

from OEP. To provide unemployment compensation for disaster victims, OEP has advanced \$250,000 to the Department of Labor.

Most of the work necessitated by the April 17 disaster is being carried out through supplemental Federal assistance of this kind. The May 11 disaster in Lubbock has required considerably greater aid, especially in housing.

In Lubbock, OEP promptly established a disaster field office at 1420 Texas Street, under OEP Region 5 Director George Hastings, to coordinate Federal agencies' efforts. Two "one-stop centers," where information could be obtained on all Federal disaster assistance programs, were also set up—at the Mi Casita Northeast Community Center, 2420 E. Erskine Street, and at the Guadalupe Center, First Street and Avenue P—each with an OEP official in charge.

Th centers were publicized, in English and Spanish, through newspapers, radio, pamphlets distributed at churches, and loudspeakers in cars, to reach all disaster victims. Also, a 90-minute telecast over KCBT-TV, featuring Representative George H. Mahon of Lubbock and George Grace, head of OEP's Field Operations Office, was viewed by an estimated 10,000 persons; the program was taped and translated into Spanish for rebroadcast by radio.

A Red Cross survey of the destruction in Lubbock reported 540 dwellings and house trailers destroyed, 519 with major damage, and 764 with minor damage. Some 2,500 persons were given emergency shelter in the city's colosseum through May 18, when the shelter was closed. Meanwhile, temporary housing was made available by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Veterans Administration. Much of this was represented by a vacant HUD-owned housing project. HUD placed 309 families immediately after the declaration, had 387 units ready for occupancy on May 14, and had turned over 543 properties to the city by May 17. By May 15, VA had delivered 38 properties, with 18 more repaired and available. The combined figures from both agencies as of June 8 showed 774 units available, 700 of them turned over to the city, 666 occupied, 74 still under repair; only 30 applications were pending. At the request of the victim-occupants, some units were made available before they could be brought up to satisfactory condition; repairs on these were continued after occupancy.

The rental policy agreed upon by HUD and OEP provided rent-free occupancy for the first three months, with monthly charges thereafter (for the remainder of the first year after the declaration) ranging from \$45 to \$60, depending on number of bedrooms. Occupants pay for utilities and refuse-collection. In hardship cases, rentals and other charges can be adjusted.

Homeowners and businessmen whose properties were damaged in these disasters can obtain long-term low-interest loans from the Small Business Administration under its own authority. SBA declared a disaster loan area for western Texas on April 18, as well as another for Zapata County after a May 24 tornado and one for Hays County because of the May 15 San Marcos flooding. SBA offices were quickly opened in Plainview and Clarendon, after the April tornadoes, in addition to Lubbock.

Because so many of the victims of the Lubbock tornado were Mexican-Americans, special efforts were made to assure observance of civil rights. An OEP compliance team, sent to Lubbock, worked closely with the White House Staff, the Department of Justice, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking, the Labor Department's Office of Federal Contract Compliance, and, locally, several Mexican-American leaders, Mayor James Granberry's 11-member advisory com-

mittee on rehabilitation, and the Disaster Legal Assistance Project. Matters of principal concern to the team were employment, housing, transportation, legal services, insurance, and land ownership. As of May 25, legal assistance cases undertaken by the Disaster Project of the Lubbock County Bar Association and the legal aid society numbered 135.

Because the OEP compliance team was concerned with so many post-disaster aspects, it served as a catalyst in determining available assistance. It helped, for example, in obtaining additional slots for the Labor Department's local Neighborhood Youth Corps and "Operation Mainstream" projects.

The team's "Civil Rights Compliance Report Re Tornado Disaster in Lubbock, Texas," submitted on June 9, is especially useful as a study of the early stages of Federal assistance. It is therefore appended to this report.

OEP has also undertaken a case study of Federal efforts in providing assistance to individuals in the Lubbock disaster (especially as authorized by Public Law 91-79), to determine better ways of helping to meet human needs in future disasters.

INNOVATIONS IN INDIAN EDUCATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there is so much "bad" about the State of Indian education that we do not always give proper attention or credit to those individuals and programs which are contributing significantly to the slow but important improvements that are being made.

Mrs. Rosemary Christensen, an Indian leader in Minnesota and a staff member of the Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, took a look at some of the innovations in Indian education in a speech this spring before the League of Women Voters of Minnesota. The league itself has been one of the Indian's most consistent advocates in Minnesota.

Mrs. Christensen pointed out three categories in which innovations have taken place: First, nationally, at the Rough Rock Demonstration School on the Navajo Reservation; second, regionally, at the demonstration classrooms on the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota; and, third, statewide, the progress being made under the guidance of Minnesota's director of Indian education, Mr. Will Antell.

Although much remains to be done, nationally, regionally, statewide, and locally, I am proud of the progress being made in Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Christensen's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INNOVATIONS IN INDIAN EDUCATION

(Talk given at League of Women Voters of Minnesota Biennial Council Meeting, April 15, 1970, by Rosemary Christensen)

It is such a pleasure for me to be here at the League of Women Voters Biennial Council meeting. The League holds a special place in my esteem for the outstanding work done in the area of Indian affairs. This is not to slight other equally important League interests illustrated by the booklet I recently received entitled "Equality of Educational Opportunity" (a very timely work indeed!). The League holds a well-deserved reputation as a hard-working, fair, responsible organization. The research behind each League publication

speaks for itself and deserves everyman's admiration. Perhaps I should say open-mouthed admiration when it is added that all the work is volunteer.

