paint curled by the Caribbean sun, and battered by the Atlantic storms, the wooden ship slipped into her berth on Terminal Island as her young crew whooped, laughed and waved.

The seven sailors on board—from San Pedro, Redondo Beach, Torrance and Denmark—were the last of the original crew of twenty. The missing crewmen, some of them students and school teachers from the South Bay, had left the ship and flown home from Panama and Barbados to be back to school in September.

Charles Arreola, 28, co-owner and captain of the *Prince Louis*; Robert Wallace, 19, Robert Robinson, 17, Frank Canetti, 22, Anthony Ostoch, 22, Robert Trombari, 25, and 19-year-old Ole Hansen from Denmark completed the trip.

They were glad to be home, but their voyage had been a happy one.

"We didn't have a single personality problem the whole voyage," said Robert Trombari, the ship's engineer.

"The whole crew was really just one big happy family."

They had to be, since they all lived together in the roughly converted cargo hold which became their home for 73 days.

Raymond Wallace, captain of the ship from Denmark to Panama, sailed with his wife Barbara, and his 8-year-old daughter, Mari. They and another couple left the ship in Panama, but Wallace was on hand to greet the ship in Los Angeles.

His son Robert was still on board.

Wallace, a special effects designer who designed some of the ships at Disneyland and the conversion of the Princess Louise Restaurant at the harbor, acted as mentor and teacher for the first part of the cruise.

"We held classes in seamanship and navigation every day," Wallace said.

The elder Wallace was well qualified for the job—he first went to sea at the age of 15, and was a master mariner by the age of 18. "And I've been sailing ever since," he added.

Trombari, who lives in Redondo Beach, said the most exciting part of the journey came when the ship's steering system broke during the height of a storm off the coast of France.

"I guess you might say I was really concerned," the engineer said in what appeared to be a pretty big understatement.

"The wind was blowing over 65 knots per hour, and the waves were 20, maybe 22 feet high, when the chain block that controls the steering pulled out of the deck."

"The skipper, two men on watch, and my-

July 20, 1970

self were the only ones on deck—everybody else was sick."

But they managed to rig a block and tackle on the tiller to hold the ship against the wind, and the steering gear was repaired.

"The only other time we were scared," Trombari added, "was the Saint Elmo's fire thing."

Another young crew member told of the weird and frightening play of green fire about the ship off the coast of Mexico.

"We were in the middle of a big thunder-storm," he explained. In the light of one of the lightning flashes he saw the ghostly green and blue fireballs racing around the steel rigging, and illuminating the anchor chain and mast.

"Just then a peal of thunder went off in my ear, and I said, that's it—that's all—I'm going to get off the ship in Acapulco."

The three-master was built in 1921 in Marstel, Denmark, and had been used for hauling cargo until she was purchased by her new American owners.

The Prince Louis, once named the Lillaebe— which means "small sound" in Danish—sailed out of the famous Ring Andersen Shipyard in Denmark on July 20.

The captain sailed under engine power most of the way, since there was only enough wind for the sails for 10 days out of the cruise. The 150 horsepower diesel engine pushed the schooner along at a steady eight knots, night and day, as the ship traversed the Atlantic, the Caribbean, and the Pacific oceans.

Their best speed logged on the voyage, however, was under sail—a churning 12 knots an hour—with the entire crew laughing and urging their weathered and creaking ship onward.

After leaving Denmark, the Prince sailed through the Kiel Canal in Germany, and docked in Portsmouth, England.

"We were there for three days, and did the whole London scene," Robinson said.

They sailed from Portsmouth to Vigo, Spain, and then to Funchal on Madeira Island. From there they made an 18-day crossing to Bridgetown on the Island of Barbados, stopping to explore and skin-dive in the crystal clear waters of the Windward Island Chain.

After going through the Panama Canal they headed for Acapulco, Mexico, but ran into a fuel problem.

"We were mixing lube oil in with the diesel fuel to stretch it out, but we couldn't make it," Trombari said.

They had to anchor in the tiny harbor of Port Angeles, Mexico, and travel cross country to the next village to get fuel.

"It took us two days to haul it back in drums and bring it aboard in the skiff," Trombari recalled.

With fuel for the engine, the Prince made it to Acapulco, and then to Mazatlan to obtain a visa for their Danish cook.

The last leg of the adventure lasted six days and brought them home again—into the Port of Los Angeles with the American flag waving proudly at their battered stern.

#### BOMBS AWAY

#### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy is continuing a questionable policy against the wishes of 726 American inhabitants of the Puerto Rican municipality of Culebra.

These people live constantly in fear of bodily harm from the use of part of their

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

home island for missile weaponry practice.

The Navy's principal justification for perpetuating its activity on Culebra is that the island has been historically assigned such a role.

This rigidity is not in the spirit of our democratic traditions which counsel flexibility and accommodation to meet the changing times. The Navy's intransigence is also contrary to its own proud and meritorious traditions and a blight on the compassionate nature we consider part of our national ethos.

I am in complete accord with the New York Times editorial of July 10, 1970, and that of the Washington Post of July 14, 1970, both of which follow:

##### CULEBRA AND GOLIATH

Can anyone really believe that the only suitable target area in the entire Atlantic Ocean for testing a new generation of guided missiles and glide bombs is a 7,000-acre island off Puerto Rico which 726 American citizens call home? So says the United States Navy, which already owns a third of the island of Culebra and now intends to lease and eventually buy another third.

What the Navy has really wanted to do for fifteen years is to buy all of Culebra and resettle the island's residents elsewhere. But Culebra is a municipality of Puerto Rico and can be dissolved under the Commonwealth's Constitution only by vote of its residents. A survey indicates that 95 percent of the Culebrans oppose the Navy's current expansion plan and at least 75 per cent want the Navy to pull out altogether.

Under existing conditions, Culebrans must cope with a nerve-wracking noise-pollution problem from shelling, bombing and low-flying Navy jets. Culebrans find their freedom of movement curtailed by Navy maneuvers and security requirements, their economy and development menaced by the Navy's expansion plan.

As part of what the Navy calls the "inner range portion" of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range complex, Culebra unquestionably offers substantial advantages for the development of new systems. What is equally obvious is that the Navy for a long time remained insensitive to the rising resentment of the Culebrans and dragged its feet on examining possible alternatives to the use of this inhabited island.

It would be a salutary example of what one likes to think the United States is still all about if the mightiest Navy in the world now decided on its own to weigh anchor and go elsewhere to explode its new arsenal, leaving 726 poor islanders in peace and quiet.

##### WHY BOMB AN INHABITED ISLAND?

It is time that high-level attention be paid to the controversy over Culebra. The Navy, which already owns about one third of this 7,000-acre island in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, is trying to obtain another third of it so as to expand its training operations there, with the installation of a Walleye missile target on the immediately adjacent small island of Culebrita. The move is bitterly resisted by most of the 726 inhabitants and many other Puerto Ricans on the ground that the use of the island as a target has already made life there almost intolerable.

The Puerto Rican Civil Rights Commission has described the military training operations on Culebra as "excessively intense, continuous, irregular and dangerous." The cattle business on the island is said to have been virtually ruined. Fishing has been gravely impaired, and since these two industries have been the chief source of income for the families living on the island, the economic impact of the shelling and bombardment has been severe. Equally troublesome is the effect

on education. One teacher reports that the school buildings "tremble with every explosion" and that the children are too frightened, distracted by noise and plagued by loss of sleep (from the night bombing) to give serious attention to their studies.

Repercussions from this use of an inhabited island as a target have spread far beyond Culebra itself. Many Puerto Ricans see in it evidence of a general lack of sensitivity in Washington to commonwealth problems. Tensions on the island have risen notably since the shelling and bombing on Culebra have been stepped up. A columnist for the San Juan Star recently suggested that if Congress should grant the Navy's request to take over more of the island it "could swing popular sentiment toward independence or at least away from statehood more effectively than anything else."

Aside from the injustice of inflicting conditions akin to warfare on the people of Culebra, therefore, the Navy's policy threatens to complicate the relations between the United States and the commonwealth. Just now these relations are in a delicate state. Sentiment in favor of independence has been growing along with sentiment for statehood, although a substantial percentage of the people still seem to favor the existing commonwealth status. It would be most unfortunate if the government in Washington should unduly influence the outcome of the debate now going on in regard to Puerto Rico's future by continuing a shortsighted and inhumane policy in Culebra.

The need for good relations between Puerto Rico and the United States will remain an imperative of the future whether the commonwealth is retained or statehood is requested. For one thing, the Roosevelt Roads Naval Base is the second most important naval installation in the Caribbean. For another, the relations between Washington and San Juan are enormously influential in our dealings with the rest of Latin America. Even though the Navy finds Culebra a convenient area for its training operations, we simply cannot afford as a nation to get into the posture of putting bombs ahead of people.

#### HORTON COMMENDS HUMANITARIAN SPIRIT OF C. RAYMOND NARAMORE AND THE ROLE OF THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF ROCHESTER AND MONROE COUNTY

#### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, it was my honor and privilege to attend the dedication of the C. Raymond Naramore memorial painting at the Humane Society's Lollipop Farm in Fairport, N.Y.

C. Raymond Naramore was executive vice president of the Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe County, and for 17 years, he dedicated himself to the work of the society. I knew him for years before his sudden death on March 28, 1969. I personally knew of his kindness and love for all living things. He had a tremendous love for his cause and he dedicated himself to the prevention of cruelty to all mankind and animals. He was a true humanitarian.

Ray Naramore was a teacher for 35 years at West High School before he started full-time work with the Humane Society. He immediately began to make

July 20, 1970

the Humane Society an active part of the community. Ray's work became widely known, and soon the public started to donate money to the Humane Society. He purchased the first animals which children could view and pet. They were three llamas, five deer, two burrows, and five Persian caracul lambs.

It was largely due to Ray's efforts that the present Lollypop Farm came into existence. I was present at the 1966 dedication of Lollypop Farm which was the start of Ray's dreams coming true. Stray and injured animals find a home at the farm and the public can then adopt them.

It is indeed fitting that a memorial painting should be dedicated to Ray. It was painted by an outstanding local artist, Stanley J. Gordon.

The ceremony was especially moving. The program included Mr. Chester Champion who introduced Mr. Henri Projanski. Mr. Projanski gave the invocation. Speakers included Mayor Stephen May, Dr. Stanley Jacobs, president of the board of directors of the Rochester Humane Society, and Mr. Thomas Justice, president of the American Humane Association. Mr. Frank M. Rogers, executive director, introduced Dr. Jacobs. Dr. Jacobs presented the painting of C. Raymond Naramore of the Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe County and Mrs. Naramore accepted and unveiled it. The memorial plaque was unveiled for the renaming of the Concourse Hall to Naramore Hall.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to share with my colleagues the names of the officers of the Humane Society because they have contributed so much to the cause against cruelty to animals.

They include:

Bruce Percy, chairman of the board; Dr. Stanley B. Jacobs, president; Vice Presidents Frank W. Allen, Schuyler Baldwin, Mrs. Emil Brown, Chester C. Champion, Mr. Raniet Miner; Henry R. Dutcher, Jr., secretary; Miss Katherine G. Love, treasurer; Bruce Percy, treasurer permanent fund; Frank M. Rogers, executive director; Sharon I. Anderson, director of humane education.

Board of directors—Charles Andrus, George Beinetti, Mrs. James L. Berigan, Donald Bilgore, Mrs. Mercer Brugler, Mrs. Phillip Burrill, Realtor E. Cherne, John D. Cockcroft, M. John Corson, Mrs. William H. DeWitt, Mrs. Martin Donahoe, Jr., Miss Vivian Evans, Mrs. Richard Garrett, Dr. Eric S. Green, Mrs. J. Lawrence Kennedy, John H. Kitchen, Mrs. Macy L. Lerner, Clarence S. Lunt, Glenn E. Matthews, Mrs. C. Raymond Naramore, Gilbert A. Nusbaum, Mrs. Frederick T. Pierson, Jr., Henri P. Projansky, Frank M. Rogers, William F. Rust, Herman H. Schwartz, William F. Sheppard, L. B. Skeffington, W. Stephen Thomas, Mrs. Harry P. Toppin, and Mrs. George Todd.

The program booklet contained a very comprehensive history of the Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe County from 1873 to 1970, which I include in my remarks:

#### HISTORY OF THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF ROCHESTER AND MONROE COUNTY FROM 1873 TO 1970

The Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe County was founded by J. B. Werner in 1873 because of his great concern for horses and mules that pulled barges on the canal. Fifteen years later in 1888 it became

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

necessary to protect other animals. After some work the Humane Society became a legal organization by the New York State Legislative Branch.

The Humane Society became a part of the City pound and was not widely known until in 1952, C. Raymond Naramore, a teacher for 35 years in West High School and known for his humane work with people as well as animals, started full time work for the Humane Society.

Mr. Naramore immediately started to work to make the Humane Society an active part of the Community life of Monroe County. He first made up a well organized program to present to the public. He formed Committees and a larger Board of Directors and spoke to assemblies in public schools; Scout troops; and any group who would listen to him. He moved the Society from the pound to an old barn on South Clinton Ave. His work soon became widely known and the public began to donate money for this project. Soon able to purchase 4 acres of land with the help of friends he purchased the first animals for children to come and see and pet. They were—three llamas, five deer, two burros and five Persian caracul lambs. Later goats were added.

Ray continued to plan and build always looking ahead to the future. Food Huts were established so that people could feed the animals.

In 1964 Hiram Marks gave the Humane Society 140 acres on Victor Road, Fairport, N.Y. Many days, weeks and months of hard work obtaining pledges, contributions and donations until in 1966 ground was broken for our present "Lollypop Farm." Here at Lollypop Farm some of Ray's dreams came true. Strays, injured animals were picked up and the public could adopt dogs and cats from us.

Humane Societies cost money; Labor, Staff members, food for our animals, fuel, electricity and many other expenses that occur. We are ever expanding and growing.

Mr. C. Raymond Naramore, our Executive Vice-President, after 17 years passed away very suddenly on March 28th, 1969. Hundreds of heart warming letters have been received by his family and many tributes have been paid him. This beautiful painting that we are dedicating today is his final tribute. This beautiful painting was made possible by the gifts to the C. Raymond Naramore Memorial Fund from Ray's friends. We here at the Farm are striving each day to make our Society one that Ray would be proud of. With your help we will succeed.

Mr. Speaker, at the unveiling of the memorial painting, Mr. Thomas Justice, executive vice president of the Humane Society of Columbus, Ohio, was the guest speaker. For many years, Mr. Justice has been the president of the board of directors of the American Humane Association which has a membership of over 1,000 societies.

He knew Ray Naramore well, and I would like to share with my colleagues his speech which so finely captures the dedication of Ray.

The speech follows:

#### THE DEDICATION OF THE MEMORIAL PORTRAIT OF C. RAYMOND NARAMORE

One of the great privileges and pleasures of my thirty year career in humane work took place here when I was invited to participate in the dedication of these beautiful and modern animal facilities on July 9th, 1967.

As president of the American Humane Association I was proud to honor a fellow humanitarian, a fellow association board member, and a close personal friend, in the dedication of this humane complex, which had been a long time dream and cherished ambi-

tion of your then most esteemed and beloved, executive vice president, the late C. Raymond Naramore.

Today, three short years later, I return. I return with the same great privilege, the same pleasure, and the same fidelity of purpose to join with you in paying honor and tribute with deep and abiding love to the memory of this great but very humble benefactor.

I remember eighteen years ago when that man, who was new to formal and professional humane work, began his upward climb in our campaign against cruelty. A man, who had earlier in his life devoted himself to educating and encouraging children and who, when at the age of fifty-five threw himself into a new career, that embraced not only children but all living creatures.

I first met Ray Naramore eighteen years ago. I quickly learned that here was a man, who refused to approach any challenge without first having ammunition to meet that challenge, and here was a man, who refused to compromise any position or condition that was basically and fundamentally inhumane. Having once accepted the assignment to head the Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe county, he determined to learn first hand how other humane organizations were operated and so—he came to Columbus.

He came to Columbus to observe the operation of my society. This was our first meeting. Ray stayed a week with me, and it was to me a very memorable week, with Ray working very hard to learn the intricacies of humane work, a field of endeavor he had not previously known from the inside. While he observed and learned, he also shared with me his hopes, his ambitions, and his philosophy for a better world—a world that would embrace kindness and compassion as a way of life.

When he left Columbus to return to Rochester, he took with him a commitment that his humane society would always offer succor to all helpless creatures, and that the humane education of the children would be of paramount importance in furthering the end toward kindness to all of God's animal's. He spent the rest of his life working toward that goal. I am sure that somewhere, somehow, he must know that this work, his work, is being carried forward as he had planned that it would.

Ray told me many times during the years that followed our first meeting how much he loved children and animals. It was that love that first brought him into this work and it was that love which sustained him over the difficult times he encountered while building this fine humane society into its rightful place of prominence on the local, regional, and national scenes.

Ray had, after all, devoted thirty-five years of teaching the youth of this community. As a classroom teacher and a student advisor he came in contact with all types of young people. He worked with boy scouts, girl scouts, and many other young peoples groups, and even before he turned himself to humane work he had exposed these young friends of his to his love for animals.

During his years as an educator, Ray Naramore, still had time to enjoy his animals, especially the horses and dogs he raised. When he retired from his formal education chores he eagerly accepted his new challenge with this society, and in so doing he implemented his educational know-how into a far reaching program of humane education, inculcating in the hearts and minds of all of this community's citizenry—a feeling of kindness and compassion toward all their animals. His efforts were successful.

Those of us who knew him intimately, also knew how much he gave of himself to that success. No matter what difficulty he faced, and no matter what the time of day the difficulty occurred, he was ready, willing and

confidently able to meet and overcome any obstacle.

Ray Naramore was totally committed to humane work. His concerns encompassed not only those on the local scene but far more than Rochester and Monroe County. They encompassed the nation, and indeed problems of the world. Make no mistake those on your local scene were enough for any ordinary man to handle, but Ray Naramore was no ordinary man. By showing those larger concerns, Ray was forced to give even more of himself to the cause. He did so willingly and without hesitation. To do otherwise would have been unthinkable and so he gave of himself completely.

When Ray was invited to serve as a member of the board of directors of the American Humane Association he accepted without hesitation. We who worked with him on the association's board knew and understood his devotion. We admired him and loved him for his sincerity and for his enthusiasm.

We miss Ray Naramore and I miss Ray Naramore, as I know you do. His death last year left a place in your community and in our National Humane Movement that cannot be filled—but remembering him, as we are doing here today, with the dedication of this memorial portrait, will be an everlasting tribute to his devotion, his dedication, his love, and his enormous zeal for the protection of the helpless, and the prevention of cruelty to all mankind and his animals.