But my special appreciation is expressed for such works as *Indians in Minnesota* and *Indians in Minneapolis*. Well-researched documents on Minnesota and Minneapolis Indians are a scarcity, and we have the League to thank for those statistics that are available in the afore-mentioned documents. I have heard these publications quoted from Albuquerque to Washington, D.C.—from the NCAI to the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education. I am, of course, eagerly awaiting the soon-to-be-ready updated League publication on the Minnesota Indian.

My remarks here tonight are entitled innovations in Indian education. The word "innovation" is heavily used at the moment and perhaps overused or misused in some instances. But in looking at the word itself, it means, according to Webster's, the introduction of something new—a new idea, method, or device—to make change. And in looking at the statistics available on Indian education a change is necessary.

Accordingly to Senate subcommittee findings, the number of suicides and alcoholics among the native population has increased. Adolescent suicide rates on the Quinault Reservation in the state of Washington and the Fort Hall Reservation in Idaho are termed of "epidemic proportions." In South Dakota suicide attempt rates are more than twice the national average. The drop-out rate everyone knows about, and though it changes numerically from region to region, the overall average in both the drop-out and suicide rate is a national disgrace—or as the subcommittee entitled their report: "Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge."

In discussing innovations, I have placed them in three categories:

1. Rough Rock Demonstration School in Arizona (as a national famous example);
2. Red Lake classrooms and the regional laboratories (as a regional example);
3. Leadership provided by the Director of Indian Education in Minnesota (as a state example).

The first area: The Rough Rock Demonstration School is, of course, nationally known. Dillon Platero, the Navaho director of Rough Rock, cites three innovative approaches at his school:

1. The first and most important—The school is controlled by the community. The school board is all Navaho—the director is Navaho; decisions are made and carried out by the Navaho people.

2. The Navaho Curriculum Center—Here books and materials are prepared for use in the school's curricula. These items reflect Navaho culture through music, stories, and folkways of the people—a recent publication is biographies of famous Navahos. I saw a copy of this book; it's beautifully illustrated, interestingly written, and any child would be pleased to learn of his forebears in this way. Additional materials being prepared are permeated with the Navaho culture. The very stories used are traditional Navaho stories. The heroes have Navaho names and the illustrations look like Navaho people—past and present. The writing is currently being done by Navaho writers. The language of the people is used to teach the younger children, and English is taught as a second language.

3. The third area is the cultural input at Rough Rock—When you visit the Rough Rock School, it's very apparent you're in Navaho country. Famous Navaho legends and paintings are on the walls. Navaho women (usually traditionally dressed and sometimes carrying babies on cradleboards) are in the classrooms, dorms, and on the grounds. Little girls are busily learning to weave Navaho rugs in the classrooms during their free

to disseminate even the most unpopular ideas by peaceful methods.

They have the right to use the streets and other public grounds to conduct peaceful demonstrations, to distribute handbills, to quietly picket; to broadcast on radio and television; to produce controversial motion pictures, and to ignore ex parte injunctions.

As evidence of our high regard for the First Amendment we have even evolved special procedural rules. These permit attacks on prospective government action limiting freedom of speech on the grounds that we must discourage any "chilling effect" on such a vital right.

IV. THE LIMITS OF DISSENT

However, there are limits beyond which the First Amendment may not be carried.

The most famous, of course, is that laid down by Mr. Justice Holmes in *Schenck*.

"The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theater, and causing a panic."

"It does not even protect a man from an injunction against uttering words that may have all the effect of force."

"The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree."

V. FREEDOM OF ASSEMBLY

Nowhere are the questions of "proximity and degree" more difficult than under the right of assembly provision of the First Amendment, as opposed to the right of free speech.

While today we tend to speak of assembly and speech in the same breath, they are two different rights. During the Constitutional Convention, there was a heated debate over the freedom of assembly clause, with its detractors claiming it was "minutiae."

The Supreme Court has pointed out the two different standards. It said in *Cox v. Louisiana*:

"We emphatically reject the notion . . . that the First and Fourteenth Amendments afford the same kind of freedom to those who would communicate ideas by conduct such as patrolling, marching, and picketing on streets and highways, as these amendments afford to those who communicate ideas by pure speech."

The Court added:

"We also reaffirm the repeated decisions of this Court that there is no place for violence in a democratic society dedicated to liberty under law . . . There is a proper time and place for even the most peaceful protest and a plain duty and responsibility on the part of all citizens to obey all valid laws and regulations."

Thus, the Supreme Court has ruled that demonstrators do not have a constitutional right to cordon off a street or to use a loud amplification system or to block the entrance of a building, or to insist that passers-by listen to speeches, or even to peacefully demonstrate on public property, such as a county jail, which is set aside for specific governmental purposes.

In that case, the Court noted:

"The United States Constitution does not forbid a State to control the use of its own property for its own nondiscriminatory purpose."

VI. THE APPLICATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Here, we come to the most difficult question: How do we, as lawyers and public officials, insure a maximum range for free speech while, at the same time, attempting to insure a minimum opportunity for violation of the rights of those who are not involved in a demonstration?

Here are some of the guidelines that we

in the Federal government follow in Washington and which I believe should be considered by local and state officials.

1. Encourage the peaceful exercise of First Amendment rights, regardless of how unpopular the cause. Merely to tolerate freedom of expression is not good enough.

We believe it is appropriate to establish an atmosphere in which citizens want to express themselves on the issues of the day.

And to make sure that persons wishing to conduct a demonstration be given the benefit of the doubt; that in questionable situations it is always wiser to offer a little more freedom than a little less.

2. Realize that most large political demonstrations may entail a certain amount of inconvenience to local residents, may impose additional expenses on local taxpayers, and may engender widespread community hostility to demonstrators.

Traffic may have to be rerouted. Sidewalks may become crowded. Police and health officials may have to leave their normal routine. Additional manpower may have to be employed.

Because the police have the primary government obligation of insuring an orderly demonstration, perhaps a few words of guidance are in order.

Police should remember that they are professional law enforcement personnel who should not be swayed by their approval or disapproval of the views expressed by the demonstrators.

They should be sensitive to and understanding of the fact that persons emotionally involved in a demonstration do not always behave in a normal fashion.

If arrests must be made, they should be accomplished with a minimum of force needed to restore order.

We have found in Washington that the key to a successful demonstration is careful preparation and extended negotiations with the demonstrators.

When both the local government and the demonstrators attempt to understand the problems that each side faces, the problems tend to be solved quickly in an atmosphere of compromise.

Of course, there may be a sizeable cost in terms of manpower and money. But we think that this should be a cost that a local community is more than willing to absorb as the price of being part of a free republic.

Given our times, we cannot expect political demonstrations to be conducted like prayer meetings. We must expect language which may incite hostility or may be obscene.

This is because the First Amendment protects all of us, including men and women who choose to be unruly, unreasonable, and impolite.

On the other hand, residents of local communities have rights, rights which should not be seriously impaired.

Businessmen must be able to conduct their affairs. Schools and municipal services must be provided. The ordinary life and commerce of a city must be allowed to function effectively.

I reject the notion that persons exercising freedom of speech have a right to shut down a community any more than a community has a right to keep out demonstrators.

But this leaves several difficult problem areas still unresolved. Generally, these are cases where public officials have good reason to believe there may be violence perpetrated by the demonstrators or against them.

Because local officials have the obligation of protecting the demonstrators and the community, certain limitations may be in order on how and where the demonstration is conducted.

Most of these problems come down to case-by-case decisions, frequently made under extreme pressures of time. I do not think there are any hard and fast rules. Local of-

ficials should be familiar enough with their own communities to work out acceptable compromises.

Of course, there are always the courts as a last recourse for either side. But judges are hardly in a better position to make law enforcement decisions than are reasonable and responsible city officials.

VI. CONCLUSION

In recent months hundreds of thousands of American citizens have come to Washington, D.C., to exercise their rights of free speech and peaceable assembly.

The Department of Justice has now furnished to the Senate a voluminous report on the lessons we have learned and the steps we have taken to protect and confirm the First Amendment rights.

I think you will find the report encouraging and I believe you will agree that it matches performance to the promise offered by President Nixon when he said:

"Peaceful protest is part of the American tradition. The right to dissent is a force for change, but it is the right to disagree, not the right to disobey laws."

"So let us have order in America—not the order that suppresses dissent and discourages change, but the order that guarantees the right to dissent and provides the basis for peaceful change."

REPORT ON TEXAS TORNADO DISASTERS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, so that Senators may be kept well informed of Federal activities in regard to the tornado disasters earlier this year in Lubbock and the Panhandle of west Texas, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an updated report on such activities which I have recently received from George A. Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

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

FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN TEXAS MAJOR DISASTER, DECLARED MAY 13, 1970

On May 13, 1970, President Nixon declared a "major disaster" for Texas as a result of the tornadoes and windstorm April 17 in the Panhandle-South Plains area of the State and the devastating tornado May 11 in Lubbock. This declaration was amended June 26 to include Hays County because of flood damage in San Marcos April 15. This special report covers some of the principal relief and recovery actions by Federal agencies under Public Law 81-875 and other authorities, during the first month after the Presidential declaration. (It does not, therefore, include actions in response to the San Marcos flooding.)

Under recently adopted procedures, the Office of Emergency Preparedness is responsible for allocating from the President's disaster relief funds whatever amounts may be required for a particular "major disaster." Thus far, \$2 million has been earmarked for assistance in the tornado-stricken area—the counties of Briscoe, Cochran, Donley, Gray, Hale, Hockley, Lamb, Lubbock, Farmer, and Swisher.

These funds are to be obligated for project applications submitted by the State or by local governments and approved by the OEP Regional Office for debris clearance, protective and health measures, road and bridge repair, temporary housing, and repair of public facilities and utilities. Project applications may be submitted up to 90 days after the disaster declaration. Funds are also used to reimburse other Federal agencies for work performed under mission assignments

time. The children are taught in Navaho with Navaho teachers in the beginning grades. And as mentioned above, curriculum materials reflect Navaho folkways and culture.

Mr. Platero sums it all up by saying, "The school belongs to the DINE (the people), and it's an integral part of the community." He added that the school is used as a community center—for recreation—and the school is now exploring the possibility of working with the community in building houses, etc.

In the second example mentioned, the Red Lake classrooms numbering seven on the Red Lake Indians Reservation, are under the auspices of a regional laboratory. There are 15 laboratories scattered around the country funded in the most part by OE and devoted to Educational Research. Of the fifteen, four have programs in Indian Education. This region comprising five states—Wisconsin, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and Iowa—is served by UMREL.

UMREL's program is, in brief, the development of systems and decision rules which will make it possible for scientifically proven principles of behavior to be applied in school environments. Much of educational research in the past has lacked the developmental work which is necessary for effective use. Thus, UMREL is examining each step carefully on the basis that the behaviors of all persons in the school environment must contribute to the desired behavior changes in the student.

The Red Lake demonstration classrooms were begun in April of 1969. Training programs for teachers and aides were devised and used on the Red Lake site as well as the St. Stephen's school in Minneapolis. Based on educational and psychological research on the ways children learn, these classrooms are arranged to provide the best possible learning environment for the students. Put very simply, research findings show children learn best when learning is reinforced with pleasant consequences. Classrooms are arranged with this in mind. Two areas are defined in such a classroom: task area, or work area, and the reinforcement area. All instruction is individualized to the student, and every lesson is prepared in sequences every child can handle taking into account individual differences and abilities.