Let us all rededicate ourselves to the cause which Ray Naramore so fervently espoused and pray for the repose of his soul in everlasting peace, with the knowledge that his contributions toward the creation of kindlier attitudes, the protection of the helpless, and the prevention of cruelty were not in vain.

#### VIETNAMIZATION AND REPRESSION

#### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 16, 1970*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I highly commend my colleagues, the gentleman from California, Mr. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, for their diligence and perseverance during their recent factfinding tour of Indochina. The shocking disclosure of the treatment of prisoners in Con Son National Prison in South Vietnam points up once again the brutal and repressive nature of the regime which the Nixon administration maintains in power in Saigon. The most discouraging part of the whole episode is that this finding is only one blatant example of the pervasive police state tactics that govern the people of South Vietnam. For over a year, the present administration, including both the State Department and Dr. Henry Kissinger's office in the White House have had at their disposal a report issued by a U.S. study team on political and religious freedom in Vietnam which late last spring visited four South Vietnamese prisons and detailed the terrible conditions inside them, including the use of tiger cages at Con Son.

As one who was privileged to be a member of that study team I called for an investigation on the House floor, June

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

19, 1969. It was not acted upon despite the fact that our Government was at the time financing a \$1.3 million expansion of the Con Son facilities.

In the meantime there have been at least four other reports calling attention to these conditions. One is the study by the Vietnamese journalist, Pham Tam, which I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 9, 1969. Another is based on the personal inspection of Con Son prison by a delegate of the International Committee of the Red Cross in Saigon, and was made available to both the Nixon and Thieu administrations. Finally, both houses of the South Vietnamese legislature have issued reports alleging torture of students in government prisons.

Notwithstanding these repeated disclosures, the chief American adviser on public safety in Saigon, Frank Walton, compared the Con Son prison to a Boy Scout recreation camp. Even after Congressmen HAWKINS and ANDERSON had seen the tiger cages at Con Son with their own eyes, the American AID advisers for South Vietnamese prisons were insisting that conditions were not bad. But the situation goes far beyond the inhuman conditions which exist at Con Son or any of the other detention centers in the provinces of Vietnam. Con Son is not an isolated incident which minimal corrective action will erase. It is symptomatic of the continuing and brutal deprivation of freedom in South Vietnam. This charge hits fundamentally at the Nixon administration's Vietnamization plan to end the war. How can we expect the Thieu-Ky dictatorship to preserve itself in power if in the absence of terror and American muscle it is totally bereft of the popular support of its people?

I join today in sponsoring the concurrent resolution introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON). This bill relates to the treatment and exchange of civilian and military prisoners in Vietnam and urges the President to impress upon the Thieu-Ky regime that we will not condone a continuation of their present violations of their own citizens' civil rights and liberties. But in my judgment the President must go further. He must seriously examine the Vietnamization program and honestly face up to the reality of the corrupt government we continue to support in Vietnam.

#### LEGACY OF THE COLD WAR IN INDOCHINA

#### HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 20, 1970*

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in light of the continuing and heightened debate over the role of the United States in Southeast Asia I find an article by Townsend Hoopes in the July 1970 issue of Foreign Affairs extremely timely.

Mr. Hoopes, in explaining the basic rationale behind both the initial involvement of the United States in South Vietnam and the justifications for our con-

tinued presence in the country, points to a "cold war syndrome," which he describes as "alive and well and living in Washington." The author believes the policymakers of the Nixon administration tend to see "every local uprising as a mortal test of wills between a Communist octopus and the free world coalition."

It would appear to me that the deep division and emotional reaction to the Cambodian invasion was but an example of the rejection of this cold war syndrome by an increasing percentage of the American public. This article by Mr. Hoopes points out the archaic nature of the cold war syndrome and the pressing need for the President and a "small, influential segment of the foreign-military bureaucracy" to recognize that there is "no reason why our rich and powerful country cannot extricate itself from Indochina with reasonable poise and dignity, without a traumatic loss of self-confidence, and without a lapse into mindless isolation."

I find such observations by the former Under Secretary of the Air Force and distinguished author of "The Limits of Intervention" to be both pertinent and telling. I hereby insert "The Legacy of the Cold War in Indochina" which appeared in the July 1970 issue of Foreign Affairs into the RECORD:

#### LEGACY OF THE COLD WAR IN INDOCHINA (By Townsend Hoopes)

A question recently posed by a distinguished colleague is central for anyone who earnestly seeks to understand how an entire generation of American political leaders, with the best will in the world, pushed the country onto the slippery slope that led ever downward into the engulfing morass of Indochina. The question is this: "Why did so many intelligent, experienced and humane men in government fail to grasp the immorality of our intervention in Vietnam and the cancerous division it was producing at home, long after this was instinctively evident to their wives and children?"

As a nation we are still only beginning to address this prickly and uncomfortable question. The New Left has of course long since rendered its own verdict: namely, that the entire leadership was venal, and was moreover acting within the compulsions of an imperialist system. For those, however, who still value reason and believe in factual, proportioned discourse as the most reliable road to approximate truth, the question is serious and compelling; ultimately it is inescapable. While we remain at some distance from a complete answer, it seems certain that an important part of the answer lies in what has been called the cold-war syndrome and in its ramified legacy. Every American over 40 (especially those between 40 and 60) shares involuntarily in this legacy, to a greater or lesser degree, because the cold war was the pervasive reality of the years in which that generation came to its political maturity. By cold war I mean, of course, the highly charged and dangerous power struggle that bellowed up out of World War II between a monolithic communist structure directed by Stalin and a rather more loose, hastily reassembled coalition of nations led by the United States.

There is a tendency today, especially among younger people, to denigrate the Stalinist threat, to discount the challenge and the perils it presented, and by various efforts at historical revisionism to conclude that the cold war was an unnecessary happening provoked by American imperialists and militarists. The evidence of those who helped to formulate the democratic response,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

or who merely lived through the period, is of course quite different. The cold war was a real and bitter struggle touched off by Stalin's utterly serious efforts to subvert and capture Western Europe, to penetrate the Mediterranean basin, and to gain a major influence in the strategic Asian anchor, Japan. No doubt, U.S. insistence on free elections in Eastern Europe confirmed the worst suspicions of Soviet leaders that a universalist American capitalism intended to deny Russian paramountcy in the belt of states through which Hitler's terrible invading force had marched, a buffer zone regarded by Stalin as the minimal requirement of Russian security. But it was not merely the case of a Kremlin leadership understandably paranoid in the aftermath of unprecedented human loss and physical devastation inside its homeland; it was also the case of a leadership impelled by the iron logic of a messianic ideology, a fact that made the Soviet Union compulsively expansionist and thus something quite different from the classic nation-state. Through his far-flung operative Stalin discerned, in the war-bred chaos beyond his borders, new opportunities to extend Soviet power.

Disciplined, activist communist parties all over the world were almost instantly responsive to central direction from the Kremlin; and they were bent upon widespread disruption and seizure, stimulated by the brute fact that much of the civilized world lay physically and economically prostrate in the immediate wake of World War II. To meet and turn back a fundamental challenge to the power balance which we had fought that war to restore, we were thrust by irresistible logic into a series of dramatic salvage operations—to aid the Greeks and Turks, rebuild Europe through the Marshall Plan, establish the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, stand in Berlin, fight in Korea. As the one free nation with the necessary strength and coherence to lead the resistance, we were forced by the steady pressure of postwar crises to exertions of a scale and character that seemed to make our universal involvement a permanent necessity. While, in fact, the restoration of Western Europe and Japan, and the effective blunting of Moscow's ideological-military thrust, required only about eight years, the effort was totally absorbing. Combined with the harsh lesson in power realities taught by World War II, its effect was to shape the thinking of an entire American generation with respect to the way power is organized in the world and with respect to the requirements of U.S. security.

## II

The Korean war in particular shaped our national attitudes about the developing situation in Vietnam and thus made probable, as early as 1954, our ultimate military intervention 11 years later. For the attack on South Korea was a Russian decision—a command by Stalin to send a Russian-trained puppet army across an established international boundary line. Washington saw the attack as a naked, centrally directed aggression, a bold attempt to upset the precarious postwar balance, a dagger aimed straight at our vital interest in Japan. This grave view only in resolutions, but in sending to battle was confirmed by the United Nations, not combat forces from 14 member nations. Such a vigorous response, mingling free-world idealism with a practical determination to defend the global power balance, was a singular triumph for the collective security idea. As it redeemed the dismal failures of the League, so also it confirmed the suspicion that the communist menace excluded no means in pursuing its expansionist aims.

Washington had thought it discerned the Russian hand in Southeast Asia even before this event. A month before the attack on Korea, the United States extended military and economic aid to those three petty states

to which France had in 1948 granted a nominal independence within the French Union. Announcing the new policy from Paris, May 8, 1950, Secretary Acheson said in part: "The United States, convinced that neither national independence nor democratic evolution exists in any area dominated by Soviet imperialism, considers the situation to be such as to warrant its according economic aid and military equipment to the Associated States of Indochina and to France in order to assist them in restoring stability. . . ." While the policy reflected, in part, a price demanded by France for her cooperation with NATO, it seems fair to assume that the language was of American choosing. As the Korean war deepened, so did our assistance to the French forces in Indochina. A joint statement in September 1951 by high diplomatic and military officials of the two governments expressed "complete agreement that the successful defense of Indochina is of great importance to the defense of all Southeast Asia," and emphasized that American and French policies in Indochina "are not at variance." The United States promised faster deliveries of military equipment. A similar communiqué of June 30, 1952, expressed "unanimous satisfaction over the vigorous and successful course of military operations;" it added that the "excellent performance of the Associated States' forces in battle was found to be a source of particular encouragement." Already underwriting one-third of the total cost of the Indochinese war, we proceeded further to expand our military aid to "the French Union."

In 1954, we were just a year beyond a painfully achieved Korean truce, after three years of bloody fighting. The communists had won the civil war in China, a result which brought severe psychological shock to Americans, who had nurtured sentimental notions of the Chinese people and of U.S.-Chinese relations. Mao was consolidating his control over that vast land mass and its population then numbering 600 million people. Chinese communist intervention in the Korean war, brought on by a serious misreading of diplomatic signals on both sides and by the Truman-MacArthur decision to march to the Yalu, had highly charged America's fears of the Yellow Peril; more broadly, it had reinforced our perception of a precarious coalition of free states under assault across the entire globe by a seamless international conspiracy. In the circumstances, it was almost inevitable that the United States would view the impending French departure from Indochina as merely the opening of another avenue for communist expansion in Asia.

The possibility of local, independent communist action lay outside the range of our cold-war vision. As Secretary Dulles said in June 1954: "At the moment, Indochina is the area where international Communism most vigorously seeks expansion. . . . The problem is one of restoring tranquility in an area where disturbances are fomented from Communist China, but where there is no invasion by Communist China." From the penetrating analyses of George Kennan, the leading Russian expert of his time, the somewhat undiscriminating inference was drawn that every form of communism flowed without limit into power vacuums and open crevices wherever they presented themselves. And Indochina without the French seemed to fit that interpretation almost precisely, with Ho Chi Minh dominant in North Vietnam and the Chinese land mass controlled by Mao.

America's policy, engineered by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, thus set about building an anti-communist counter-force in the South—first by helping to establish the de facto reality of a new sovereign nation, next by finding and installing a new national leader (Diem), and then by endowing him with abundant economic and military assistance. The United States was not a signatory to the Geneva Agreements

(nor to the Final Declaration of the conference which spelled out the agreement to all-Vietnam elections in 1956); as President Eisenhower explained it on July 21, 1954, the agreement "contains features which we do not like." In a separate statement at Geneva, the United States declared that, while it would refrain from the threat or the use of force to upset the terms of the settlement, it would take a grave view of any renewal of communist aggression in the area. It then moved urgently to conclude the SEATO alliance and to bring under its protection Cambodia, Laos and one-half of Vietnam, i.e. "the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam."

In July 1955, the new government in Saigon took, with U.S. encouragement, the next logical step; it rejected the North Vietnamese invitation to discuss elections, on grounds that were above suspicion in the West, given the context of total struggle against "International Communism." Saigon argued that the people in the North would be unable to express their will freely, and that falsified votes in the North could outweigh genuine votes in the South. Underlying every specific move was the firmest American determination to prevent any further communist advance.

It is significant that these policies and actions were strongly supported by the American people; there was no dissent from within government, very little from Congress or the press, and nothing significant from scholars or other close observers of foreign affairs. As a nation we had little perception that we might be frustrating a widely supported national independence movement by lending our aid and our prestige to what were at best colonial puppets, who suffered an innate incapacity to win over any sizable segment of the Vietnamese people to their side, and who, as it turned out, could not govern at all without the direct presence and support of a very large U.S. expeditionary force. What we saw predominantly was another disagreeable, but utterly necessary, effort to plug the dike against further communist expansion in Asia.

## III

It is very difficult to argue today that that judgment did not reflect the historical and political truth for America at the time, for it was based on direct, chilling and bloody encounters with Stalinism at many strategic points on the globe. The trouble and the tragedy have been that the American response to the cold war generated its own momentum and, in doing so, led us progressively to actions beyond the rational requirements of our national security. Looking back, one can see why men of good conscience—even men with a sense of history—were vulnerable to the developing *hubris*, for the major elements of our national response had roots in some of the noblest American traditions. From Woodrow Wilson down through Franklin Roosevelt we were bequeathed the legacy of America's democratizing mission in the world. And whatever retrospective cynicism Americans might have felt at having fought in 1918 "to make the world safe for democracy," it did not make the "Four Freedoms" or the "Atlantic Charter" any less compelling as political aims in 1945. From Woodrow Wilson and Henry Stimson came the strong belief in the need for collective security against aggression, a conviction reinforced by the disastrous failures of the League of Nations in the 1930s which had led us to the holocaust of World War II. From the tense confrontation with Stalinism came a semi-official, increasingly dogmatic anti-communism.

Each of these strands of policy was legitimate and useful, if applied with a sense of proportion. But what began happening after, and as a result of, the Korean war can be seen with the benefit of hindsight as extension pressed to the point of distortion.

July 20, 1970

Stimson's doctrine held that collective action was required to prevent rather clear-cut aggressions by great powers against the vital interests of other great powers, in order to maintain or restore a working balance of power among those leading states. But John Foster Dulles, who practiced a devil theory of communism, began to apply the collective security idea to cases where great power involvement was merely speculative or tenuous, or where the U.S. interest, seen in proportion, was only marginal. The Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), viewed by Dulles as a barrier to a Soviet military attack southward into the Middle East, merely generated improvements in the road network and other communications linking Iran, Afghanistan and Pakistan; it also provided Pakistan with arms in order to balance off India.

CENTO did not, however, prevent Soviet penetration into the Middle East; that feat was accomplished bloodlessly by the proven Western stratagem of offering military equipment—in this case to Egypt, Syria and Yemen. The South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), created in response to what was seen as the danger of communist Chinese hordes pouring down through Southeast Asia and on into Malaya, Burma and Indonesia, brought together a strange collection of physically weak or politically disabled partners. Indeed the unlikelihood that they could or would ever act effectively in concert was so apparent that the alliance provided only the thinnest cloak for what was privately understood to be its underlying purpose; namely, the protective exercise of U.S. power. Six months before the treaty was signed, Secretary Dulles had warned of a possible communist Chinese invasion of Southeast Asia. "If such overt military aggression occurred," he said on June 11, 1954, "that would be a deliberate threat to the United States itself. The United States would of course invoke the processes of the United Nations and consult with its allies. But we could not escape ultimate responsibility for decisions closely touching our own security and self-defense."

By these and similar pronouncements the Chinese communist menace was inflated, and the American defense line drawn through the heart of Southeast Asia. Thus were distortions of threat and interest progressively embedded in the unspoken suppositions of policy formulation, accepted by both political parties and sustained by American public opinion. From 1950 onward, we underwrote, for example, a large Nationalist Chinese Army on Taiwan, a policy based partly on the rationale that it was necessary to guard against a large-scale invasion from the communist mainland; more objective analysis showed in 1965 (when Mao's armed forces were better organized and equipped) that his chances of sending a sizable amphibious force across 120 miles of open water in the face of Nationalist aerial surveillance, the Seventh Fleet, and quickly available U.S. combat airpower was approximately zero.

By a similar process of inflation, the proportioned impulse that produced the Marshall Plan led later to the delusion of "nation-building" in Vietnam, and Lyndon Johnson's expressed hope of bringing the full fruits of the Great Society to the Mekong. Prudent and rational anti-communism, which recognized Moscow and Peking as major adversaries in the international arena, but understood that ideology is transient while national interests endure, degenerated for a time into a sort of religious obsession which saw the threat as a changeless, all-encompassing evil; the result was to cloud clear thought. The pressures thus arising from a combination of real and spurious threats and from our assumption of vast responsibility in a world seething with change and discontent, moved U.S. policy—and American opinion—toward a Pavlovian tendency to see every local up-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rising as a mortal test of wills between a communist octopus and the free world coalition. The trouble was, of course, that this view of our various adversaries as a monolith persisted long after the facts on which it was based had begun to shift.

The sea changes in the communist situation that occurred in the late 1950s and the 1960s are now well known; one needs therefore to cite only the major developments as reference points: (1) the Sino-Soviet breach, which split the vaunted unity of communist doctrine and thus progressively undermined the Soviet position as Mother Church; (2) developments within the U.S.S.R. itself—caused by years of effective NATO containment, the aging process, and the effects of affluence—which moved Russia toward the posture of a status quo power and noticeably reduced Soviet revolutionary fervor in relation to the underdeveloped world; (3) Moscow's progressive loss of appeal to and control over communist parties throughout the world that lie beyond the physical reach of Russian military power; and (4) the growing uneasiness of the Soviet position in Eastern Europe, brought about by broader economic and cultural relations with the West and the radiated effects of de-Stalinization in Russia. The latter process led, of course, over a period of years, not only to signs of public criticism of the official system in Russia, but also to varying kinds of self-assertion in Eastern Europe, where latent nationalism needed only opportunity to be rekindled. The invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 seemed to mark the end of officially tolerated post-Stalin liberalism, but it did not end Russian uncertainties in Eastern Europe; moreover, it once again showed the world a siege mentality that could hardly enhance the attraction of communism in other places.

Notwithstanding these developments—which between 1954 and 1964 were of course unevenly paced, partially disguised, and incomplete—every American policy action in Vietnam during that period, under three Presidents and ranging from economic aid to military training to military supply to the sending of advisers, continued to be based on what seemed a self-evident proposition: namely, that the expansion of "International Communism" presented everywhere, and in nearly every form, a direct menace to U.S. security that had to be stopped—in the last resort by whatever means were necessary.