The children were first tested to establish their starting performance level. Then the teacher gives them individually prescribed lessons. Each child works independently at his own speed. When he finishes the lesson, he takes his paper to the teacher-aide who checks and records his work. If the work is okay, he chooses an interesting activity from several pictured on the RE menu.

After he chooses an activity (give examples), he goes to the RE area, (separated from the task area by a screen), engages in the chosen activity for several minutes, and is then directed by the aide to go back to the task area for further tasks. Under this type of classroom, all children receive pleasant consequences for doing classroom work—they are successful—they compete only against their own past performance as they work independently on tasks. Careful records are kept to provide teacher, parent, and the child clear and precise information on how he is doing in the classroom. Record keeping is in the form of a data sheet called the PPDF (Pupil Performance Data Form). Detailed data on lessons, performance time, RE events can be kept on this form. The PPDF is a form designed for computer use. The lab has plans for computer use that are very exciting; but since I have seen the computer in operation only once, I cannot speak knowledgeably of that part of the program.

The third example, as I mentioned previously, is at the state level. We are very fortunate here in Minnesota to have a state director of Indian Education. Under his leader-

ship many exciting things are happening on the Indian scene; such as: Teacher-training workshops are planned for the summer sessions of 1970. These sessions will provide knowledge of Chippewa and Sioux history, culture, and values; also the social, economic, political, and educational aspects of contemporary Indian affairs. They will provide the opportunity to develop skills to bring the history and culture into the content of the curriculum, to identify and use in classroom activities, valid resources of Indian culture and history. This will be done by interaction with Indian lecturers, Indian teachers, Indian professional people, plus valid records of Indian history, culture, and Indian life styles. Tribal officers, Indian leaders, and Indian people who are spokesmen for the Indian world will also contribute. In brief, these workshops, under the auspices of the director of Indian education and the Minnesota Indian Education Committee, will provide input to teachers that should be provided (and are not) by the colleges and universities in their pre-service and inservice sessions.

Another exciting aspect of Indian education in Minnesota today is what is happening or what may happen at several of the predominantly Indian schools in the state. The idea is to take the above two examples—national and regional—and combine these two innovations to make a third change; that is, to take the educational and psychological research on the ways children learn—incorporate into this the Indian input with Indian leadership and Indian participation as illustrated by the Rough Rock example. This, in my opinion, is truly innovative—to use the behavioral framework as the base of the school operation with Indian input reflected in the curriculum in the form of Indian history, language, and especially prepared units of study on many aspects of Indian culture. This could be reflected in the teaching of basic skills in phy. ed., home ec.—the possibilities are endless.

This last example is still in the planning stage so I hesitate to speak about it, but things are happening in Indian education in Minnesota today.

Indians are pushing for 1) better textbooks; that is, books that are historically accurate for all peoples; 2) more realistic teacher-training methods to be incorporated into colleges and universities; 3) a wider spectrum of human knowledge to be reached in all schools today, not just Indian schools or minority population schools; but all kids should learn about Indians and other peoples—the contributions to this country—the other side of the history coin should be in all the books children read. Kids will grow up into adults, and adults will continue to look with misgivings, suspicion, and downright hate at someone different than he in life style, values, color, and ethnic background if this information is not part of the school curriculum. If we are to live together—let us learn together.

CREDIBILITY GAP IN EDUCATIONAL AND POLITICAL CRISIS

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the months of May and June are traditionally devoted to resounding—and too often, empty—oratory on the part of politicians, educators, and other public figures. Our youth are bombarded with the sounds of challenge as they embark upon new adventures within the formal educational structure or the practical world of day-to-day occupations. Too often, however, these speakers lack credibility as the young compare their words with their actions in everyday life.

This enormous credibility gap is at

the heart of our current educational and political crisis. Both sides know this—and both share the responsibility. Yet, in the end, it is those who sound the noble tone—and painfully fail to observe it—that must shoulder the greater burden. These failures, no doubt, are often inadvertent—many times they are not failures at all, but lack of communication—and occasionally they are the inventions of the overzealous and uninformed.

Yet this lack of credibility, and lack of meaningful communication, whatever its source, is an important element of a national crisis of conscience that must receive immediate and thoughtful attention by those whose primary duty is public service. The challenge begs for attention. No meaningful view of public service and of patriotism can ignore the tremendous reservoirs of resentment among the young minorities, and other disenfranchised elements of our population. It is time to act in a sensitive and perceptive manner to rekindle hope and involvement among those whose lot leads them to despair. This capacity has always been the hallmark of our political system. To ignore this duty is to participate in its disestablishment.

I feel that we all share this duty, whether as public officials or as citizens. And we must all take that one, large, additional step—make that additional commitment—that would allow us to be judged, not solely by our words, but by our deeds.

Following my remarks today, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a recent speech delivered by Mr. Ralph Nader at Franklin Pierce College, Rindge, N.H., be inserted in the Record following my remarks. My comments today are called forth by certain ideas expressed in this speech.

On that occasion, I feel, there was no credibility gap. Mr. Nader has struck a responsive chord among the young that deserves our attention. I do not necessarily subscribe to all of the views expressed in this speech; but I do feel that it is a necessary document. Mr. Nader's view of citizenship as a duty to question and participate deserves thoughtful and considerate response especially as we consider the unrest so prevalent among our young people.

Too often, we have focused on what is wrong with our young without taking into account their tremendous concern and high ideals. And we have too often underestimated their capacity for following the dictates of that concern in judging our institutions and policies.

We must remember that most of our young people do not want to see the destruction of our system; they earnestly seek its improvement. They lack leadership—and faith in their leaders. It is this issue to which Mr. Nader addressed his remarks. These words have a special relevance to the college graduates that he addressed; and they have a special relevance to those who choose to devote their lives to public service. I commend Mr. Nader's remarks to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROMPTU REMARKS BY RALPH NADER AT THE FRANKLIN PIERCE COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT

The world that you will enter in as citizens is one which will span the years conforming to your careers—one that will extend into the twenty-first century. The changes in the next 45 years will dwarf in all dimensions the rapid pace of change we scarcely began to understand and respond to in the past generation. The Planet earth is finally beginning to be seen as a finite, eminently exploitable structure in which three and one-half billion people now live and perhaps some seven billion will be living at the turn of the century. The view of the planet as a concrete embodiment of the finiteness of man and everything that binds him to his fellow man, has not long been a secular view. The humility it brings, the awareness it develops, the sensitivity it creates, is primarily a hopeful sign. But while we are confronted with overwhelming forces and complexities, while we see man increasingly delegate his responsibilities and his actions to institutions and to machines, perhaps we can once again recognize that basic to all our hopes and progress is the individual human being and the reliance on that human being to make his contributions . . . however modest . . . however grand . . . to the earthly design.

There are many skills that are said to be developed in a formal educational structure. Many areas of substance . . . areas of technique. I would like to focus on a number of major characteristics that will never be developed even partially in a formal educational structure unless they are linked with the longevity of individual concern and self-renewal. The first is sensitivity—a development of sensitivity that ranges from the aesthetic to the ability of one to empathize the problems of others who live in less than healthful or adequate conditions.

The increasing difficulty or inability, to sensitize ourselves to those in our midst, those who are suffering from severe malnutrition . . . poverty . . . those who are suffering from the serfdom of technology . . . those who are suffering from being sent abroad to engage in deeds whose only nobility is in the semantics that are given to describe them . . . the lack of sensitivity toward the young . . . the exceptional lack of sensitivity towards the very old . . . is the bedrock on which despair and rage are built. The constant striving to engage ourselves and expose ourselves to the phenomena, to the feelings and to the facts so that we can increasingly sensitize ourselves to these problems . . . must become part of the human condition.

More and more we are becoming increasingly removed from the problems of our fellow man. They are only brought to our attention in rather cool, impersonal statistics or short media developments and as a result, we can become insensitive to the point of cruelty quite beyond our willingness to express those unfortunate traits. A nation which can generate mass pathos and concern for a dog that has fallen down a well but on the other hand can view with historic insensitivity the starvation deaths of two million human beings in Biafra illustrates this enormous gap between our presumed stature as human beings caring for others and the environment that reduces us to these levels of priorities.

Beyond sensitivity one can build and suggest many remedies. But perception can be seen as a more intellectualized extension of sensitivity, and analysis can be seen as a more precise and scientific extension of perception. Perception is what we so badly need . . . the ability to perceive that which is before us clearly, candidly, unequivocally. A major current illustration of our inability to perceive that the destruction of our environment here at home, of air, water, and

soil, purity, is a form and a very pervasively massive form, of environmental violence. In our inability to view this environmental destruction with its abusive replay on man and on unborn generations illustrates the ability which certain forces, who do not wish that this perception be widespread, the ability for them to succeed in dulling and diverting and depreciating the proper intensity of reaction.

A nation which can sentence a breaker into a phone coin box to a jail term of two years, but can leave with impunity, with no enforcement of existing laws, no enactment of other more stringently needed laws, thousands of plants and other industrial polluters to desecrate and ravage and contaminate rivers and streams, lakes, and air and soils, and of course, human beings, is a nation that is exceedingly perched on a lethally hypocritical double standard.

Our political leaders chide the young . . . do not (they say) do not justify the means by the ends . . . you may have a worthy cause in your strivings for world peace . . . but don't engage in these techniques that disrupt and confront. These elders are justifying means and ends whose violence and cruelty utterly dwarf the objects of their scorn and contempt in the younger generation. What is the war in Vietnam but a justification of the means for the end?

A justification of probably the most massive persistent form of violence ever inflicted on a country of comparable size. What is the de facto, decades-long justification of environmental pollution? Of the destruction of the very substance of the patria—the land, the air, the water, other than justifying the means for the end? The justifications were couched in thoughtless boosterism—"that's the price of progress," "that's the smell of the payroll," and other similar easy explanations. What other reason can be given for the massive illegalities among the propertied, among the corporations, among the large unions, among government agencies themselves, in areas that range from health and safety standards to open, democratic procedures, to the allocation of economic resources to the corruption of public officials. What other reason can be given than that ours is becoming endemically a lawless society . . . lawless from one end to another . . . lawless in the form of a governor of a southern state thumbing his nose at federal law . . . lawless in the form of many unions making a mockery of the labor laws, lawless in the form of corporations bribing public inspection officials, undermining the integrity of government, manipulating laws to exclude their criminal behavior from criminal sanctions. Lawlessness at the top inevitably breeds disrespect from the law throughout the population. It becomes a contagion.

A society takes on some of the organic characteristics of a fish—it rots from the head down. And nobody understands more immediately the hypocrisies and the illegalities and the disgraceful behavior at the top than those who receive their impact at the bottom of the economic ladder. For many years we have been engaging in a very easy tribute to law enforcement officials. At the same time those in our slums had a much more realistic appraisal of the endemic and institutionalized corruption of significant numbers of these very officials sworn to uphold the law . . . corruption in the form of bribery . . . corruption in the form of involvement in criminal activities . . . the kind of corruption that is now being made public in New York City and its police force. When basic grassroots enforcement officials have succumbed to a degree where their honest colleagues are intimidated from speaking out, from reporting, from attempting to change, then the corruption is no longer episodic . . . it's epidemic.