We thus embarked upon large-scale military intervention in 1965 because the President's advisers, and the President who accepted their advice, remained the prisoners of their cold war experience at a time when communist power had in fact ceased to be monolithic and was breaking up into ideological and political fragments. Intellectually aware of this fragmentation, American leaders were nevertheless unable to acknowledge and apply the implications of that process for either "International Communism" or the U.S. interest in Southeast Asia. Still impelled by the long shock wave produced by the communist victory in China and the French collapse in Vietnam, they saw instability in that area as primarily the consequence of alien subversion; they also saw it as intolerable—and remediable.

The cold-war syndrome prevailing in Washington in 1965 thus represented no break with the Eisenhower and Kennedy periods. None of those responsible perceived the necessity—or the possibility—of redefining our interests or our role in the world in ways that would permit the drawing of more careful distinctions between those commitments and involvements that are in fact vital to our national security, and those that spring more or less from our deeply held view of what the world "ought" to be and of how it "ought" to be organized. A few viewed the prospect of a protracted testing of wills in insurgent-counterinsurgent combat with missionary zeal, accepting as an article of

faith the dubious notion that an insurgency blocked in Vietnam would deter an insurgency planned in Jordan or Trinidad. Convincing absolutely of America's altruism, they were persuaded that only through the application of American-guided "nation-building," American counter-guerrilla doctrine and, if need be, American military forces could backward nations be saved from the scourge of instability and brought to their rightful place in the modern world.

Our efforts on behalf of South Vietnam through 1964 are not, I believe, fairly construed as immoral, if one thus understands the origins of the governing U.S. attitudes and the formidable new strength and dimension they were given by the relentless pressures of the cold war. Though flawed by progressive misconceptions, U.S. policies toward Southeast Asia were well intentioned and pursued in the earnest belief that we were defending freedom. Yet at each of several critical junctures—in 1962 when President Kennedy (at the prompting of General Maxwell Taylor and Walt Rostow) introduced artillery and fighter-bomber aircraft into South Vietnam and raised U.S. advisory strengths from 700 to 16,000; after the overthrow of Diem in November 1963; in the autumn of 1964 when the collapse of the cardboard regime in Saigon seemed imminent—American leadership failed to grasp the central truth: namely, that the U.S. interest in Southeast Asia is limited, not vital; that while a limited effort to shore up South Vietnam was warranted, a total effort to save a government founded at low tide upon the receding sands of the French colonial empire was both alien to our interest and destructive of our reputation. The sudden discontinuity in the American presidency may well have been the decisive factor after 1963.

In any event, the chances for restraint, for acknowledging mistakes with reasonable grace, and for an intelligent cutting of losses were missed. The nation went over the brink and down the slippery slope. We failed to see that the realization of our ostensibly limited objectives in Vietnam required in fact the total frustration of the other side's aims, and thus might well involve a wholly open-ended commitment. North Vietnam's unexpected tenacity, deriving from the fact that the war was for Hanoi a vital struggle, led us in the event to the application of progressively unlimited means. This loss of proportion led to wanton destruction, to a gross disparity between ends and means, and therein lies the immorality.

It would be, of course, incorrect and unfair to place all of the blame on President Johnson and his advisers, for, as is evident, we are dealing with what has been a national state of mind. It is well to remember that the advisers were widely regarded when they entered government as among the ablest, the best-informed, the most humane and liberal men who could be found for public trust. And that was a true assessment. President Johnson himself reflected a fateful duality, with overtones of personal tragedy. In late 1964, before the decision to insert American combat forces was taken, there is evidence that he clung to very real doubts concerning the wisdom of further U.S. military involvement in Vietnam, and that he resisted the contrary advice of major cabinet officers. But once he was overborne by the felt pressure of events or the collective weight of his advisers' experience, once he was committed, then his visceral preference for victory came into the open. From that point onward, his domineering personality and his strong allergy to dissent within the bosom of his official family made it almost certain that advice to him would continue to be homogeneous.

Three years later—with a half-million Americans waging no better than a military stalemate, with physical and human destruction in Vietnam on a rising scale, with our domestic scene punctuated by protests, draft

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 20, 1970

resistance and the fateful merging of anti-war and racial dissension—it still required a near cataclysmic event to arrest a policy of open-ended escalation. To put the matter more precisely, it required the dramatic, undisguisable shock of the Tet offensive to knock the props out from under the contrived structure of official optimism, to create heavy public pressures for change, and thus to enable a few well-placed and determined men within the government to restore a measure of proportion to our policy in Vietnam.

## IV

What are the outlines of the situation today, a little more than two years after the Johnson decisions that put a ceiling on the war? They suggest the tenacity of the legacy. Shopworn, altered by circumstance, lacking the full confidence of old, the cold war syndrome appears nevertheless to be alive and well and living in Washington.

One perceives that President Nixon had the opportunity (like President Eisenhower with respect to Korea in 1953) to take definitive steps toward liquidating the war during his first months in office, without political risks for himself, indeed with political benefit for both his own party and the cause of national unity. In fact, his opportunity was broader. It was no less than the chance to lead the nation firmly away from a decade of self-deception in Indochina, to admit a national mistake and by that cleansing act begin to uncoil the contradictions and restore the national balance. He could have set himself the task of demonstrating that, after five years of major fighting, we had done as much as we could do to assist South Vietnam, and that our proper course should now be an orderly but unwavering withdrawal, recognizing two central realities: that the tangled political issues which torture and divide Vietnam, growing as they do out of long colonial repression and the consequent struggle to define a national identity, can be settled only among the Vietnamese themselves; and that contrary to the erroneous assumption on which U.S. military intervention was based, the particular constitutional form and ideological orientation of Vietnamese politics do not affect the vital interests of the United States.

It is significant that the new President did not take that road, but meditated upon the problem until the honeymoon period was over and the war had become unmistakably his responsibility and that of the Republican Party. Why did he do this? One is drawn by his actions and utterances to the conclusion that he personifies the ambivalence of his generation, which is now in uneasy transition from the ingrained certitudes of the cold-war syndrome toward somewhat unpalatable new truths. He is somewhere between believing in the essential rightness of this war and understanding that the American interest requires its liquidation. He has evolved a policy that seems aimed at substantially reducing and possibly ending the American role, but so conditionally and gradually as to make the process almost imperceptible. At the same time, he has been unwilling to abandon either the rhetoric that supported our intervention in the first place or the implicit insistence that our proxy must prevail even if we depart. Like his immediate predecessor, he appears to lack the scale of mind and the inner security required to risk even a transient loss of national prestige for the sake of a healthy national adjustment to reality in Southeast Asia.

On November 3, 1969, Mr. Nixon said he was proceeding on two fronts: "a peace settlement through negotiations or, if that fails, ending the war through Vietnamization." Negotiations have thus far failed—chiefly because the U.S. negotiating position does not reflect current realities. With minor embellishments, this position still

rests on the President's proposals of May 14, 1969, calling for mutual withdrawal of United States and North Vietnamese forces followed by internationally supervised elections, which would be arranged by a special commission in which the National Liberation Front would participate. But Hanoi has never been prepared to accept arrangements for elections worked out under the auspices of the Thieu government and in which the winner would take all; and the U.S.—South Vietnam military position (now affected by the withdrawal of 110,000 American troops and the announced intention to remove another 150,000) is not sufficient to compel the withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces. The resulting deadlock at Paris ought not to be surprising; it reflects the fact that our present political aims exceed our bargaining power.

To put it bluntly, the one thing we can negotiate at this stage of the war is the manner of our going. Averell Harriman, who speaks with a special authority on the subject of negotiations with the North Vietnamese, appears to believe that if we would declare our intention to leave South Vietnam, we could negotiate not only the return of our prisoners, but also the formation of a neutral government in the South, including but not dominated by the National Liberation Front, and committed to settlement and cordial relations but not merger with North Vietnam. According to Mr. Harriman, an unambiguous American declaration of departure could bring the Russians into a cooperating position, and could thus establish the preconditions for international guarantees of the negotiated arrangements, including, after a reasonable period, international supervision of all-Vietnam elections.

It does not seem impossible that a clear-minded President could lead American opinion to an understanding that firm action along this line need not be cause for a national nervous breakdown; in fact, the military and economic, as well as the psychological, advantages of removing our leg from the quicksand are fully demonstrable. Our power and influence would not evaporate. We would not be rendered incapable of defining and defending our vital and legitimate interests. On the contrary, our ability to reassure our NATO and Japanese treaty partners, and our capacity to exert a firm and steady influence on the dangers in the Middle East, could only be enhanced by the restoration of our global poise. Our industrial, technical and cultural achievements would continue to astound and attract the world.

President Nixon remains convinced, however, that American prestige in Asia rides on the survival of an anti-communist régime in Saigon. He thus sees an approach such as the Harriman proposal as leading to "humiliation and defeat for the United States." He employs the scarce tactic of a "bloodbath" if we should depart under conditions that would leave the survival of the Thieu régime in doubt. In this he misrepresents the known facts concerning Hanoi's treatment of Catholics in the North since 1954, and ignores: (a) the clear reality that an announced U.S. intention to depart would create a strong incentive for compromise settlement among virtually all South Vietnamese, except the inner circles of the Thieu régime; (b) the marked Vietnamese capacity and penchant for accommodation; and (c) the fact that a bloodbath exists in Vietnam *here and now*—in the form of indiscriminate killing and destruction produced by B-52 saturation raids, search-and-destroy operations, "free fire" zones, and atrocities such as those perpetuated at Song My. From such a perspective, the President was not moved to modify his negotiating position at Paris, but to invade Cambodia in what most experienced observers regard as an illusory

attempt to force Hanoi to negotiate on his terms.

Thus strapped to a negotiating position that cannot succeed, he is thrown back upon the policy of Vietnamization. This is a policy of a certain virtue, but it is important to understand what it can and cannot accomplish. If linked to a definite deadline for total withdrawal, it can be a vehicle for the relatively rapid extrication of American forces; if not so linked, it can become the deliberate or inadvertent centerpiece of an argument designed to show that the permanent retention of sizable American forces in South Vietnam is an inescapable necessity if we are to avoid "humiliation and defeat." In neither case, however, is Vietnamization likely to lead to an ending of the war through political settlement. For by enlarging and strengthening South Vietnamese armed forces, it buttresses Saigon's natural resistance to compromise negotiation; on the other hand, it cannot change the military balance sufficiently to modify Hanoi's refusal to negotiate on Saigon's terms. Unfortunately, President Nixon is trying to leave the impression that Vietnamization is somehow equivalent to negotiations, in the sense that it leads to "a just peace;" in fact, it moves in the opposite direction—toward making the war interminable.

The Nixon policy thus comes down to a continuation of the strategy of attrition, hopefully at lower and therefore politically acceptable levels of violence, and ending hopefully at some distant date in a sort of triumph by survival for the Thieu régime. It is a policy built on the gossamer dream that the Thieu forces can in fact be enabled to stand alone against North Vietnam within the time-frame defined by American domestic pressures for the withdrawal of U.S. forces. It is a policy which seeks to control events in Southeast Asia, while at the same time reducing U.S. forces and thus U.S. bargaining power and influence in the area. It is a policy which declines to come to grips with the hard choices that must be made if U.S. forces are to be protected as their numbers decline and the war continues.

In particular, the insistence on a very gradual, very conditional departure creates vulnerabilities that are potentially grave. The lingering nature of the process makes it vulnerable to unanticipated intervening events—like the Lon Nol coup in Cambodia—which knock it off balance, create new pressures for compensatory military action, and thus further confound an already complicated set of equations. At the same time, the conditional nature of the process—the uncertainty over whether we intend to leave totally or only partially—precludes a negotiated settlement and works against the development of even a tacit understanding with the other side with regard to lowering the level of violence. It thus increases the jeopardy of U.S. forces. It also keeps alive the hopes of those who, erroneously believing the 38th and 17th parallels present analogous issues, want to "do a Korea;" that is apply indefinitely whatever American muscle is required to transform South Vietnam into an anti-communist bastion.

It is reasonable to suppose that the perception of some or all of these weaknesses in present U.S. policy, and a desire to escape their consequences, was what led President Nixon to his watershed invasion of Cambodia. That decision, taken virtually without consulting any person or institution that shares his Constitutional responsibility, brought to a climax an already growing crisis of confidence in the national leadership. It showed how seriously the President had underestimated the risks of his policy for the continued cohesion of our own society. It showed that the Indochina issue is more than ever a virulent poison in the national bloodstream, reaching now to all segments of the population, but permeating those citi-

zens under 25 years of age who are called upon to do the actual fighting and who by 1975 will comprise nearly half the population. It made blindingly clear the grave peril of extending our national preoccupation with the Indochina war for an indefinite period.

These are somber indicators of the prospect before us; yet the shocked and impassioned general reaction to the Cambodian adventure may in fact point the way to more hopeful developments. For that reaction seems to show that, while the President and a small, influential segment of the foreign-military bureaucracy remain residually hooked on the cold-war syndrome, there is rapidly widening agreement in the Congress, the press, the intelligentsia, and even in the putative silent majority on these propositions: (1) the United States does not and cannot control events in Southeast Asia, either at the present level of effort or with a much larger commitment, and neither can the Russians or the Chinese; (2) the United States has no vital interest at stake in Indochina; we can accept and adjust to whatever outcome is arrived at by the people who live there; (3) the United States must wholly terminate its military role in Indochina within a short time (by the end of 1971 at the very latest) or else accept grave risks of our own national disintegration; and (4) if our elected leaders will cease their appeals to the emotionalism that unavoidably surrounds the concepts of "national commitment" and "national prestige," and will deal in true proportion with the real choices facing us in Southeast Asia, there is no reason why our rich and powerful country cannot extricate itself with reasonable poise and dignity, without a traumatic loss of self-confidence, and without a lapse into mindless isolation.

The highest test of character is to learn from the past, to admit one's mistakes, and to act on that admission. This remains the course of honor and reason and sanity for United States policy in Indochina. Any other course can only compound the present contradictions and lead us to the kind of trauma that could quite literally dissolve the bonds of our political union.

#### PREVENTIVE DETENTION VI: THE CHICAGO BAR ASSOCIATION SAYS NO

#### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the recently issued report of the Civil Rights Committee of the Illinois Bar Association opposing the preventive detention provision of the District of Columbia omnibus crime bill. Those of us who are both concerned with the grave problem of crime prevention and the protection of individual liberties welcome the support of this distinguished organization's forceful report on this important issue.

The report thoughtfully expresses both the constitutional and practical dangers of preventive detention to the American system of justice. It states that the Nixon administration's bill might compound the existing problem of administering justice in the District of Columbia by adding to the burden of the courts. Furthermore, the Bar association's report criticizes the Justice Department for not

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

adequately researching the objective value of preventive detention.

In opposing the short-sighted and potentially dangerous measure proposed by the administration, the report calls for less extreme measures, and a more thoughtful and factually based approach to the frustrating problem of crime control.

The report follows:

##### REPORT OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE

###### I. BACKGROUND

Of the many causes cited as contributing to the increase in crime, one which in recent months has been the subject of significant attention—the pre-trial release of criminal defendants—has risen to prominence principally as a result of legislative, rather than judicial, action.

The Bail Reform Act of 1966 enacted by the 89th Congress revised existing eligibility standards for the pre-trial release of defendants in non-capital cases. 18 U.S.C. §§ 3041, 3141-43, 3146-52, 3568 (Supp. III, 1968). The Act provides that any person charged with a non-capital crime shall be released on his personal recognizance or upon the execution of an unsecured appearance bond, unless it is determined that additional safeguards are required to assure the appearance of such a person, whereupon a judicial officer may impose any one or any combination of the following additional conditions:

"(1) place the person in the custody of a designated person or organization agreeing to supervise him;

"(2) place restrictions on the travel, association, or place of abode of the person during the period of release;

"(3) require the execution of an appearance bond in a specified amount and the deposit in the registry of the court, in cash or other security as directed, of a sum not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount of the bond, such deposit to be returned upon the performance of the conditions of release;

"(4) require, the execution of a bail bond with sufficient solvent sureties, or the deposit of cash in lieu thereof; or

"(5) impose any other condition deemed reasonably necessary to assure appearance as required, including a condition requiring that the person return to custody after specified hours. 18 U.S.C. § 3146 (a) (Supp. III, 1968)."

Thus, the Act does not permit, in the making of such determination, consideration of possible risk the released defendant might represent to the community. The legislative history of the Act makes this point quite clearly:

"This legislation does not deal with the problem of the preventive detention of the accused because of the possibility that his liberty might endanger the public, either because of the possibility of the commission of further acts of violence by the accused during the pre-trial period, or because of the fact that he is at large might result in the intimidation of witnesses or the destruction of evidence. . . . Obviously, the problem of preventive detention is closely related to the problem of bail reform. A solution goes beyond the scope of the present proposal and involves many difficult and complex problems which require deep study and analysis. The present problem of reform of existing bail procedures demands an immediate solution. It should not be delayed by consideration of the question of preventive detention. Consequently, this legislation is limited to bail reform only. H.R. Rep. No. 1541, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 18 (1966) (remarks of Congressman Cellier)."

With the opening of the present 91st Congress it became evident that there was a desire in both Houses to take a further look at the Bail Reform Act. Hearings held by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee indicate

that, while many members endorse the objectives of the Act, there is considerable sentiment for providing discretionary authority to judicial officers to consider factors other than likelihood of a defendant's appearing for trial in determining eligibility for release. This attitude was reflected in President's call on January 31, 1969 for legislation to permit pre-trial detention of defendants in non-capital cases whose pre-trial release is considered dangerous to the community at large or to particular individuals. 27 Cong. Q. Weekly Rep. 238 (Feb. 7 1969). Pursuant to the President's request, the Department of Justice sent the Senate a proposed amendment to the Bail Reform Act of 1966. This proposed amendment, S. 2600, was introduced by Sen. Roman L. Hruska, Neb., R., on July 11, 1969. 115 Cong. Rec. S7906-11.

S. 2600 would amend the Bail Reform Act for the purpose of reducing crime committed by persons released on bail. The principle features of the bill are:

"1. Authority to consider danger to the community in setting conditions of pre-trial release;

"2. Authority to deny pre-trial release for a sixty day period to specific categories of defendants who are found to be dangerous after an adversary hearing with appropriate procedural safeguards;

"3. Authority to revoke pre-trial release and detain defendants who violate release conditions; and

"4. Provision for mandatory additional terms of imprisonment to be served consecutively by persons found guilty of bail jumping or of committing an offense while on pre-trial release. 115 Cong. Rec. 7909 (1969)."

This report is concerned solely with the most controversial of these provisions—namely those summarized in sub-paragraph 2 above, dealing with pre-trial detention for a period of sixty days. These provisions are also set forth in detail in Appendix A to this report.

The legislative history of these pre-trial detention provisions is further complicated by the following developments. On July 11, 1969, Sen. Hruska and others introduced S. 2601 for the Nixon Administration, proposing reorganization of the courts of the District of Columbia. 115 Cong. Rec. S7906. S. 2601 passed the Senate within 70 days of its submission, on September 16, 1969. (See remarks by Sen. Ervin, 116 Cong. Rec. S4387 (March 24, 1970)). On March 19, 1970, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 16196, the "District of Columbia Omnibus Crime" bill, substituting this omnibus bill for the Senate text of S. 2601 and returning S. 2601 to the Senate with a request for a conference. 116 Cong. Rec. H1956-H2090. H.R. 16196 includes preventive detention legislation; S. 2601 is entirely devoid of any reference to preventive detention. Moreover, the preventive detention measures contained in H.R. 16196 are identical to the principal features of S. 2600 previously summarized.

On March 24, 1970, the Senate amended S. 2601 as amended by the House, substituting bills previously passed by it and omitting all provisions for preventive detention; the Senate also requested a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon. 116 Cong. Rec. S4392 (March 24, 1970). It is somewhat disturbing to observe that the senators who were most critical of preventive detention (such as Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina) were not included among those appointed to represent the Senate on the Conference Committee.

###### II. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

The question whether pre-trial detention of a defendant considered dangerous to the community at large or to particular individuals would be constitutional entails two separate issues: first, whether the "excessive bail" clause of the Eighth Amendment gives

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

or implies an absolute right to bail, and makes its denial unconstitutional; and second, whether the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment prevents the imprisonment of a defendant on the basis of a prediction of future misconduct. Neither of these two issues has been decided by the Supreme Court.

The most recent consideration of the meaning of the Eighth Amendment is *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. 524 (1952), (5-4 decision). In an opinion by Mr. Justice Reed, the Court held that alien members of the Communist Party were not entitled to be released on bail, pending final determination of their deportability. Mr. Justice Reed said:

"The bail clause was lifted with slight changes with the English Bill of Rights Act. 1 Wm. & Mary II, ch. 2, § 1 (10). In England that clause has never been thought to accord a right to bail in all cases. Petersdorff, on Bail, 483 et seq., but merely to provide that bail shall not be excessive in those cases where it is proper to grant bail. When this clause was carried over into our Bill of Rights, nothing was said that indicated any different concept. I Annals of Congress 753. The Eighth Amendment has not prevented Congress from defining the classes of cases in which bail shall be allowed in this country. Thus in criminal cases bail is not compulsory where the punishment may be death. I Stat. 91, § 33; Rules of Criminal Procedure, 46(a). Indeed, the very language of the Amendment fails to say all arrests must be bailable. We think, clearly, here that the Eighth Amendment does not require that bail be allowed under the circumstances of these cases. *Carlson v. Landon*, 342 U.S. at 545-546."

Although Justice Reed does not explicitly say, here, that the only properly bailable cases are those which Congress has defined as bailable, it should be observed that he did say that, "The Eighth Amendment has not prevented Congress from defining the classes of cases in which bail shall be allowed in this country." To illustrate this point, he observed that, "Thus in criminal cases bail is not compulsory where the punishment is death."<sup>1</sup>

Arguing in dissent in *Carlson*, Mr. Justice Black rejected the Court's interpretation of the Eighth Amendment, as expressed by Justice Reed, saying:

"As to (1): The Eighth Amendment is in the American Bill of Rights of 1789, not the English Bill of Rights of 1689. And it is well known that our Bill of Rights was written and adopted to guarantee Americans greater freedom than had been enjoyed by their ancestors who had been driven from Europe by persecution. As to (2): It is true bail has frequently been denied in this country 'when the punishment may be death.' I fail to see where the Court's analogy between deportation and the death penalty advances its argument unless it is also analogizing the offense of indoctrinating talk to the crime of first degree murder. *Carlson v. Landon*, p. 557."

The other three dissenting justices (Frankfurter, Douglas and Burton) did not join in Mr. Justice Black's dissent, but Mr. Justice Burton, besides joining in Mr. Justice Frankfurter's dissent, added "the suggestion that the Eighth Amendment lends support to the statutory interpretation he advocated. That Amendment clearly prohibits federal bail that is excessive in amount

<sup>1</sup> The rule in point, here, is: (1) *Before Conviction*. A person arrested for an offense not punishable by death shall be admitted to bail. A person arrested for an offense punishable by death may be admitted to bail by any court or judge authorized by law to do so in the exercise of discretion, giving due weight to the evidence and to the nature and circumstances of the offense. Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, 46(a)(1).

when seen in the light of all traditionally relevant circumstances. Likewise it must prohibit unreasonable denial of bail." (p. 569).

*Stack v. Boyle*, 342 U.S. 1, is another recent case which considers the meaning of the Eighth Amendment's "excessive bail" clause. In an opinion by Mr. Chief Justice Vinson, the Court held that the constitutional prohibition of excessive bail was violated when a District Court uniformly fixed an amount of \$50,000 for each of twelve members of the Communist Party charged with conspiring to teach or advocate the overthrow of the government by force or violence. Speaking for the Court, Mr. Chief Justice Vinson said:

"From the passage of the Judiciary Act of 1789, 1 Stat. 73, 91, to the present Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 46 (a) (1), federal law has unequivocally provided that a person arrested for a non-capital offense shall be admitted to bail. p. 4.

"The right to release before trial is conditioned upon the accused's giving adequate assurance that he will stand trial and submit to sentence if found guilty. pp. 4-5.

"Bail set at a figure higher than an amount reasonably calculated to fulfill this purpose is 'excessive' under the Eighth Amendment. p. 5.

"Since the function of bail is limited, the fixing of bail for any individual defendant must be based upon standards relevant to the purpose of assuring the presence of that defendant. The traditional standards as expressed in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are to be applied in each case to each defendant. p. 5."

In a separate concurring opinion, Mr. Justice Jackson, with whom Mr. Justice Frankfurter joined, agreed with Chief Justice Vinson's understanding of the function of bail adding: "But the Judge is not free to make the sky the limit because the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution says: 'Excessive bail shall not be required. . . .'" (p. 8)

Suffice it to say, then, that from the foregoing quotations there are basically two ways of reading the Eighth Amendment: (1) either as guaranteeing an absolute right to bail in non-capital criminal cases; or (2) as a guarantee to reasonable sums of money calculated according to standards relevant to assuring the defendant will not flee the jurisdiction and based upon provisions of federal law as determined by Congress.

Professor Caleb Foote, in a historical study of the Eighth Amendment and its framers, argues that the right to bail was acknowledged as a primary right that had to exist in a large class of cases and that reference to excessive bail was merely one method of preventing any circumvention of this right. Foote, "The Coming Constitutional Crisis in Bail": I, 113 U. Pa. L. Rev. 959, 965-989 (1965). Foote builds a strong case explaining why the inadequate expression of this intent to have an absolute right to bail was the result of a historical accident. See too his testimony in *Hearings On Amendments To The Bail Reform Act Of 1966*, Before Subcomm. on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., at 357 (1968). But with all due respect for Professor Foote's argument of historical accident, it is certainly true that an explanation of this historical event as an accident appears to be less than immune to attack. See e.g., Mitchell, *Bail Reform and the Constitutionality of Pre-trial Detention*, 55 Va. L. Rev. 1223 (1969).

In short, the argument for the absolute right to bail interpretation of the Eighth Amendment rests on a shaky foundation. Federal law has always provided for the right to bail by statute; and the statutes have traditionally denied the absolute right to bail in capital cases. Moreover, it would not be taking liberties to deduce from Mr. Chief Justice Vinson's remarks in *Stack v. Boyle*

that the purpose and function of bail is to assure the presence of the defendant at trial. If this is correct, then it may reasonably be argued that setting bail and the application of the Eighth Amendment to this procedure was not meant to apply to people considered so dangerous to the community that they ought to be released. Whether this would be a worthwhile argument to pursue or not, it is interesting to note that bail is generally discussed in terms of assuring the appearance of the accused for his trial and not in terms of protecting society from dangerous persons.<sup>2</sup>

Even the rationale for denying bail in capital cases is based on the idea of assuring the appearance of the accused for his trial, since it is assumed that a man who knows that conviction could mean his life would attempt to flee the jurisdiction. If Congress, consistently with the Eighth Amendment, could enact the statutes which gave the right to bail in noncapital criminal cases and denied this right in capital cases, based upon the ostensible purpose of assuring that the accused would be brought to trial, Congress apparently, with equal consistency, could also pass a new statute denying the right to bail to persons because of predictions about their dangerousness to society.

Even assuming that preventive detention will survive an attack based on the Eighth Amendment, the due process issue must still be faced. Due process problems concerning the nature of the procedural system for administering preventive detention are exceedingly difficult. Aside from the obvious argument that preventive detention would violate due process *ex hypothesi*, since it would deprive the defendant of his liberty before a conviction, the outstanding fact is that we simply do not have available the predictive techniques that an acceptable system would require. As a result of this lack of technical proficiency, would there not be an inevitable tendency to over-detain? This emerged with particular clarity during the 1969 hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. See especially testimony of Professor Dershowitz, Hearings on Amendments to Ball Reform Act, pp. 172-185. While it has been argued that the civil commitment of the mentally incompetent to stand trial, sexual psychopaths, narcotics addicts, chronic alcoholics, and the mentally ill provide analogous situations (see Mitchell, *supra* at pp. 1233-1234) the analogies are far from compelling. The essence of the problem is that comparable standards of judgment are unavailable in ordinary criminal cases, prior to full trial. Although some of the proposals for preventive detention try to minimize the dangers of abuse by specifically defining the offenses to which the procedure would be applicable, and by providing for some form of adversary, though summary, proceedings, they do not obviate the basic difficulty of lack of adequate knowledge and standards for judgment. Indeed the closer that the hearing on detention comes to a full trial, the more it accentuates the underlying evil of court congestion and delayed trials.

It has also been argued that pre-trial detention has in effect been authorized, without violation of due process, in the denial of bail in capital cases as well as in the setting of prohibitively high bail in non-capital cases. In response to this argument, it should be noted first that the denial of bail in capital cases is primarily to assure appearance at the trial rather than to prevent danger to the community; and second that setting of prohibitively high bail is an abuse of the bail process which has been

<sup>2</sup> This statement does not apply to bail after conviction and pending appeal.

July 20, 1970

increasingly frowned upon both by judicial decisions (*e.g., Stack v. Boyle, supra*) and by the Bail Reform Act itself. Consequently it is doubtful that such arguments will be very persuasive in countering the due process objection.

### III. CONCLUSION

Our opposition to the current proposals for pre-trial detention is not, however, based primarily upon constitutional objections, even though these are serious and might be conclusive. Rather it is based upon the need for a more carefully thought out and factually supported program for improving the administration of criminal justice than is represented by these current legislative proposals. Almost all the experienced and well-informed witnesses at the 1969 Hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights agreed that the most fundamental step toward solving the problem of crimes committed by criminal defendants awaiting trial would be the substantial expediting of the processes of criminal justice. It was testimony such as this which convinced Senator Ervin that pre-trial detention, instead of contributing toward such a fundamental solution, might even aggravate the situation by increasing court congestion through the need for additional, adversary pre-trial hearings.

Finally, Senator Ervin was particularly disturbed by the lack of a basic factual study to support the administration proposals. As he said in the last Senate debate on the District of Columbia Omnibus Crime Bill:

"If there was one thing upon which all witnesses were agreed in the January 1969, hearings of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, it was that there was inadequate information upon which to judge the necessity for such a gross invasion of the Bill of Rights. 116 Cong. Rec., p. 8915 (March 24, 1970)."

This was especially surprising because a major scientific study was commissioned by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and conducted by the National Bureau of Standards to ascertain the amount of pre-trial crime committed, to develop reliable predictive devices, if possible, to support preventive detention, and to search out ways to prevent and control pre-trial crime short of preventive detention. This commissioned study was completed on March 31, 1970, and it is astonishing that the Department did not allow for its completion and utilize its conclusions so that any legislation on preventive detention could be considered objectively on its merits. Senator Ervin has suggested that the study "will refute much of the frantic rhetoric the Department has issued about the need for preventive detention". 116 Cong. Rec., p. 8915 (March 24, 1970).

In the last analysis, however, the concept of due process must achieve a reasonable balance between essential protections of the individual and the essential protection of society. In this balancing process, fundamental fairness requires that the less extreme remedies must be explored and tested before going on to the more extreme ones. This has not been done in the situation at hand. Attorney General Mitchell himself admits that alternative methods for dealing with the problems of crimes committed by persons released pending trial, such as speedier trials, better and more complete supervision of such released persons, and prompt revocation of the release in case of violation of such conditions, including of course, any subsequent offenses, have not been either extensively or effectively used. (See Mitchell, *op. cit. supra*, 55 Va. L. Rev. at 1242.) Whatever may be said with respect to the merits of such intermediate proposals, the case has

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

certainly not been made out for proceeding immediately to so drastic a remedy as a pre-trial detention with all its concomitant evils, based on such elusive standards as are now being proposed."

The problems we face in America, today, are exceedingly frustrating; but we must not allow frustration to lead us to extreme and costly overreactions which may undermine our way of life. As Chief Justice Burger has just reminded us.

"In periods of stress there are always some voices raised urging that we suspend fundamental guarantees and take short-cuts as a matter of self-protection.

"But this is not our way of doing things short of a giant national emergency.

\* \* \*

"In those few periods of our history when we suspended basic guarantees of the individual in times of great national emergency we often found, in retrospect, that we had overreacted. (Speech to the American Law Institute, May 19, 1970, reported in Chicago Daily News, May 20, 1970.)"

### THE SECRET CONGRESS

#### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a striking amount of high quality support lately from the "fourth estate" for the bipartisan, antisecrecy amendments being proposed to the Legislative Reorganization Act. Various columns and editorials have focused their attention on the need for open committee sessions and similar recommendations designed to enable the public to scrutinize congressional activity.

There has been a noted absence of concern, however, with record votes on House amendments. If we are willing to propel the House to its legitimate status as a truly representative body, I strongly believe that we should respond to these voices around the country and conduct our operations in the public eye. Secrecy in the House is by no means the fancy of

"In this connection attention is called to the Report of the Advisory Committee on Pre-trial Proceedings of the American Bar Association Project on Minimum Standards for Criminal Justice, which states in its Introduction:

"After lengthy consideration, and not without misgivings by some members, the Committee proposes new and far-reaching methods of meeting the problem but stops short of recommending outright preventive detention. In essence, the standards provide for revocation of release where the defendant violates the conditions of his release. (Section 5.6 *infra*). If a released defendant is indicted or held to answer for a subsequent serious crime his release will be revoked. (Sections 5.6-5.8 *infra*). While these measures do not, of course, provide absolute protection against crime while on release, the present state of knowledge about the magnitude of the problem, the difficulties of predicting criminal behavior in the immediate future and the fact that measures short of detention have never been tested, persuade the Committee that outright preventive detention could not be proposed. Pp. 6-7."

the press' imagination as some have suggested. Rather, it has become so integral a part of our congressional lives that, I fear, we scarcely notice it. Demands for a more responsive Congress have come from all quarters of society. Today's passage of the amendment permitting radio and television coverage of committee hearings is an admirable first step in removing any Byzantine skulduggery from the House.

I urge adoption of all of the bipartisan antisecrecy amendments, but particularly the O'Neill-Gubser amendment to provide for record votes on amendments. It seems to me that how we vote on key issues before the House is the absolute minimum we owe our constituents. I would like to include in the RECORD several articles and editorials which will be of interest to my colleagues:

THE SECRET CONGRESS  
(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—America may have an "open society," compared to Communist countries, but Congress remains largely a "secret society." Most Americans actually do not know what their congressman is doing much of the time, despite the extensive press coverage of the House and Senate.

This is because the real work of Congress is done in committees, behind closed doors, and not on the floor in open view. Congressmen defend the practice as being in the interest of either national security or a smoother legislative process. The press and some other outside groups have challenged the secrecy rules to little avail.

### GROUP SEEKS HOUSE REFORMS

Now, for the first time in anyone's memory, a group of concerned House members has come forth with a serious critique on the secrecy problem and some proposed solutions. The Democratic Study Group (DSG), a band of liberal Democrats seeking House reforms, worries that public confidence in the House may be destroyed unless something is done to expose the deliberations of Congress at their roots.

The DSG points out that secrecy takes many forms. It is closed committee meetings; it is refusal to disclose record votes taken in committee; it is the unavailability of reports and other information about the contents and effects of bills.

Beyond this, on the floor itself, there are scores of non-record votes on major amendments in the House (but not the Senate). And all House-Senate conference committees, where the final bargaining is done, are closed tight.

"Whatever the form," the committee says, "the effect of such procedures is to deny the public and members of Congress themselves basic information they need to participate effectively in the democratic process."

It is probably true that the secrecy pervading the legislative process has helped to make the House incomprehensible to the average citizen and, in its special way, has contributed to the unfavorable public image of a congressman as one not to be trusted.

Since most congressmen are hard-working, respectable people who deserve public trust, it would be in the interest of Congress to invite greater public scrutiny. A good argument can be made that secrecy prevents members of Congress from doing their jobs effectively.

Nearly half of the hearings and meetings of the House committees are currently closed to the press and public. Most of these sessions involve major committees such as Ways and Means, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and Appropriations. Indeed, the DSG found that the powerful appropriations panels—the one that examine the budget in detail—hold all of their more than 300 annual meetings and hearings behind closed doors, "out of sight of the taxpayers who foot the bills for its actions."

The House Appropriations Committee releases the transcript of its hearings in due course but they are heavily censored. It should be noted that the companion Senate committee manages to hold about three-fourths of its meetings in public.

Although the legislative reorganization act of 1946 requires all committees to keep a record of the votes on any question on which a record is demanded, the information is never released by the committees, with one exception in the House, the Education and Labor Committee.

A new attempt at legislative reorganization will be before the House in a few weeks. The DSG is suggesting that the measure be amended to open House proceedings to more public scrutiny.

Perhaps the most significant move will be an effort to require record votes—not now permitted—when the House is considering amendments. If a lawmaker had to take a stand in public, he might make it a point to be present and voting. Currently, the participation is less than one-third of the House membership.

## WANTS COMMITTEE VOTES PUBLIC

There will be a proposal to require a two-thirds rollcall vote to close a meeting or hearing, plus disclosure of the reason for doing so. And the DSG wants every member's vote on committee rollcalls to be made public.

The efforts at procedural reform will be closely watched but could suffer at the hands of the present system. Ironically, whether the House is to change its ways and get on the record" will be decided by "nonrecord" votes under the ingrained procedures of the past.

HOUSE READY TO DEBATE CONTROVERSIAL SECRET VOTING  
(By Richard A. Ryan)

**WASHINGTON.**—How did your congressman vote on such recent controversial issues as:

Cutting off funds for the war in Indochina.

Continued development of the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system, MIRV, and the supersonic transport airplane.

Limiting the government's ability to seek further school desegregation.

Further funding of the Apollo space exploration missions.