Perception allows us to describe real-

ity regardless of the symbols, regardless of whether reality comes in sneakers or in cufflinks, regardless of whether the acts are committed in a slum or in a corporate suite. Perception is not enough; analysis is necessary. Man tends to move toward change and resolving conflicts first by sensitivity and then by perception and finally by analysis . . . which in our system largely must mean law. The complexity of our society is such that the velocity of inter-relationships has reached a point of fantastic intensity compared to last century's. We now interact actively, unconsciously, subconsciously, indirectly with so many forces impinging upon us all. We are now so interdependent that interdependence, which can be a source of strength, can now be a source of enormous weakness if it is disrupted. The institution that resolves the conflicts, that anticipates the problems, that establishes freedom and order, must be the law. There is no other institution that is embedded with the duly constituted authority of the people . . . in any democracy that means rule of the people by the people and for the people as a continuous condition.

Analysis means telling people what the facts are . . . it means analyzing systems of power . . . it means sweeping aside the kinds of facades that only serve to camouflage injustice, corruption, brutality, inaction, apathy or simply laziness. It means, for example, a recovery of the true meaning of patriotism which isn't just saluting the flag or singing "My Country 'Tis Of Thee". Patriotism involves deeds. And until we begin to consider the ruining of our environment . . . the suppression of rightful claims of minority groups . . . the inequities in our governmental structures and our relationships with others in the world as serious challenges to patriotism, meaningfully defined, we will continue to follow the emergence of new political demagogues who wave the American flag . . . who disgrace it . . . who transform it into a fig leaf to cover the shames . . . to cover their insensitivity to justice . . . to cover their inability to develop wisdom. And until we begin to take these symbols back to our own embrace and ally them with our courses of humanity and equity those who would use them for their own nefarious, myopic or politically opportunistic purposes will continue to have them by their side, without any claim of legitimacy, for use as mass diversions or brain-washings.

The overriding concern with institutions should be how we as individuals can tell our institutions that they are not going to have a momentum of their own . . . otherwise known as bureaucracy . . . that they are going to reflect individual inputs . . . that the individual in these large institutions whether they are companies or government agencies or other organizations, must reassert his rights . . . and that every person who is part of a large organization must have that line drawn for himself beyond which he will no longer subserve himself to the dictates of the organization, beyond which he will say . . . my loyalty to mankind, to my society, to my fellow citizen, overrides my loyalty to my organization and that is where I must place my commitment and knowledge. Unless every individual somewhere in his mind draws that line when he will no longer simply take orders, when the pressure point is built up in terms of public hazard or public interest that he must stake his claim as an individual . . . unless every individual has that line drawn for himself he will have within him a potential slice of the Nuremberg problem.

Analysis of institutions is in its infancy. We know so little of what goes on inside government, inside corporations, and inside many other large and influential groups. Whatever we wish to develop in terms of a social design for the future, one critical re-



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 116

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 9, 1970

No. 115

Senate

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States delivered a message on Indian Affairs with recommendations which, if implemented, could have far-reaching effects upon Indian citizens of our Nation.

To the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), who served so ably as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, to me, and to the other members of the subcommittee, the President's message was especially gratifying because the President restated many of the same recommendations we made in our final report last November. It is encouraging to know that the report has not fallen upon deaf ears at the White House, and that the President has decided to join us in seeking long-overdue reforms in Indian affairs.

There are several points in the President's "new policy" which I would like to call attention to because I believe their implementation offers American Indians the opportunity for significant progress.

First of all, I want to record my agreement with the President's statement that "forced termination is wrong." Self-determination is possible without termination of those services the Federal Government is obligated to provide.

In regard to education the Indian Education Subcommittee specifically recommended:

The Federal Government shall not terminate Federal responsibility and services in educational fields to any Indian tribe, band, group, or community, unless such termination is consented to by those Indians affected by such termination.

The President has asked the Congress to repeal House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the 83d Congress which established congressional approval of the termination policy. I point out that the Senate has, in effect, already stated its opposition to termination of House Concurrent Resolution 108 in Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, which was agreed to by the Senate in 1968. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), submitted that resolution, and we are grateful for his insistence at that time in putting the Senate on record as opposed to termination. I am pleased that the House, which did not agree to the McGovern resolution in 1968, has reintroduced an antitermination bill this session. Representative DONALD FRASER, of Minnesota's Fifth District and a devoted advocate of Indian rights, has been one of the driving forces in introducing that legislation.

The President also asked that Indians be given the opportunity to control and operate Federal programs. If Indians are ever to control their own destinies, it is essential they be permitted to do so without the meddling hand of the insensitive non-Indian—the type of person who seems to predominate in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The Indian Education Subcommittee recommended that tribes and Indian communities should be able to contract directly with the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the programs provided, for example, by the Johnson-O'Malley funds. The President has expressed his concurrence with that recommendation.

To expedite the transfer of schools from Federal control to control by locally elected school boards—another sub-

committee recommendation—the President has asked the Vice President to establish a Special Education Subcommittee within the National Council on Indian Opportunity, which the Vice President chairs. The Council has met only once since this administration took office. I certainly hope there will be considerable improvement on that record by the Special Education Subcommittee.

I am sorry to hear the President has asked this subcommittee to conduct yet another review of Indian education. The Senate subcommittee report is probably the most comprehensive document on this matter ever published. This report, together with the soon-to-be-released national Indian Education study contracted by the Office of Education, should certainly provide all the data and information the special subcommittee would need to accomplish its mission. We do not need another study to tell us what a tragedy Indian education is. I think the Vice President's Subcommittee's time could better be spent seeing that Indians who want control of their children's education are given that control.