Chances are you don't know—not because you aren't interested but because the information is not available.

Unless your representative is willing to volunteer the information there is simply no way of knowing for sure how he voted—if indeed he even took the time to vote.

But this shroud of secrecy, under which congressmen have ducked politically explosive issues since 1789, is now under attack.

The House begins debate Monday on the legislative reorganization bill of 1970.

The bill, the first one to stand a chance of passage since the reorganization act of 1946, appears to be rather innocuous.

Its main provisions provide for opening some House committee hearings to television broadcasting, extending the Legislative Reference Service, permitting free tours of the Capitol and requiring that House pages be of college age.

But a broad-based coalition of congressmen is prepared to offer a series of amendments which, if adopted, would rattle Capitol Hill.

Chief target of reform-bent legislators is the system whereby congressmen can avoid being recorded on controversial votes. Current rules prohibit record votes being taken when the House meets as a Committee of the

Whole, as it does when it debates pending legislation.

The concept was patterned on the English system whereby members of Parliament could hide their individual votes from the king. Although Britain reformed this system to provide for public votes in 1832, Congress has clung to its secrecy.

During Committee of the Whole sessions, votes are taken either by voice, division—in which opponents and proponents alternately stand up—and teller, whereby congressmen simply walk down the aisle and are counted as supporting or opposing the measure.

Amendments defeated in Committee of the Whole cannot be brought up again when the House is in formal session. And most of the controversial measures are contained in amendments.

Efforts to record how legislators vote on teller votes is made extremely difficult because they walk away from the press gallery, the only gallery where note-taking is permitted.

Among the important measures decided this year by nonrecord votes were:

An amendment to delete funds for American ground combat forces in Cambodia which was defeated 94-163, on a teller vote.

Amendments offered to cut funds for ABM, the C-5A plane, the MIRV (multiple targetable reentry vehicle) missile, and the B-1 bomber, defeated by teller votes.

An amendment to strip funds from the Department of Transportation appropriations bill for development of the supersonic plane (SST) which lost, 86-102, on a teller vote.

Arguments against recording votes are that it is too time-consuming. Roll call votes, for example, take about 30 minutes; teller votes take only 10.

Reformers, however, intend to counter this argument by proposing that teller votes be continued but that the congressmen be recorded by name, not merely counted. This will mean an additional two minutes over the present system.

Nonrecord votes, critics contend, are inherently dangerous.

A congressman, for example, might vote in support of his chairman to curry favor rather than in support of his constituency.

HOUSE WEIGHS VOTING REFORM  
(By Antony Prisendorf)

**WASHINGTON.**—The House of Representatives is poised to act this week on a crucial measure that would put an end to the traditional secrecy in voting on major legislative amendments.

Next to the stifled issue of seniority, it is probably the most important procedural reform to confront the Congress since 1946, when it enacted its last major internal reorganization.

Bipartisan supporters of the measure, who represent practically the entire spectrum of political thinking, are fairly confident of passage when their amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 is introduced on the floor, either tomorrow or on Wednesday.

But even though the amendment has the endorsement of the Democratic majority's leadership and House Republican conference chairman John B. Anderson of Illinois (GOP minority leader Gerald Ford has yet to commit himself) the sponsors are refraining from any bold predictions of victory.

One Capitol Hill strategist explained the unusual degree of caution this way:

"We don't know for sure, even at this late point, who our enemies in this one are. And it's rare for a major amendment like this one to pass on the floor without some kind of parliamentary procedure being invoked."

## HIGH STAKES

The stakes are high. If adopted, the reform measure would abolish the time-honored procedure of permitting House members to

vote anonymously on most of the important and controversial issues to come before them.

The chief target of the proposed reform is the parliamentary procedure by which unrecorded votes are taken on amendments during committee-of-the-whole sessions, when quorum requirements have been lowered and roll-call votes suspended to save time.

Members presently cast their votes in committee-of-the-whole sessions by lining up in the two main aisles and filing by tellers who count them as they pass but who do not record their names.

During the current session, members voted in this anonymous way on amendments dealing with such crucial issues as the right of 18-year-olds to vote, the ABM, the supersonic transport, school desegregation, as well as various aspects of the war in Southeast Asia.

A record vote can be requested later on amendments, but only on those that have been adopted, not those that were defeated. Shielded in this way from public accountability, "often only 30 per cent of the membership bothers to vote," a public-interest organization based here in Washington has found.

One bit of irony surrounding the reform effort is that when the amendment comes up for the deciding vote, that vote, too, will be cast in secret, which makes it sponsors slightly more wary of its outcome.

HOUSE CHALLENGED TO RECORD MEMBERS ON ALL KEY ISSUES  
(By Robert Healy)

**WASHINGTON.**—On May 6 during the debate on the military procurement bill in the House, there were three amendments offered that gave members chance to make a stand on the Cambodian invasion. But in each case, there was a teller vote where the Congressmen file down the aisle and are counted for and against the amendment by tellers. There was no record of the vote.

The House was meeting as a committee of the whole. The committee is kind of a procedural fiction which allows the House to operate under less stringent rules. A quorum, for instance, in the committee of the whole is 100 rather than a majority or 218 under the regular rules. It allows for limitation of debate and it prohibits roll calls.

In the past the House has dealt with the anti-ballistic missile systems, the SST and key domestic amendments in the committee. And in every case where there was voting on these amendments, the public had no way of knowing how their Congressmen voted or whether in fact they had voted.

The committee of the whole procedure was taken from the British when Congress was established. British members of Parliament developed the procedure when they were rowing with the king. It had the effect of removing the king's man from the chair, and protected individual members of Parliament from the king's wrath. (The British abandoned the no-record vote system 140 years ago.)

But the Congress has used this as a neat device for ducking the wrath of the voters for all these years.

This week, the House will begin a major effort towards reform. It has little sex appeal for the public because it deals with procedural changes about which the general public knows little and cares less.

But the major effort of this reform is easy to understand and has broad implications for the voters in the nation. It is an amendment sponsored by Rep. Thomas P. O'Neill (D-Mass.) a liberal, and Rep. Charles Gubser (R-Calif.), a conservative. The amendment is to the overall reform bill. It would eliminate the secret vote in the committee of the whole.

Like many other processes which are made more responsive to the public, it does not

make it more efficient. To the contrary, the House operates largely through its committee systems and in many cases this means through a strong committee chairman, Committee chairmen and a handful of members of the committee handle the processing of a bill on the floor and usually in the committee of the whole and pass an amendment. The chairmen of the individual committees are very persuasive in this process. This persuasiveness will be challenged in part when and if the new reform is accepted in the House this week.

The arguments for the passage of the amendment are obvious—people. The people's right to know how their Congressmen voted on key legislation. The secrecy of the teller vote erodes the credibility of the House itself at a time when institutions are under assault.

And while regular roll calls produce 85 to 90 percent attendance in the House, frequently less than one fourth of the House passes on the critical amendments in the committee of the whole.

Beyond that there are the less obvious arguments. Committee chairmen sometimes jam a special interest provision into a bill which would not stand the debate and roll call test and the procedure of the full House. But because of the very nature of the committee of the whole system it passes through easily.

And finally sometimes the votes on amendments are more meaningful to the record of a Congressman than the final record vote.

The O'Neill amendment has broad support, including Carl Albert, who is expected to be the next Speaker of the House.

But at the same time it is a very "in" thing and there is apt to be very little public interest or pressure on the Congressmen to vote for the amendment. And many of the committee chairmen will be opposed to it.

Yet it is a very simple proposition. As Congressman O'Neill put it at his press conference last week: "I believe this amendment is necessary to restore Congressional accountability and to involve more members in these important decisions." And that's about the best argument for it.

#### AGAINST SECRECY IN CONGRESS

For many years this newspaper has argued long and often for the public's right to see and hear the deliberations of its elected officials. Illinois now has on its statute book a law requiring all public meetings to be public, including committee meetings, with certain reasonable exceptions.

We therefore are particularly pleased that the anti-secrecy movement is taking hold in Congress where members have notoriously ignored the people's right to know.

This week action is scheduled in the House on H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. A group of Congressmen, including Illinois Republicans John N. Erlenborn and Thomas F. Railsback, are sponsoring amendments which would require a public recording of how members vote on major issues both in committee and the House floor. They would open committee hearings and meetings to the press and public, and require publication of committee reports and hearings a reasonable length of time before final House action is taken.

House members now can avoid putting themselves on record on a final vote on an issue by permitting passage by a voice vote (all in favor say "Aye") or by a standing vote in which members are counted but not recorded individually.

The public is entitled to know how its individual members vote on major issues and it is entitled to even more than that. It is entitled to know the reasons behind their votes and this means the voters are entitled to hear the arguments made in committee meetings.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Unless there is such a free flow of information to the public, the democratic process is handicapped.

One of the most secret of the House committees is the one labelled Ways and Means, in which all government spending originates. (In the Senate, virtually all appropriations hearings are open.)

It has been argued that secrecy is needed in such House committees so that members may not be inhibited about speaking up and asking questions, thereby, perhaps, exposing ignorance of the subject.

Secrecy is argued for appropriations subcommittees on the grounds that it is necessary to prevent "raids on the treasury." We don't follow that argument. It seems to us that raids on the treasury might better be prevented by letting the public see what's going on.

In a special report, the Democratic Study Group, which has been working to modernize government and the political parties, noted that what the secrecy process does is concentrate the "power of the purse" in the hands of a few men. It denies the taxpaying public an opportunity effectively to influence national priorities and makes a farce of the principle of representative government. Even congressmen who are not members of the particular subcommittees are barred from them.

The Democratic Study Group says:

"The only real opportunity afforded other members of the House to influence an appropriations measure is during floor consideration. However, after months of closed-door committee consideration, this stage of the appropriations process is telescoped into a few days with the predictable result that members can do little more than rubberstamp the committee decisions."

Surely the public expenditure of billions of dollars should not be the private business of a few influential congressman. Nor should the public be held at arms length as the House debates life and death and dollar issues and then votes them up or down in virtual anonymity.

We salute the courageous band of innovating congressmen who are trying to let some light into the capitol.

#### HOUSE SECRECY UNDER ATTACK

A drive to end secrecy in the U.S. House of Representatives is gaining impetus backed by a broadly-based, bipartisan coalition of 56 members.

The group's major effort is directed against present procedures which permit members to vote anonymously on most important amendments that come before the House. For example in recent months the House has defeated amendments dealing with such key issues as the Vietnam war, the supersonic transport, the 18-year-old vote and antiballistic missile without any member being put on record.

The House Democratic Study Group in a June 24 special report said "secrecy has a more debilitating impact on the House than its well-publicized companion, the seniority system."

That's a pretty strong statement, but the report cites chapter and verse:

"Secrecy in the House takes many forms. It is closed committee meetings; . . . refusal to disclose record votes taken in committee; . . . unavailability of reports and other information about the contents and effect of legislation; . . . non-record votes on major amendments during floor consideration of bills; . . . closed House-Senate conferences and more off-the-record votes; . . . calling up conference reports and other measures for a vote before members have had adequate opportunity to study them."

The report also says: "Perhaps the most notorious example of secrecy is the House appropriation process which is almost totally

closed not only to the public but also to most of the membership . . ."

Proposals to change at least some of these procedures will be acted upon next week when the House takes up a reorganization bill.

Prospects are hardly bright for the thorough-going reform our national legislative process so urgently needs. But the fact that a widening base of younger members persist in bringing the matter up is encouraging and perhaps indicative of eventual success.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

#### HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 15, 1970

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, during this past week of July 12-18, 1970, the 12th annual observance of Captive Nations Week was held throughout the United States and in 17 other free nations. This week called attention to the brave but long-suffering peoples of nations which have been captured by the Soviet Union in the name of international communism.

We cannot afford to forget the atrocities, terrorism, mass deportations, and comprehensive subjugation by which the peoples of the captive nations were forced to submit to superimposed political structures directed from Moscow. The inhumane and abominable methods by which the Soviet Union militantly suppresses rebellions against Communist tyrannies by courageous victims further underlies the despicable nature of communism.

Whenever any human being is denied the most elemental right of human liberty against his will, then each individual's own liberty is diminished. Today over 1 billion of our fellowmen languish behind the Iron Curtain. There is an existence in which there is little or no freedom of speech, in which freedom of the press is largely unknown, and in which freedom of religion is largely nonexistent. Their freedom to travel is severely restricted. Communist governments continue to impose all-encompassing control over all aspects of daily life.

In asking ourselves what we as concerned American citizens can do to help the plight of the Captive Nations, I would like to make the following suggestions and points:

First, educate ourselves and our neighbors.

Second, set up a special Committee on Captive Nations. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for reconsideration of House Resolution 420, that I submitted in April of 1967 and which reads as follows:

H. RES. 420

Whereas on the all-important issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Whereas the nationwide observances in the seven anniversaries of Captive Nations Week have clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy, and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the eight Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh

ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That there is hereby established a nonpermanent committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with the recommendations, not later than January 31, 1968.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

SEC. 6. The committee shall enjoy a non-standing status, performing its duties in the course of the Ninetieth Congress and subject to renewal only as determined by needs in the completion of its work and further purposes of the House of Representatives.

As individual citizens you can write the members of the Rules Committee urging them to reconsider House Resolution 420. This committee would unquestionably offset the appalling ignorance of our youth and others regarding the captive nations.

Third, move for reconsideration of the Freedom Academy bill—the purpose of the bill is to establish a research and educational institution as an independent agency of the U.S. Government, to assist in the development of methods and means employable in both the governmental and private sectors to counter all forms of Communist political warfare, subversion, and insurgency.

Fourth, stop trading with the Communist bloc nations. We are committing treason and national suicide when we trade with the Communist bloc nations.

Fifth, I propose that we mount an effective "freedom offensive." This would

consist of a campaign using psychological, political, and economic weapons against the regimes of captive nations everywhere.

Sixth, I urge President Nixon and the governments of all other free nations to call for the United Nations to institute a U.N. Committee to investigate Russian communist tactics, communist enslavement, and persecution of the captive nations under its direct and indirect domination.

I further urge President Nixon to demand that the United Nations enforce its charter provisions which guarantee self-determination to all peoples; a U.N. provision which the Soviet Union accepted but has openly refused to follow.

Seventh, I call on my colleagues to review our U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union. There are a great deal of misconceptions and false assumptions on which our policy is based, and thus a full review of our U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union would go a long way to dissipate present illusions about "building bridges to Eastern Europe," "detente," "accommodation," "peaceful coexistence," and other wishful steps that are not even in harmony with the principles and traditions of our country.

The observance of Captive Nations Week must be so absorbed in the world's mind that no one forgets the Hungarians, the East Germans, and all the captive nations. It is paramount that we remember the almost daily escapes of the exceptionally brave men and women who leave their heritage, their possessions, and often some of their loved ones, to join the free world and leave behind the Communist enslavement of the captive nations.

This week should also remind each of us to give thanks to our God for the liberty that we enjoy as American citizens. We who possess the blessings of life, liberty, property, and pursuit of happiness as inalienable rights must never take our good fortune lightly. May we ever be aware of the great sacrifices of those who have gone before us to make our freedom possible and of the present personal sacrifices of our young men in defense of insured liberty.

Oppressed people have traditionally looked to us for hope and inspiration. During last week, we reaffirmed a two-fold promise: To remain firm against further Communist usurpation in the world, and to do all within our power to work for the ultimate liberation of every captive nation.

The people of the United States cannot permit themselves to ignore the reality of 1 billion freedom loving people living in Communist dominated captive nations. We cannot forget the strategy of the Soviet Union is to ever expand the territory under its influence and control, until it gains total world domination.

It is an inherent right of all human beings to have the freedom to choose their respective forms of government; a right that the captive nations have been denied by brutal and godless communism. Let us remember the plight of the captive nations and do all within our power to help them; lest we forget and become a captive nation ourselves.

July 20, 1970

July 20, 1970

25127

LT. GEN. LESLIE R. GROVES

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, just 2 days before the 25th anniversary of the first atomic bomb explosion, the man who created and directed the organization that built the bomb, died in Washington. He was Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, director of the Manhattan project in World War II.

The New York Times, in an editorial last week, summed up General Groves' vital role by saying:

General Groves's personal achievement was the organizational miracle that brought together hundreds of thousands of men and women of the most diverse talents to make a theoretical concept reality in less than three years. The force he unleashed is still not tamed, but it is still true that if the United States had not been the first in this field, the atomic bomb would nevertheless have been built, probably by others of greater malevolence and less responsibility.

General Groves, as the Washington Daily News said in an editorial July 16, "was the right man, in the right job, at the right time." The News did not exaggerate in saying:

Many thousands of American men are alive today because Gen. Groves' team won the bomb race.

General Groves was a great man of strength and courage, as brought out in a Washington Post editorial on July 16. Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of War, picked him to head the atomic bomb project because he was capable of "ruling with an iron hand."

General Groves had the character and qualities for leadership and responsibility that are inherent in the best of Americans. I recommend to my colleagues the reading of the following obituary from the New York Times as well as the editorials from the Times, the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News:

GENERAL GROVES OF MANHATTAN PROJECT DIES

(By Albin Krebs)

Lieut. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, director of the World War II Manhattan Project, which developed the atomic bomb and ushered in the nuclear age, died Monday night at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington. The retired general, who was 73 years old, had suffered a heart attack at his home earlier in the evening.

General Groves' Army career spanned almost 30 years—from 1918, when he was graduated from West Point, to his retirement in 1947—but it was his role as overseer of the development of the atomic bomb that brought him prominence.

On Aug. 6, 1945, a 400-pound atomic bomb nicknamed "Little Boy" was dropped over the Japanese city of Hiroshima, reducing it to ashes and leaving more than 70,000 people dead and 68,000 injured.

The explosion brought to a close one of the greatest military-industrial adventures in history, the race by the United States, in a \$2-billion calculated risk, to be the first nation to unleash the power of the atom. The driving force behind that victory was a brusque Army engineer, Leslie R. Groves.

As director of the secrecy-shrouded Manhattan Engineer District, created specifically

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to beat Nazi Germany to the development of an atomic weapon, General Groves recruited the nation's greatest scientists to work on the project.

He directed the program to build, in a matter of months, the atomic bomb research, experimentation and manufacturing facilities that stretched from Washington and New York to Oak Ridge, Tenn., Los Alamos, N.M., and Hanford, Wash.

Wearing civilian clothes, he criss-crossed the country, persuading such industrial giants as E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co. to take an active part in the production of fissionable materials. Hundreds of private contractors were intimately involved in the secret project.

General Groves watched over the details of securing and processing the radium and other materials used in the bombs, and he supervised development of the devices that carried the nuclear loads and triggered them over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan.

Ultimately, he even had the final responsibility for deciding that it would be Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and not other Japanese cities, that would be subjected to mass death and destruction.