I am pleased by the President's decision to expand urban Indian centers in seven major cities, including Minneapolis. But this still barely touches at the needs of urban Indians. The Indian in the city is often more destitute and more impoverished than his brethren on the reservation. Because of their mobile status, many do not qualify for services available to other urban poor, and because of outdated BIA regulations they are not eligible for benefits received by reservation Indians. Much, much more needs to be done in this area.

I am appreciative of the fact the President has listened to those of us in Congress who have been advocating increased funds for Indian health.

This winter the administration refused to permit the Indian Health Service spend \$3 million of appropriated funds. With Indian infant mortality nearly 50 percent higher than for the general population, with tuberculosis rates eight times higher, with the suicide rate twice that of the general population, and with alcoholism, otitis media, and other diseases taking an astounding toll yearly, it was inconceivable to me that funds to be used in this area could be withheld. After more than 90 Representatives and Senators sent letters of protest to the President, he relented and released the funds. Now the President wants an additional \$10 million this fiscal year for Indian Health. This is a most encouraging change of priorities, and I hope we see more of the same.

The President made several other recommendations. Some, such as that calling for the establishment of a new Admin-

istrative Council on Indian Affairs, are ant Secretary for Indian and Territorial Affairs who would be solely concerned with Indian and territorial peoples, was recommended by the Indian Education Subcommittee and has already been introduced in a Senate bill. Other recommendations have not yet been formally introduced, but are encompassed in a comprehensive Indian education bill which Senator KENNEDY and I are presently working on.

Without being too much a pessimist, I would like to note that this is not the first time we have heard a good-sounding plan for Indian affairs. Over the years we have gone through innumerable new approaches, new directions, and new policies, only to find that after the breeze of practicality has cleared the air of the rhetoric, the Indian is still the most deprived and most isolated minority group in our Nation.

You will recall that in 1968 we heard a Presidential message on Indian affairs. It was an announcement of a "new national policy" in Indian affairs, a policy which sought maximum Indian participation and control, and the pursuit of excellence in a model school system for the Federal Indian schools. I quote from a portion of President Johnson's address that day:

I am asking the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, to establish a "model community school system" for Indians. These schools will have the finest teachers, familiar with Indian history, culture and language, and will feature an enriched curriculum, special guidance and counseling programs, modern instructional material, a sound program to teach English as a second language, and will serve the local Indian population as a community center for activities ranging from adult education classes to social gatherings.

To help make the Indian school a vital part of the Indian community I am directing the Secretary of the Interior to establish Indian school boards for federal Indian schools.

Two years have passed since that dictum, and how much of a model has the Federal model community school system become?

It has become a model all right—of everything a sound educational system should not be. Textbooks are still outmoded and insensitive to Indian history, culture, and language. Guidance and counseling programs guide and counsel Indian students directly into jail. Only three locally elected school boards have been established since the President's directive. At that rate, it will be 2044 before the Bureau's 223 schools have local control.

Just recently I received a report on the model school at Brigham City, Utah. There, the teachers and administrative personnel are authorized to use handcuffs on students. The guidance and counseling office uses jail referral slips to deal with belligerent students. Students' heads are shaved in total disregard for the significance of long hair in certain Indian religions. This is the kind of progress that has been made toward a model community school system.

If the recommendations of the Senate Indian Education Subcommittee, as proposed by the President in his message yesterday, are implemented, this Nation will go a long way toward providing Indians with the opportunities they long have been denied. I am hopeful that now, with the President's stated support, we can begin making some serious headway.

tions of the 727-200 based upon its effect on passenger terminal crowding.

Since that time, many changes and improvements have been made by the airlines and the airport management to facilitate handling of people in the terminal building and to provide additional automobile parking and better passenger access to the building areas. Because of these improvements, the airlines believe the use of Washington National by 727-200 aircraft will improve service to the public without creating any congestion or operational problems.

The first step in relieving the 1966 situation was to smooth passenger flow by voluntary scheduling cutbacks on the part of the airlines. Next, the airlines expended over \$15 million to improve the convenience and capacity of their passenger terminal accommodations. Obsolete counters and display areas were removed from the central building and new counter areas were located in wings. This enlarged passenger waiting areas. Passenger hold rooms were constructed and loading bridges installed. Terminal building space has increased 60% since 1967. At the same time, the airport management was adding greatly enlarged public (37%) and employee (33%) parking spaces and improving the traffic flow into and out of the terminal building.

As the additional facilities became reality several airlines, individually, requested a relaxation of the restriction on the operation of the 727-200 aircraft. In each case, the request was turned down.

During the controller slowdown, the Administrator permitted operation of the 727-200 to accommodate the public. Since then, he has permitted them to be used, while evaluating the operation.

As far as the airlines are aware, the 727-200, operating at Washington National, introduces no new problems with regard to size, weight, noise, pollution or overcrowding of facilities. On the contrary, it offers the opportunity to satisfy today's traffic requirements with greater convenience to the public.

Let me review each of these points.

The highest capacity aircraft regularly serving Washington National are the DC9-30 with 107 to 117 seats and the 727-100 with 95 to 105 seats.

Seating capacity of the 727-200's currently operated by carriers serving Washington National runs from 122 to 137. Thus, the highest capacity 727-200 would offer 20 more seats than the DC9-30 now operating at Washington National.

With respect to size, the only difference between the 727-100 and -200 is 20 ft. in additional fuselage length. Washington National gate positions are adequate for both. Recent experience with the -200 at Washington National has demonstrated full compatibility with that facility. Washington National management reports "no new problems".

As for weight, Washington National runways are adequate for dual wheel gear aircraft weighing up to 200,000 lbs. Maximum allowable weight for the 727-200 at Washington National is 162,900 lbs. This limitation, based on field length considerations, is 3,900 lbs. more than the maximum allowable weight for the 727-100. When airport temperature exceeds 59°, these weights are further reduced for performance considerations.