Although many of his scientific colleagues in the Manhattan Project raised deeply troubling moral questions with themselves over their involvement in the atomic bomb program, after the war, General Groves never wavered in his belief that making and using the bombs had been his country's correct course.

"The atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki ended World War II," he wrote in 1962. "There can be no doubt of that. While they brought death and destruction on a horrifying scale, they averted even greater losses—American, English and Japanese. No man can say what would have been the result if we had not taken the steps that were necessary to achieve this end."

### KEPT OUT OF POLITICS

In light of his background, General Groves was not an altogether likely choice for one of the most gravely important assignments of the war, which he received in 1942. Until that time he had been regarded as not much more than an efficient plodder, and he did not play Army politics.

Leslie Richard Groves, who was born in Albany on Aug. 17, 1896, was named for his father, a Presbyterian minister who became an Army chaplain shortly after his son's arrival. The Groves lived where the Army sent them—Cuba, the Philippines and various posts in the Western states.

At 17 the future general entered the University of Washington, where he spent a year. Then, after two years at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he was appointed to the United States Military Academy. In 1918, having graduated fourth in his class, he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army Corps of Engineers.

He did not become a captain until 1934. In the years intervening, he attended various service schools to complete his civil engineering education, and he served in Hawaii, Nicaragua, Washington, and at several Army posts.

In July, 1940, when he was promoted to the rank of major, he joined the War Department's general staff. With the outbreak of war the following year, he became Lieutenant Col. Groves, and was soon put in charge of supervision of construction of training camps. Part of his job was overseeing completion of the Pentagon.

Like many regular officers, Colonel Groves was eager for service abroad as a commander of combat troops, and in September, 1942, he was offered such an assignment. But he needed the approval of his superior officer, who told him he could not leave Washington.

"The Secretary of War has selected you for a very important assignment, and the President has approved the selection," General

Groves quoted the superior officer years later, "If you do the job right, it will win the war."

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson soon informed General Groves, who was promoted to brigadier because of the importance of his new job, that he was chosen because he had earned a reputation for "ruling with an iron hand, which will come in handy."

General Groves, who confessed he knew little about atomic physics, quickly learned a lot.

For some years, he was told, such renowned scientists as Neils Bohr, Enrico Fermi and Ernest O. Lawrence had been at work on the problem of utilizing the tremendous force locked within the atom. By 1942, several scientists were working on means of using the explosion of the atoms of metal uranium, a lustrous white substance derived from pitch-blende or carnotite, to create a lethal new weapon.

In a report to President Roosevelt on how an atomic bomb might be feasible, General Groves wrote: "I realize that the human race in its better moments might wish that this thing would be impossible, that we would fail; but . . . there are also elements in the human race that would not hope that, and maybe they would find out how to do it."

The President's reply was a scrawled "O.K., F. D. R.," and General Groves and his rapidly-building army of civilians and military men went to work in earnest.

Rapidly, the Manhattan Project grew, until, by 1945, more than 600,000 scientists, technicians, mechanics, construction workers, soldiers and other personnel were concentrating on creation of the supersecret weapon.

### OPPENHEIMER A PROBLEM

General Groves, as expected, ruled all with an iron hand. His passion for elaborate security measures—all of his own reports to the President and other superiors were made verbally—became legendary. Sensitive scientists, accustomed to working at a leisurely, scholarly pace, squirmed under his restrictions and demands that they work 18-hour days, since he did so himself.

Throughout most of his adult life, General Groves was a chunky, heavyset man, with a tendency toward paunchiness. He was just under 6 feet tall, and he tried to keep in shape playing tennis. Although he was businesslike and tough-talking at work, on social occasions he was soft-spoken and genial.

One of his thorniest problems was the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, whose selection as director of the Los Alamos laboratory was opposed by General Groves's own security men on grounds Dr. Oppenheimer had, years before, associated with Communists and other left-wingers.

General Groves chose Dr. Oppenheimer for the job anyway. Years later, long after Dr. Oppenheimer was stripped of his security clearance because of his opposition to development of the hydrogen bomb, General Groves praised him and said he still considered him to have been the best man for the Los Alamos job.

### RECALLS FIRST TEST

It was near Los Alamos, at Alamogordo, N.M., that the first atomic bomb was tested, at 5:30 A.M., July 16, 1945. General Groves wrote of it in his book:

"My first impression was one of tremendous light, and then as I turned, I saw the now familiar fireball. As [we] sat on the ground looking at this phenomenon, the first reactions were expressed in a silent exchange of handshakes. We all arose so that by the time the shock wave arrived we were standing. I was surprised by its comparative gentleness . . . but the light had been so much greater than any human had previously experienced."

The decision to use larger bombs on the

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was made by President Harry S. Truman, at the urging of General Groves and most of his colleagues in the Manhattan Project. (The Nagasaki bomb, which killed 45,000 people, was dropped Aug. 10, 1945.)

General Groves opposed turning over atomic development to the civilian-run Atomic Energy Commission after the war. He believed that there was great potential for peacetime use of atomic energy, but that because other nations, notably the Soviet Union, were seeking to perfect atomic weapons, control of atomic secrets and materials should remain in the military.

## JOINED REMINGTON RAND

He left the Army in 1947 to become a vice president in charge of research for Remington Rand in Connecticut. He retired to private life in 1961. Last Feb. 27, President Nixon presented him with an Atomic Pioneers Award.

Tribute to General Groves came from Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, chairman of the A.E.C., and a key scientist in the original A-bomb project (he was a co-discoverer of plutonium, one of the original nuclear explosives).

"For three critical years," Dr. Seaborg said, "he directed the most awesome project in the history of mankind. He was a constant source of amazement . . . He had the deep respect and admiration of his staff for his ability to organize and get things done."

General Groves is survived by his widow, the former Grace Wilson, whom he married in 1922; a son, Brig. Gen. Richard H. Groves of the Army Corp of Engineers; a daughter, Mrs. John A. Robinson; a brother, Dr. Owen G. Groves; and seven grandchildren.

## ALAMOGORDO PLUS 25

Just before dawn, in the desert near Alamogordo, New Mexico, 25 years ago today, the age of nuclear weapons was born. Those who watched that first atomic bomb explosion were stunned and awed by the giant fireball. One of them, William L. Laurence of this newspaper, described it as "a burst of flame such as had never before been seen on this planet, illuminating earth and sky for a brief span that seemed eternal with the light of many super-suns." But secrecy veiled that first test. Not until a few weeks later, when atomic bombs wiped out Hiroshima and Nagasaki, did men all over the world learn what a fateful milestone in human history had been passed.

The destructive power that thundered at Alamogordo was almost trivial in comparison with that which exists in any one of thousands of atomic and hydrogen bombs now in the arsenals of the five nuclear powers. But the ingenuity and industry which have added so much to the effectiveness of the military atom have not yet been matched by corresponding political accomplishment aimed at protecting all mankind, at guaranteeing there will be no successors to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Today's reality among the major powers is a peace based on mutual terror. It is unsatisfactory and inadequate, an unstable equilibrium that could be broken by unexpected technological advances or by a political disaster that brought an irrational individual or group of individuals to leadership of a nuclear power.

The man who headed the effort to build the first atomic bombs, Lieut. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, died earlier this anniversary week. He and his Manhattan Project colleagues—scientists and non-scientists alike—were driven until near the end by fear that Hitler's Nazis might obtain this weapon first. They could not foresee all the complications and terrors their achievement would bring long after World War II was dusty history.

General Groves' personal achievement was the organizational miracle that brought together hundreds of thousands of men and women of the most diverse talents to make

a theoretical concept reality in less than three years. The force he unleashed is still not tamed, but it is still true that if the United States had not been the first in this field, the atomic bomb would nevertheless have been built, probably by others of greater malevolence and less responsibility.

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1970]

## LESLIE R. GROVES

Just 25 years ago—at half past five on the morning of July 16, 1945—at Alamogordo, N.M.—the first atomic weapon devised by man was tested. It produced a blinding flash of light brighter than any ever glimpsed before by human eyes; and it produced as well a loss of innocence akin, perhaps, to that experienced by man and his mate when they first tasted that fruit which the serpent told them: "In the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Two days ago Gen. Leslie R. Groves, the man who commanded the titanic collective enterprise through which that weapon was created, died unexpectedly at the age of 73.

An able and experienced—although not particularly distinguished—officer in the Army Corps of Engineers at the time he was chosen to command the Manhattan Project, Leslie Groves was one more illustration of the mysterious way in which great responsibility and great opportunity often marry to generate great leadership. Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson chose him because he was said to be capable of "ruling with an iron hand" and told him, "If you do the job right, it will win the war." The "job" entailed the expenditure of more than \$2 billion, the construction of vast and complicated engineering facilities scattered all over the United States and the management of some 600,000 scientists, technicians, mechanics and other personnel in and out of uniform. It entailed, also, the most elaborate security regulations and controls, both in regard to the selection of people and in regard to the secrecy surrounding their endeavors.

Perhaps the single most fateful decision made by General Groves was the selection of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer to head the Los Alamos laboratory. The physicist was known to have radical political views, and known Communists were among his intimate associates. Nevertheless, he was a man of towering intellect, unique skill and an extraordinary capacity for organizing and inspiring men of science. Strong objections were raised to the selection of Dr. Oppenheimer. General Groves overrode them. In July of 1943, he issued a firm directive: "In accordance with my verbal directions of July 15, it is desired that clearance be issued for the employment of Julius Robert Oppenheimer without delay, irrespective of the information which you have concerning Mr. Oppenheimer. He is absolutely essential to the project."

Oppenheimer's performance more than vindicated the general. It was a decision that must have taken immense nerve and toughness—and a sense of judgment reflecting far more wisdom, compassion and understanding of human character than was shown by those who, years later, pilloried Robert Oppenheimer after he had nobly served his country. Oppenheimer himself was asked once how he accounted for General Groves' choosing him. Philip M. Stern, in his fine account of "The Oppenheimer Case," reports that the scientist characteristically replied: "Leslie Groves had a fatal weakness for good men."

The ultimate appraisal of Leslie Groves' contribution to his country and to mankind must await a future judgment—perhaps a Judgment Day. He was a superb soldier. The talents for organization and administration, the daring and imagination he brought to his mammoth assignment were peculiarly Ameri-

July 20, 1970

can, reflective in a sense of the genius of America. Their imprint on the world is, in any event, indelible.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 16, 1970]

## LIEUTENANT GENERAL GROVES

This country owes much to Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves who died this week at age 73.

In the darkest days of World War II, Gen. Groves was the right man, in the right job, at the right time.

In the summer of 1942 when the Allied cause was at its lowest, the then Col. Groves was given the task of heading up the super-secret Manhattan Project to develop an atomic bomb.

No one knew whether an atomic bomb actually could be developed. But the Nazis were known to know about the splitting of atoms of uranium and the race was on.

Thousands of scientists were recruited, new plants built around which whole cities grew up and the project proceeded at full speed and under such secrecy that not even Mrs. Groves knew what was going on.

It's history that three years later the U.S. team won. And all that time the project was under the firm direction of Gen. Groves, a superb manager from start to finish. His cardinal principles were that responsibility and authority cannot be diluted or divided and that the job of a manager is to pick the best possible man for a job, give him the broadest possible charter for action and then leave him alone.

Humanists will argue for the rest of time, we suspect, whether the atomic bomb ever should have been developed. But in WW II there was little, if any, disposition to think so altruistically. It was the firm conviction of our leaders that the enemy unhesitatingly would use an atomic bomb if he had one.

Gen. Groves' achievement in planning an organization to bring the atomic bomb program to a successful fruition ahead of the enemy certainly ranks with the skills necessary to mount a successful invasion.

And possibly more so. For the development and use of the bomb unquestionably shortened that war by no one knows how many days.

The bomb was first exploded 25 years ago this week in New Mexico. On Aug. 6, 1945, the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan. On Aug. 9, a second was dropped on Nagasaki, and on Aug. 14, Japan surrendered unconditionally.

Many thousands of American men are alive today because Gen. Groves' team won the bomb race.

## MISS CONNECTICUT CHOSEN

## HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to Miss Cynthia Ann Fowler of Cheshire, Conn., who recently was chosen Miss Connecticut. I am pleased that out of all the lovely young ladies who competed for the title that one of my constituents from the Fifth District was bestowed with so gracious an honor. I was delighted to learn of her rendition of Strauss' Laughing Song at the competition which is a favorite of mine and no doubt was a factor which contributed to her selection as Miss Connecticut. Miss Fowler not only is a talented singer but she plays the piano, clarinet, violin, trumpet, and

flute, making her a true virtuoso. Future generations of students will receive the benefits of her varied talents since she aspires to a career in music education; Miss Fowler's beauty, charming personality, and zest for life will contribute to her continued success. I wish Cynthia Ann Fowler, Miss Connecticut, the very best of luck in the forthcoming competition for the Miss America title in September at Atlantic City, N.J.

I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Waterbury Republican. The editorial follows:

**MISS CONNECTICUT WINNER**

Congratulations are in order for Cynthia Ann Fowler of Cheshire after being crowned the new Miss Connecticut.

The 21-year-old blonde, a senior at Western Connecticut State College, was chosen over the weekend from a competitive field of young ladies from throughout the state.

Not only is Miss Fowler an attractive young lady, but she possesses all the credentials of a very talented musician. Besides singing, which won her the preliminary talent contest, she plays piano, clarinet, violin, trumpet and flute.

We wish the new Miss Connecticut well when she competes for the Miss America title in September at Atlantic City, N.J.

**A COURAGEOUS YOUNG MAN**

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Joseph F. McDermott, a courageous young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I should like to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

**GI FROM COLLEGE PARK KILLED IN VIETNAM**

A 20-year-old Army draftee who lived in College Park, has been killed in an engagement with the enemy near the demilitarized zone in Vietnam, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

Spec. 4 Joseph F. McDermott 3d, was wounded on July 8 when his unit encountered an enemy force while on patrol in Quang Tri province, an Army spokesman said. He was admitted to an Army hospital and died the same day.

**DEMATHA HIGH GRADUATE**

He was a member of Troop D, 2d Squadron, 17th Cavalry, 101st Airborne Division (Air Mobile). He was on a two-day support mission when he was fatally wounded.

Specialist McDermott was born in Washington. He graduated from DeMatha Catholic High School in Hyattsville in June 1968.

He attended Prince Georges Junior College for six months and then went to work as an installer with the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company in Washington.

**SURVIVORS LISTED**

He was drafted on September 19, 1969. He completed his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and his advanced training at Fort Knox, Ky. Following completion of his training, he was sent to Vietnam on February 19, 1970.

Before being drafted he had lived with his parents at 4803 Delaware street in College Park. He had planned to return to school and study accounting after completion of his military service.

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

Specialist McDermott is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. McDermott 2d, of College Park; three sisters, Miss Mary L. McDermott, Miss Margaret A. McDermott and Miss Dorothy E. McDermott, all of College Park, and his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. McDermott, of Mount Rainier, Md., and Mrs. Benjamin Hollenback, of Scranton, Pa.

**A SCIENTIST PLEADS FOR ABOLITION OF SECRECY**

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday's Wall Street Journal and Sunday's Washington Star carried an article on secrecy by one of our Nation's most eminent scientific leaders, Dr. Edward Teller, "the father of the H-bomb." Dr. Teller's remarks are not directed at secrecy in the House of Representatives, but rather at secrecy in his own field of expertise, nuclear weapons and military security. Many of his observations and judgments, however, are pertinent to our present discussions here in the House.

For example, Dr. Teller comments that—

A quarter-century of experience should have taught us that a democracy cannot function effectively under a cloak of secrecy.

The public is denied the vital information that is essential background to critical decisions.

An uninformed public creates as dangerous a situation as a misinformed public.

Openness (is) the first commandment . . . because without openness, truth cannot be found.

The spirit of openness is a powerful and necessary tool if we want to create some order in our shrinking world in which dangers and opportunity multiply with an ever-increasing speed.

The sad fact is that secrecy works in reverse to what our public believes: our position is weakened and our adversary is strengthened. The underlying reason is that secrecy does not, and cannot, work in a democracy.

Mr. Speaker, these are words of wisdom, words of experience, words of insight. I, therefore, insert Dr. Teller's article at this point in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues:

{From the Sunday Star}

**A SCIENTIST PLEADS FOR THE ABOLITION OF SECRECY**

(By Edward Teller)

There is evidence that Russia is able to obtain virtually any information she desires from the United States—including secret defense information. It is equally evident that Russia's tight security cloak has effectively blocked our access to Russian security information.

The immediate reaction by many is that we should strengthen and enforce security measures. In my opinion, this would be a mistake.

Security is probably not protecting our "secrets" because the Russians possess a very sophisticated police state intelligence apparatus. In this respect we cannot match them.

As a democracy we should not attempt to do so.

It would be a sad day if we matched the Russians by building up a secret police force of 2,000,000 men—occupying many high positions in all walks of life, ranging across the entire economic and political spectrum. We should work in the opposite direction: we should reduce the restrictions of secrecy as completely and as rapidly as possible.

A quarter-century of experience should have taught us that a democracy cannot function effectively under a cloak of secrecy; that secrecy impedes the flow and exchange of knowledge and dampens the productivity of scientific research. In contrast, a dictatorship can keep secrets by exercising strict control over human freedom of communication and movement. It is their normal order of society, and their scientists are adapted to a repressive environment.

Secret research is generally abhorred by our scientists, many of whom cannot, and will not work under security restrictions that block open discussion and the free flow and exchange of ideas between scientists. Russian scientists do not like secrecy any more than we do. But most of them do not even dare to make any suggestion.

In developing nuclear weapons we practiced secrecy and lost the leadership that we will not be able to regain for years to come. By contrast, in the case of nuclear reactors, the removal of secrecy in 1955 resulted in the achievement of economical nuclear power a dozen years later. In this respect we are the best in the world.

In electronic computers even more remarkable results have been obtained by open competition and no fetters of "security." We are so far ahead of all of our competitors that even if they had a sample of each of our computers (which they don't), they would not be able to duplicate our progress; the same is true of solid state electronics.

I wish we could say the same with equal confidence concerning the development of nuclear weapons—which is secret.

Our policy of secrecy has been successful only in confusing the discussions of preparedness in our country.

We are in real ignorance of the advances Russia has made in the development of nuclear explosives, and our public is poorly informed regarding the developing strength of Russian nuclear arms.

The weight that Soviet missiles can carry to the United States is today several times as great as the weight we can deliver against Russia. In order to make vital decisions regarding defense, the public should be realistically and accurately informed. It is not.

But secrecy has become in the first part of the sixties a political tool to shield our leaders from criticism. For quite a few years it has been known that the Russians are rapidly expanding their nuclear capability. The facts of this deployment were not publicly emphasized and most of the relevant points were actually kept secret. Thus, the American people were unaware of a developing danger. Fortunately, this policy has been reversed by Secretary Laird.

Factual information, known to the Russians and our own government, is withheld from the public by "security" restrictions. The public is denied the vital information that is essential background to critical decisions. An uninformed public creates as dangerous a situation as a misinformed public.

And it is a paradox that we have vast stores of information, all of which is highly secret from the public and not clearly understood by authorized members of Congress, while the Russians can and do obtain this same secret information.

It might be argued that the atom bomb—the biggest, most complex and completely successful scientific project of all time—

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

was developed in complete secrecy. It was, but under that tight envelope of war-time secrecy, our scientists, military and politicians cooperated closely for national survival. At that time, secrecy was the barrier between two warring nations. Under those conditions, secrecy did not isolate the scientific, military and political communities from each other. They worked together. Nevertheless the Russians penetrated that area before the end of World War II.

After World War II, our best scientists returned to the universities, and the freedom of unclassified research. Meanwhile, the military concept of secrecy—"the cloak and dagger syndrome"—has persisted.

The news media, when reporting our strength in terms of numbers of weapons, do not know what they are talking about.

There is a popular misconception that the world is involved in an arms race in the classical sense of the word. This is not so. It is rather a race in technological discovery, closely coupled with research in applied science.

This race works in secrecy—real secrecy on the part of the Russians; pretended secrecy on the part of the United States.

The classical concept of the arms race was to compare, for instance, the number of battleships. Today we compare the numbers of atomic warheads and we imagine we know what we are talking about. But we do not. The nuclear warheads differ in power, a hundredfold or a thousandfold. They differ in function, in purpose, in sensitivity to defense measures. Actually, the situation is even more complicated. What counts are the weapons that could be created by research on defense: it is the race of ideas and the implementation of these ideas.

Our universities have been a splendid source of ideas. They also have prepared a small fraction of the students for research work on national defense as a career. Today our students in our foremost universities are indoctrinated against any such activity. The change was initiated in March 1969 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The demand was raised to exclude from the university all work related to national defense. In the last few months even more radical steps have been proposed. It is suggested that those working on national defense should be excluded from the scientific community. These demands are inflamed by offensives placards and demonstrations at scientific meetings.

The movement has spread to many institutions, including most of our leading universities. Our academic community is being separated in a most effective manner from those who are trying to apply research to the defense of our country.

I am sure that the March 4 movement at MIT was not organized by the Kremlin. But had it been so organized it could not have been more help to the Russian Communist's dream of world domination.

Meanwhile, our highly sophisticated, technological defense establishment is advancing the state-of-the-art weaponry into new and therefore secret areas. They are encountering problems of extreme complexity, and need the brain power of our best scientists. But the work is secret, and our best scientists do not want to engage in secret work. Therefore, the gap widens.

There is an urgent need to heal the breach between the academic world and those who work on the defense of our country. A revision of our security rules would be an important step in this direction.

Ever since alchemy expired, which was not so very long ago, openness was the first commandment of science. It came even before truth, because without openness, truth cannot be found.

During the difficult period of the Second World War, the commandment of openness was violated. It was replaced with secrecy.

It might be argued that under the cloak of secrecy the alchemists' dream, transmutation of elements, was actually accomplished.

To put the development of our present attitude towards maintaining a fiction of secrecy, we should review its development.

Around 1900 no important secrets existed in military technology. The arms race was something visible, something that could be seen and understood. The great unknown was the way in which forces would be employed in an actual war. Strategy and tactics remained unpredictable. Thus uncertainty, rather than secrecy, sufficed to confound every prediction concerning the course of World War I.

Technological secrets scarcely existed in this country between the two World Wars, but most of the vast scientific and technical progress of the 1940-45 era was shielded by wartime secrecy, much of which was declassified after peace treaties were signed.

But after 1945 secrecy became a permanent fixture of our policy and administrative practice. We called this policy of secrecy "security."

It would be a mistake to believe that Russian spies had no effect on history. True, nobody knows to what extent the knowledge handed over to Moscow accelerated development of the Russian atomic bomb. My guess is that Russian scientists could have performed the task just as quickly without any inside information. Once Hiroshima demonstrated the atomic explosives would work, a competent and well supported group of scientists could reproduce the result without excessive difficulty.

But Stalin was not a trusting soul. One can hardly believe that he would have placed complete confidence in his scientists when they claimed to understand atomic explosions and their feasibility. However, when Russian intelligence delivered the American atomic bomb secrets he had a complete set of independent data, and was able to move ahead on the correct project with great confidence.

On a number of occasions our negotiations with Russia on arms control failed because they already knew our atomic secrets. The first failure was the Baruch Plan, a few months after Hiroshima. We were offering them a "bargain." We wanted international control and the security such control would create. In exchange we offered our atomic secrets.

Actually, our secrets had been passed on to the Russians by an excellent scientist, Klaus Fuchs, who worked in Los Alamos during the war, and by an independent group of agents, the Rosenbergs and their associates.

Therefore, when we offered our secrets in the Baruch Plan, we were actually offering nothing. Stalin summarily rejected our proposals and the negotiations folded.

Our next attempt toward a policy of openness was made in 1954. We proposed the "Open Skies Policy," with freedom of international inspection. Russia answered "Nyet."

In 1958 we returned to the conference table and agreed with the Russians to place a moratorium on all nuclear tests.

This example should have sufficed to alert us to a peculiar fact: secrecy did not permit the discussion of the issue which turned out to be one of the most relevant results of future tests under discussion.

In 1961, after only three years, Russia broke the moratorium in a surprise move. We had claimed that our intelligence would detect any preparation for nuclear testing on a big scale in Russia. Unfortunately, we were caught by surprise.

In 1961 and 1962 there was a concentrated effort to perform atomic tests, both in Russia and in the United States. The Russian tests were numerous and well planned. The American tests were fewer and performed on the basis of improvisation.

July 20, 1970

At that time both sides began to pay attention to the possibility of ballistic missile defense. Ironically, in forthcoming negotiations of a partial test ban, the question of ballistic missile defense was not even discussed. This, in spite of the fact that perhaps the main result of these tests was connected with such a defense.

The agreement to stop nuclear atmospheric tests in 1962 has been called the first step on the long road toward a stable and peaceful world. In the meantime, underground tests were going on in both the United States and Russia. As long as the Russian tests were carried out in the atmosphere we could assess their rate of progress. As soon as the tests went underground we could not make this evaluation. Therefore, one effect of the atmospheric test ban was to strengthen effective Russian secrecy.

Atmospheric tests are particularly well adapted to the exploration of the ways in which a nuclear explosion of appropriate size can destroy an incoming missile without inflicting damage on the ground. Thus, our agreement to stop atmospheric tests has guaranteed that the Russians will have permanent superiority gained in 1961-62, in the knowledge of missile defense.

The possibilities of missile defense have been loudly discussed. But the discussions consistently stopped at the brink of technological secrecy. The potential use of nuclear arms in destroying cities is understood, but the most important details of the delivery system are classified secret.

The sad fact is that the secrets which we are trying to keep are in all probability known to the Russians.

It is lamentable that at present our government is much further from an open policy than our highly competitive industry.

We should attempt to be as open—unfettered by secrecy—as possible. Without openness no conference on disarmament or arms control can produce results. But once the policy of openness is adopted in the United States and hopefully, in the whole free world, Russia will feel the pressure and may gradually open up. If that happens it will become possible not only to discuss arms in a more meaningful manner—we will also be able to approach real understanding. The sharp difference between free societies and the communist police states will diminish.

The difference between East and West has deep roots in the past. Peace, freedom and stability will not be brought about by any single conference or by rapid political change. But the spirit of openness is a powerful and necessary tool if we want to find the means to create some order in our shrinking world in which dangers and opportunities multiply with an ever increasing speed.

One can, of course, argue that we should discuss a secret development with the Russians at the conference table in Vienna without exposing the secrets to other nations. Such a procedure would have two unfortunate consequences. The first that we would have no way of checking whether the Russians were indeed opening up their secrets.

The second and more serious result would be a feeling of utter dismay in the NATO alliance. To talk with the Russians on such subjects which we do not discuss with our allies would be tantamount to depriving the Western Alliance of its last claim to honesty and strength.

In practical terms it is impossible for the United States to open up all secrets. Some tactical secrets will have to be kept, but one may give serious consideration to a regulation whereby classified information will automatically be published after a limited period of time, for instance, after one year. This will effectively open up research and it will give pause to those who would use secrecy for purely political advantage. It may also pave the way toward a real agreement with our Russian proponents.

To observe the growth of nuclear arms should be an obligation. Today it is called spying. We should publish as much of the relevant details of all information concerning Russia as ever possible.

In the end, a policy of openness will probably lead to faster progress in our country. The sad fact is that secrecy works in reverse to what our public believes: our position is weakened and our adversary is strengthened. The underlying reason is that secrecy does not, and cannot, work in a democracy.

#### VIETNAM BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. WALDIE.** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Vietnam war is of vital concern to many Americans all of whom may diverge in their opinions concerning that conflict, I would like to call your attention to the following bibliography of scholarly works written on the subject.

This list of books was submitted to me by one of my constituents, Mr. Claude Ury of Kensington, Calif. The list includes authors who hold many diverse opinions; from the far right, to the far left. In any case, I am sure that this might be of assistance to any person seeking information on the subject.

The listing follows:

#### SELECTED LIST ON WAR IN VIETNAM

(Prepared by the Staff of the Center for South/Southeast Asia Reading Rooms)

#### VOICES OF DISSENT

Aptheker, Herbert. *Mission to Hanoi*. New York, International Publishers, 1966.

Ashmore, Harry S. *Mission to Hanoi; a Chronicle of Double Dealing in High Places*. New York, Putnam's, 1968.

Bain, Chester Arthur. *Vietnam: the Roots of Conflict*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Brookings Institution, Washington D.C. *Vietnam After the War: Peacekeeping and Rehabilitation*. By H. Field Haviland, Larry L. Favian, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Brown, Robert McAfee. *Vietnam: Crisis of Conscience*. New York, Associated Press, 1967.

Buttinger, Joseph. *Vietnam: a Political History*. N.Y., Washington, Frederick A. Praeger, 1963.

Civic Education Service. *Two Vietnams in War and Peace*. By the editors of Civic Education Service. Washington, D.C., 1968.

Draper, Theodore. *Abuse of Power*. New York, Viking Press, 1968.

Duncan, David. *I Protest*. New York, a Signet Broadside published by The New American Library, 1968.

Falk, Richard A. *The Vietnam War and International Law*. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1968.

Fall, Bernard B. *Last Reflections on a War*. Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1967.

—. *The Two Vietnams, a Political and Military Analysis*. New York, F. A. Praeger, 1965.

Friends, Society of. *American Friends Service Committee. Peace in Vietnam; a New Approach in Southeast Asia*. New York, Hill and Wang, 1967.

Gentlemen, Marvin E. *Vietnam: History, Documents, and Opinions on a Major World Crisis*. Greenwich, Conn., Fawcett Publications, 1965.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hamilton, Michael P. *The Vietnam War: Christian Perspectives*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967.

Hartke, Vance. *The American Crisis in Vietnam*. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1968.

Harvey, Frank. *Air War—Vietnam*. New York, Bantam Books, 1967.

Kahin, George McTurnan. *The United States in Vietnam*. New York, Dial Press, 1967.

Kraslow, David. *The Secret Search for Peace in Vietnam*. New York, Random House, 1958.

Lacouture, Jean. *Vietnam: Between Two Truces*. New York, Vintage Books, 1966.

Luce, Don. *Vietnam; the Unheard Voices*. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1969.

Lynd, Staughton. *The Other Side*. New York, New American Library, 1967.

Manning, Robert. *Who We Are; an Atlantic Chronicle of the United States and Vietnam*. Boston, Little, Brown, 1969 (c1965).

Morgenthau, Hans Joachim. *Vietnam and the United States*. Washington, Public Affairs Press, 1965.

P'an, Chao-ying. *Vietnam Crisis*. New York, Twin Circle Publishing Co., Inc., c1966.

Pickerell, James H. *Vietnam in the Mud*. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Reischauer, Edwin O. *Beyond Vietnam; the United States and Asia*. New York, 1967.

Russell, Bertrand. *War Crimes in Vietnam*. London, Allen & Unwin, 1967.

Salisbury, Harrison E. *Behind the Lines—Hanoi*. Toronto, New York, London, Bantam Books, 1967.

Sartre, Jean Paul. *On Genocide*. Boston, Beacon Press, 1968.

Scheer, Robert. *How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam; a Report to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions*. Santa Barbara, California Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1965.

Schlesinger, Arthur Meier. *The Bitter Heritage: Vietnam and American Democracy, 1941–1966*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

Schoenbrun, David. *Vietnam; How We Got In, How to Get Out*. New York, Antheneum, 1968.

Schurmann, Herbert Franz. *The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam*. Boston, Beacon Press, 1966.

Scigliano, Robert G. *South Vietnam: Nation Under Stress*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, c1964.

Shaplen, Robert. *The Lost Revolution*. New York, Harper and Row, 1965.

—. *Time Out of Hand*. New York, Harper Colophon Books, 1970.

U.S. Congress. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. *The Truth About Vietnam; Report on the U.S. Senate Hearings*. San Diego, Ca. Greenleaf Classics, 1966.

Vietnam Hearings; Voices from the Grass Roots, A transcript of testimony given at the Hearing on the war in Vietnam conducted by the Hon. Robert W. Kastenmeier, Member of Congress, 2nd District, Wisconsin. Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1966.

Zinn, Howard. *Vietnam; the Logic of Withdrawal*. Boston, Beacon Press, 1967.

#### II. AND THE OTHER SIDE

Fishel, Wesley R. *Vietnam; Anatomy of a Conflict*. Itasca, Ill., Peacock Publishers, 1968.

Goodwin, Richard. *Triumph of Tragedy; Reflections on Vietnam*. New York, Random House, 1966.

Hoang, Van Chi. *From Colonialism to Communism*. New York, Praeger, 1964.

Monroe, Malcolm. *The Means is the End in Vietnam*. White Plains, N.Y., Murlagen Press, c1968.

Thompson, Sir Robert. *Defeating Communist Insurgency*. New York, Praeger, 1966.

—. *No Exit from Vietnam*. New York, McKay, c1969.

Trager, Frank N. *Why Vietnam?* New York, Praeger, 1966.

Tregaskis, Richard W. *Vietnam Diary*. New York, Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1963.

Available at: Center for South/Southeast Asia Reading Rooms, University of California, 2420 Bowditch Street, Berkeley, California 94720. Phone: 642-3095 and 642-3609.

Also available at the Center for South/Southeast Asia Reading Rooms: Cambodia: Selected Reading List.

#### CONGRESSMAN SCHERLE—A MAN OF ACTION IN IMPROVING SYSTEM

#### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

**Mr. HUNT.** Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) recently distinguished himself, as we would all be proud to do, by his watchful vigilance over the affairs of Government—in this instance the Office of Education. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, Congressman SCHERLE's interest in the summer intern program at the Office of Education was sparked by newspaper accounts of the "Days of Listening" program. The student-designed program included films which attacked the President, his policies, and even his family in the most scurrilous terms. His subsequent investigation of the Office of Education yielded the conclusion that the entire Office is in dire need of reorganization and redirection.

In recognition of Mr. SCHERLE's energetic actions on behalf of the American people, all of whom the Office of Education is meant to serve, the Council Bluffs Nonpareil published on July 17, 1970, the following editorial:

#### SCHERLE HELPS SYSTEM WORK

We're proud of what Southwest Iowa's Congressman Bill Scherle is doing in trying to straighten out the summer intern program in the Office of Education. President Nixon has expressed his appreciation to Mr. Scherle; we hope Southwest Iowans will do the same.

Congressman Scherle sent two of the members of his staff over to the Office of Education, which is in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to see if they could be of help in weeding out the practices of the summer intern program which he found to be offensive. The program has been criticized (though probably not as much as it deserved) for allowing obscenity and blatant attacks on President Nixon, his family and the policies of his administration.

The acting commissioner of education, Dr. Terrell Howard Bell, had been placed in an impossible situation. Just recently appointed as interim replacement for Dr. James Allen, he has been surrounded by officials who paid him little attention and who seemed intent on promoting policies which he found objectionable. Bill Scherle's interest and concern has now made it possible for control to be established where it should be—in the hands of the acting commissioner.

The situation in the Office of Education has made it patently clear that much of the bureaucracy in Washington still looks for leadership to individuals whose main goal is to undermine the Nixon administration whenever and wherever the opportunity presents itself. And like so many professional educators, these leaders have joined ranks with the most ultraliberal element in the student groups, those who by the use of

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

obscenity and extreme dress and living habits express revolt against the society.

It would have been easy—and quite appealing—for Congressman Scherle to have stood back and fired critical attacks at the whole intern program. But he realizes that great good can come from the project and as a Republican, he recognized that he is part of the administration that is charged with the responsibility for making it work. So he became involved; he offered the considerable influence of his office to Dr. Bell and his help was eagerly accepted.

That's the way the system is supposed to work. In injecting himself into this affair, Bill Scherle has made himself a target for the extreme leftists in the educational field who resent intrusions by individuals outside their exalted fraternity—even congressmen. But we are confident Scherle's constituents appreciate his efforts to try to clean up—instead of scuttle—what could be a worthwhile program.

We hope they let the congressman know how they feel.

## THE TIGER CAGES

## HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

MR. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, the general treatment by a large segment of the press of the revelations concerning the Con Son prison affair has particularly disturbed me. In many cases, balanced reporting was sacrificed for the sensational. However, I certainly endorse the levelheaded approach appearing on the editorial pages of the Birmingham News for Wednesday, July 15, 1970, and am pleased to offer that editorial for inclusion in the RECORD at this time:

## THE TIGER CAGES

If you suggested, when the flood of stories about an alleged massacre at My Lai was at its crest, that the story ought to be kept in some perspective—that My Lai was the exception rather than the rule, while terrorism and cold-blooded murder were routine elements of the Communists' operations—you were denounced as an apologist for American atrocities and accused of closing your eyes to the brutalizing effect on fine young American boys of this immoral war in Vietnam.

You can make book that to suggest now that some perspective is needed in the case of the so-called "tiger cages" at a South Vietnamese prison will brand you as someone insensitive to injustice and inhumane treatment of prisoners.

But it was true then and it's true now.

This does not mean that inhumane treatment of any prisoners should be condoned. The United States should be using whatever influence it has to alleviate such conditions where they exist.

But the "tiger cage" revelations by two congressmen who were members of an investigating group have been seized upon by those anxious to discredit the Thieu government, while the group's majority report including observations of substantial progress in the pacification program bringing vital assistance to thousands of South Vietnamese in hamlets and villages all over the country, while warning of the need for greater economic stability—has been virtually ignored.

The impression has been fostered, too, that the Thieu government is vigorously sup-

pressing dissent and that the jails—which we are to presume are all manned by sadistic guards who specialize in torture—are teeming with "political prisoners."

It's amazing how many common criminals suddenly become victims of political persecution when they land in jail (a phenomenon not unknown in this country).

Some Vietnamese prisoners' offenses are in essence "political," of course. One may well regret this. But one has no right to expect that a democratic government with all the niceties can be created full blown, or that benign tolerance of all opposition can be expected in a war situation such as exists in Vietnam.

Even so, the Thieu government came to power by elections; North Vietnam did not. And the Saigon government is infinitely preferable to the ruthless totalitarianism of its counterpart in the north. How free do the critics of Saigon believe dissent to be in Hanoi?

Let us, by all means, keep after the South Vietnamese officials to remedy any shortcomings in the operation of their jails and prisons.

When we're done with that, perhaps some congressmen will lead a fact-finding mission to Czechoslovakia or East Germany or the Soviet Union, or China, and check up on the prisoners—yes, Virginia, including prisoners whose "crimes" are differences with their governments' policies—and lead world opinion to demand reform.

And maybe the North Koreans will invite them to tea, and explain the treatment which the crewmen of the *Pueblo* received during their captivity.

Better yet, perhaps Hanoi will welcome them on an inspection tour of the prisons where hundreds of Americans are held.

But don't count on it.

## HORTON PAYS TRIBUTE TO REV. GUY MASSEY FOR FINE COMMUNITY SPIRIT AND ACTIVITY

## HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

MR. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, having in mind the current reports of people who do not want to "get involved," it is inspiring to be made aware of those among us who do get involved and who share their talents with their communities. Such a man is Rev. Guy Massey of Rochester.

I have long been aware of Reverend Massey's gift for community involvement. Also I realize that much of his activity in behalf of others has gone too long unsung and unpraised.

It was with much personal satisfaction then that I became aware of a fine tribute paid to Reverend Massey in the Rochester Times-Union by Jose Echaniz, Jr. I share that recent column with my colleagues:

## REV. GUY MASSEY

(By Jose Echaniz, Jr.)

Dedication to a better community has been the overriding concern of Rev. Guy Massey. He has devoted most of his time to cleanup of the 5th and 7th Wards since moving to Rochester some seven years ago.

He has worked closely with city police in helping to clear the area of abandoned cars. Most recently, his attention has been directed

to the city as a whole as vice chairman of the Mayor's Beautification Committee.

Rev. Massey was an organizer and first chairman of the Rochester Neighborhood Health Center Council and a coordinator of the Northeast District Council.

In his many cleanup campaigns, he credits the cooperation of city officials—the current Republican administration as well as its Democratic predecessors—for any success. "No man accomplishes anything by himself," he says, "I would like to emphasize the co-operation of Department of Public Works officials in both administrations."

At one time, the Rev. Mr. Massey and police were responsible for removing an average of 100 junked autos a month from city streets.

The Rev. Mr. Massey was born in Jacksonville, Fla., one of 15 children of a bricklayer father. Before entering the ministry he operated his own remodeling and plastering business in California and in various other cities. "You name the state and I've worked there," he says.

In World War II, he served in the Army at Fort Ontario, remodeling and decorating barracks. Although only a private first class, at one time he had as many as 250 men working under him.

He entered the ministry in California 17 years ago because "I had thought of it all my life but I never got serious with it. I thought it was time to do something for God with the health He has given me."

In his 70 years, the tall active minister has never been confined to bed by illness.

A Baptist, the Rev. Mr. Massey has filled pulpits in and out of the city. Mayor Stephen May recently honored him on his 70th birthday for "unselfish dedication . . . on behalf of the people of Rochester."

I know the Members of Congress will join me unanimously in wishing a continued long and happy life to this outstanding gentleman. All of us are deeply appreciative of his unselfish efforts in behalf of others.

## SAVE THE "DELTA QUEEN"

## HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

MR. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as author of H.R. 17418, to save that great old riverboat, *Delta Queen*, the last of its kind in actual operation in this Nation, I was more than pleased when WKYC-TV in Cleveland recently editorialized on the need for keeping her afloat and "on active duty."

I strongly urge my colleagues in the House, and particularly those who serve on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee where my bill and similar legislation is pending, to join in the effort to save the *Delta Queen*. Time is growing short.

The editorial referred to, follows:

## EDITORIAL NO. 68

We Americans have a curious affinity for junking anything old or out of style. In the name of progress, we slap aluminum over fine granite or trade our cars because the stylists have given the new ones another hunk of chrome or lopped off a fin. In the process, we sometimes get rid of something worth saving.

This is the *Delta Queen*, the last of a breed. Oh, there are still riverboats around,

serving as restaurants or curio shops or theaters. But this old sternwheeler still carries passengers on overnight trips. She's based in Cincinnati and travels the Ohio and Mississippi River systems from Pittsburgh to New Orleans and Minneapolis-St. Paul. As you can see, there's nothing really spectacular about this 40-year old boat. No streamlining, no chrome. She's slow and not very graceful. But the Delta Queen is the last of her breed. And the breed is scheduled to die November second.

In an effort to protect passengers on ocean liners, Congress passed a Safety-at-Sea law that, among other things, forbids wooden superstructures. The intent of the law was fine and, after several disastrous fires at sea, certainly was necessary. Unfortunately, in our opinion, the law was written so broadly as to include riverboats such as the Delta Queen. A law written to protect people on the ocean days from shore applies to the Delta Queen, never more than five minutes from land. It would seem more logical if the safety regulations that apply to hotels and motels were to apply to this riverboat.

Beyond doubt, the Delta Queen's beautiful wood superstructure of oak, walnut, teak, mahogany and ironwood is more dangerous than one made of steel. It's also got more class. And, it's the last of its kind. Unless Congress grants the Delta Queen an exemption from the more restrictive provisions of the Safety-at-Sea law, the breed will disappear in November. It's a pity.

#### SELECTIVE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT URGED

#### HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the people of Utah are as eager as anyone else in the West to welcome more industry to their rapidly growing State. However, there is a growing awareness throughout the State that there is much to be learned from the mistakes of others. We all want to increase industrial development in the State, but not to the detriment of our clear water, pure air, and wide-open spaces.

I would like to call attention to an editorial in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City of June 11, 1970, which makes it clear that the rational direction of man's creative energy is absolutely essential to the preservation of an environment which enhances the lives of every citizen.

The editorial follows:

**WHY UTAH PROMOTERS SHOULD BE CHOOSY**  
Over the years this page has said that while Utah needs to promote industrial development aggressively, the state also should be highly selective about the kind of industry it seeks.

We have agreed that Utah should seek more private industry to bring a better balance to an economy that relies too heavily on government and can be hurt by a sudden shift in federal policies.

But we have declared that Utah should not seek the kind of private industry that produces noise, air and water pollution as a by-product.

If any Utahans still doubt the wisdom of being choosy about the kind of industry this state should attract and develop, we invite their attention to a statement made by the chairman of the California Water Resources

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Board during this week's Western States Governors Conference in Park City.

Due to problems of waste disposal and pollution, he said, Southern California is within five to 10 years of closing its doors to any further industrial expansion.

The lesson should be clear: Either a state is extremely careful in screening its industries, or ultimately the quality of the environment deteriorates to the point where new industry is no longer welcome.

New industry is more than welcome in Utah, of course. We need it to broaden the tax base so that additional revenue can be provided from economic growth and not just from additional taxes. We need it so Utah can provide enough jobs to keep more of its young people here, instead of educating them at great expense only to have them go elsewhere to make a living.

But Utah doesn't need more factories that obscure our beautiful mountains with palls of smoke and send Utahans to other climates in order to draw an easy breath. Utah doesn't need more manufacturing plants that turn sparkling streams and lakes into stagnant swamps where dead fish float belly-up amidst slime and scum.

We're convinced that Utah can have a healthy, livable environment and still enjoy more economic growth and progress. How? By concentrating the state's industrial promotion and development efforts on smokeless, noiseless, pollutionless industries—the kind that usefully involve highly sophisticated technology and employ highly skilled workers, and by prodding the industries already here to clean up.

Utah, unlike Southern California, is a long way from having to draw the line against industrial expansion. Let's make sure we never get to that point.

throughout the world. For the first time in history men had landed on another body in the universe. People everywhere recognized instinctively that a new era had begun, that a feat had been accomplished which generations to come would remember and honor over many centuries and millennia. They were united by feelings of gratitude and admiration toward the brave men and who had gone to the moon and toward the skilled and brilliant men on earth who had made the journey possible.

Inevitably, this rare mood of exaltation and brotherhood could not be sustained even though the enormous success of Apollo 11 was followed by the equally productive feat of Apollo 12 and then by the unexpectedly hazardous ordeal of Apollo 13. In the last half of the twentieth century, the year just passed has proved, men's sense of wonder is easily satiated, and their minds return quickly to their daily mundane concerns. By the time Apollo 13 was launched, boredom seemed to be the prevalent attitude toward moon voyages. Today the political atmosphere surrounding space exploration is so unfriendly that the already diminished NASA budget is a favorite target of Congressional economizers.

Nevertheless, the Eagle's landing was one of mankind's finest hours. The scientific dividends from the new era of lunar exploration have already been very rich, and they will be even more abundant in the future when numerous astronauts from many nations will work on the lunar surface. Men now inhabit the earth-moon system, not earth alone, and much in tomorrow's history will be shaped by the developments that will follow the Eagle's triumph.

#### AFTER THE EAGLE'S LANDING

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of the Apollo 11 flight it seems appropriate not only to remember the outstanding performance of astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins, and Edward E. Aldrin, Jr., but also the magnificent team of engineers, scientists, technicians, and the American public who backed them on their flight to the moon. Only a year later we find ourselves in a position of disbanding the crews and throwing away the vast know-how that was developed in the Apollo program. Instead of reaping the benefit of the investment made in our national space program, we stand a chance of losing much of that investment unless decisions are made to pursue a vigorous space effort in the next several years. An editorial in the New York Times of July 20 points not only to the commemoration of a major national event in the original lunar landing but also to the enlargement of man's horizons and to the paramount reasons for continuing our national and international space effort. I commend the editorial to your reading.

The article follows:

**AFTER THE EAGLE'S LANDING**  
"Houston. Tranquillity Base here. The Eagle has landed."

A year ago tonight those words from the moon sent a wave of pride and excitement

#### A BIG LITTLE GUY

#### HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, heroes are rare enough, but to find one who is only 12 years old is rare indeed, and such a find must not go unrecognized.

Bruce Burrows is such a young man, as the following editorial in the Weirton Daily Times, edited by Mr. Paul Glover, will testify.

Bruce was involved in an automobile accident while riding in one of the cars. Without fanfare he quickly helped free the cars' occupants, offered first aid, called police, and directed traffic.

As Mr. Glover expressed it, Bruce "is a little guy but he's a giant of a hero." I might add to that, he is also a giant of a man.

My congratulations to Bruce Burrows for his extraordinary service.

If he exemplifies the young men and women of this country, then America has little need to worry about its future.

The editorial follows:

#### A BIG LITTLE GUY

The instantaneous reaction and response of a 12-year-old boy was credited by Mrs. Ruth O'Connor with saving the life of her daughter in an auto accident which occurred here July 2.

Bruce Burrows was one of two neighborhood boys who accompanied Mrs. O'Connor and her daughter on a trip to a Pennsylvania ranch. On their return their car was involved in a head-on collision.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 20, 1970

Mrs. O'Connor said it was Bruce's interception reaction that saved her daughter from being hurled by the impact against the windshield.

She said it was remarkable how this boy helped free the occupants of the car, gave first aid, summoned the police and ambulance and then proceeded to direct traffic.

Where did a boy of such young age acquire the training for such self-control, self-discipline and calmness in such a tense and critical situation?

They were acquired and developed in the home, the church, the school, as a newspaper carrier and as a Boy Scout.

Weirton is proud of Bruce's distinguished record. He's a little guy but he's a Giant of a Hero.

## TEENAGER PROJECT LAUDED

**HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON**  
OF UTAH  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, we constantly hear the cry from some of our idealistic youth that the system discourages any attempt at effective reform or change. However, nationally syndicated columnist, Jack Anderson, wrote recently of a concrete way in which teenagers from my home State of Utah worked within existing structures to help the members of another church and another race. The story follows:

To REBUILD WORLD, YOUTH NEEDS PLAN  
(By Jack Anderson)

America's questing youth, fiercely idealistic, impatient for change, have been unleashed for the summer.

They are the most alert, most aware, most aroused generation in our history. But many are coups, living in a psychedelic dreamworld, doing their own thing, taking drugs to escape reality.

Some seem to believe we can end war with millennial thinking, eliminate social problems with talk of love, overcome injustice with catchwords and cliches.

Others have lost faith that social ills can be corrected without a structural change in our system. They seek to tear down our society without a clear idea of how to rebuild it.

The young need to understand, first, that there are no simple solutions. Ahead lie Himalayan-sized problems—rugged inclines to climb, not easy slopes to coast down.

The view from the bottom of the mountain may be discouraging. The Pike's Peak problems may seem too staggering for any individual to tackle. But great mountains are climbed a step at a time, and great events are produced from small acts.

The young who believe in the future, who aren't yet ready to resign from the human race, should take the initiative. Let me make a few modest suggestions:

1. Stir the starry-eyed from their pseudo-romantic dreams; rouse them to their feet; inspire them to substitute deeds for dreams. Invite the militants down from their soapboxes; challenge them to exchange their rhetoric for practical solutions.

## MORMON EXAMPLE

2. Fill your summer with constructive, not destructive activity. If you can find no great cause, settle for a small cause. In Salt Lake City, white Mormon teen-agers moved lawns, washed cars, sold baked goods, cleaned garages and did yard work to raise more than \$35,000 to help build a Negro church. You can do as much. Organize a project of your own; roll up your sleeves; pitch in and do something worthwhile. Then write me about your

project; tell me what you accomplished. Your experience may stimulate others.

3. All too often, Congress has made crucial decisions affecting the lives of millions of young persons with little regard for their views. Congress would never pass farm legislation without consulting the farmers, would never take up oil issues without checking with the oil industry, would never consider a banking bill without inviting the bankers to testify. The special interests make their influence felt through the political processes. You can do the same. Let your congressman know how you feel about the issues and back up your stand by campaigning for or against him. You can be even more effective by organizing a youth lobby on Capitol Hill.

There has always been a price tag on reform, freedom, democracy. America's questing youth cannot expect these blessings without paying the price.

## NATIONAL SERVICE VERSUS THE ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Henry Owen, writing in the Washington Post last Saturday, July 18, compared the two principal alternatives thus far advanced to continuation of the military draft: the National Service Act of 1970, H.R. 18025, and the all-volunteer Army approach.

This thoughtful article is worthy of the attention of anyone concerned with enacting meaningful draft reform:

ONE THING SURE ABOUT THE DRAFT IS A CHANGE  
(By Henry Owen)

The issue of the draft is coming to a boil. Senator Dominick predicts that it will not be renewed beyond next June 30. Twelve senators have introduced a bill calling for a volunteer army, to take its place. Ten members of the House have proposed an alternate arrangement which would involve civilian, as well as military services; although this proposal has received little public attention, a recent Gallup poll suggests that it is favored by 71 percent of the American people.

The one thing sure in all this is that the present system will somehow eventually be changed. The draft provides needed military manpower in the right amounts, of the right kinds, and at reasonable cost. For these reasons, it is an effective system when we have a massive need for military manpower and when that need is generally accepted. But neither of these conditions now obtains. The proportion of young men registering for the draft who are not called will continue to grow, as the size of the armed forces declines; and this is bound to intensify a feeling of inequity among those who are called.

The most popular and likely alternative is a volunteer army. There is a common sense attraction to the notion that we should recruit manpower for the armed forces in the same way that we do for other purposes: by paying a competitive wage. It would eliminate some resentments caused by the present system. But critics suggest that it would create two new difficulties: volunteers would have to be paid more, which would divert budgetary resources from domestic programs; and a volunteer army would tend to attract poorer folk who would be drawn in by the higher salaries—thus raising a new distinction between them and middle class youngsters who stay out, at a time when we need new distinctions between social classes like we need a hole in the head. These arguments may not be decisive, but they at least

suggest the need to look hard at other options.

One such option would be to widen, rather than abandon, the principle of national service. This is what the 10 House members have in mind. They propose that each young man be offered a choice, when he reaches age 18, between enrolling in civilian service, volunteering for the armed forces, and taking his chances in a military lottery. If he chose civilian service, he might serve in a government agency, school, hospital, the police, non-profit organizations, etc.

This proposal raises a good many questions; the sponsors have answers to some of them. To the question of whether it would cost the government too much, they answer that the government would only pay civilian servicemen a subsistence wage, whereas private employers would have to pay the government the going wage for their services. To the question of whether too many registrants would prefer civilian to military service, they suggest that the length of civilian service could be extended, and other incentives manipulated, to ensure that civilian service was not that much more attractive. Clearly, there are other problems which would need to be studied in more detail. For example: could enough useful openings be found for all the young men who might choose civilian service?

But the important thing about this proposal is not its technicalities, which can no doubt be analyzed and refined, but the broad issue which it poses: should we maintain the principle that young Americans owe their country a period of service, and extend this principle to the civilian field as part of a new approach to the draft?

The *con* argument is clear: the element of compulsion would remain.

On the other hand, this plan would allow young men who object to military service to serve in a civilian capacity instead. Additional civilian manpower could surely be used in a variety of fields—to carry out conservation and anti-pollution programs, help out in schools and hospitals, strengthen municipal services, work with the poor in Appalachia and on Indian reservations, and so on. The Domestic Peace Corps (VISTA) covers some of these needs, but not all.

A program of expanded service would not only address these needs; it would also provide an outlet for healthy idealism among the young. The turbulence of student life has obscured a central fact: young people no longer believe that it is an acceptable life goal merely to earn a living; they want to leave the world better than they found it. A good deal of present discontent reflects the difficulty which young people find in addressing this goal. Civilian service might help to fill the gap.

It would do something else besides. It would offer young people of widely differing backgrounds an opportunity to come together in common ventures. We speak of "the young" as though they were a single and interchangeable commodity. They are not. There are barriers of class, region, education and race among them, as among the rest of us. Common service would help to reduce these barriers, at a time when fragmentation is the most urgent threat facing the nation. Anyone who has lived in Switzerland knows what an important role universal service has played in cementing its diverse regions and classes. The Swiss service is military; civilian service might help to do the same thing in the United States.

All of this does not prove that civilian service is the right course; there are powerful arguments for allowing young people to arrange their own future, which is what the volunteer army would do. But it does suggest the need to look hard at the question of whether an arrangement which included both civilian and military service might not be as effective as the draft, as acceptable as a volunteer army, and more socially cohesive than either.