Take-off gross weight required to carry 137 passengers 650 nautical miles from Washington National is only 154,200 lbs., well below the design weight.

Landing impact loads in 727-200 aircraft have been reduced by changing the pressure in the landing gear cylinders.

In consideration of noise, both standard and stretched 727 models have the same wing area, same engine thrust—hence, similar performance and noise characteristics at the same weights. Many of the stretched models incorporate "hush kits" further reducing noise.

With respect to air pollution, the aircraft industry has developed and the airlines are now retrofitting JT8D engines with components that make the 727, 737 and DC-9 virtually smoke-free. These are the planes which provide the bulk of the service at Washington National. The retrofit program will be substantially completed by the end of 1972. All new production aircraft are being delivered from the factory with smoke-free engines.

All models of the 727 meet the same design and operating safety standards. The 727-200 is in world-wide operations by 20 airlines, and it has an unblemished safety record.

It would be a convenience to the public and to the airlines if the carriers had the ability to substitute 727-200 on Washington National schedules when demand or equipment routing warranted it.

As you know, some extra sections can be operated above the 40 per hour scheduled operations. Some of the concern regarding potential terminal congestion is reportedly based upon the theory that the mere availability of additional seats in the 727-200 will generate additional passenger traffic. Such a theory discounts the fact that all traffic that wants to move is now moving on existing schedules or on extra sections. Availability of additional seats in some 727's would not increase seat demand or terminal crowding but it would reduce the need for some of the extra sections. Regular schedules are fixed by the 40 per hour limit. Each extra section eliminated due to availability of extra seats in the "stretched" 727 would reduce the total daily operations, airways and airfield congestion, controller work load and community noise exposure.

To conclude, we find no basis for the objections raised by those who have viewed this step with alarm. On the contrary, we believe that the ability to operate this model aircraft into Washington National will alleviate congestion and reduce extra section operations, thus further reducing aircraft operations.

CAB TERMINATION OF THE AREA INVESTIGATION

The Air Transport Association was not a party to the Washington-Baltimore Airport Investigation instituted by the Civil Aeronautics Board on June 20, 1967. However, all carriers serving the area airports participated in the initial informal discussions. Ultimately, two carriers filed motions urging termination of the investigation while one carrier filed a motion urging its discontinuance.

In its order instituting the investigation, the Board said "the principal necessity for this investigation arises from the congestion at Washington National."

In its order of April 27, 1970, terminating the investigation cited the following facts by way of demonstrating that the congestion condition of June 1967 no longer prevails:

Between 1967 and 1969:

Passenger traffic at Washington National increased only 9.2 percent.

Terminal space increased (up to June 1970) 60 percent.

Public parking spaces increased 37 percent. Employee parking spaces increased 33 percent.

During the same period:

Dulles passenger traffic increased 39.1 percent.

Friendship passenger traffic increased 32 percent.

Dulles commercial aircraft movements increased 24.3 percent.

Friendship commercial aircraft movements increased 61.3 percent.

WNA commercial aircraft movements decreased 2 percent.

These changes in airline schedules and in passenger volumes are primarily a result of the Federal Aviation Administration's con-

trol of the number of airline schedules permitted at Washington National in any given hour. The result has been a shifting of new services for the Baltimore/Washington area to Friendship and Dulles and a smoother flow of aircraft and passengers at National.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify on these subjects.

PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last month Look magazine published an issue with the emphasis on American Indians. Senator KENNEDY's excellent article, published in that issue, outlined many of the problems of American Indians today but also discussed the progress being made, especially in the area of Indian education. The Senator from Massachusetts, who served as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, worked tirelessly on that committee and has continued working since the subcommittee's expiration last fall to see that the recommendations of the final report of that subcommittee would not go unheeded by Congress or the Federal agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD. We can learn a great deal from it.

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

LET THE INDIANS RUN INDIAN POLICY

(By Senator Edward M. Kennedy)

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education, I issued last year a report based on more than 1,700 pages of testimony. It includes statements from Federal officials, United States senators, professors, doctors, tribal chairmen and members of Indian tribes across the country.

It also includes a statement from Margaret Nick, a young native girl from Alaska. She gave us no statistics, no charts, no case studies, no classroom results. She said, very simply, this:

"... I can't predict how I should educate my children. I can't predict how they should be educated, but one thing I know is, if my children are proud, if my children have identity, if my children know who they are and if they're proud to be who they are, they'll be able to encounter anything in life. I think this is what education means. Some people say that a man without education might as well be dead. I say, a man without identity—if a man doesn't know who he is—he might as well be dead."

Add Margaret Nick to the list of Americans standing up to be recognized. Add the American Indian and Alaskan native to the list of minorities who want to take part in the decisions that affect their lives.

From a history of neglect and despair, the Indian is beginning to emerge and to demand his own identity and share of American life. It has been a long time in coming, this new Indian self-consciousness. But it is here, and America must pay attention.

Indians have already begun their move for self-reliance. They have filed legal suits in various parts of the country, involving trespass, employment discrimination, misuse of school funds, unauthorized taking of water rights and breach of treaty agreements. Many of these suits have been filed against the Federal Government itself.

Tribal councils travel weekly to Washington, bringing their grievances and proposals directly to the Congress and the Interior Department, rather than using the local Bureau of Indian Affairs, as had been the custom.

setts; one each, Kentucky, Arkansas, Minnesota, Louisiana, Michigan, Oregon, Ohio, Nebraska, and one who died did not list his home. His record, however, showed he was born in Iowa.

Another man was a native of the Philippines Islands. Many men showed next of kin in States other than their home at the time of enlistment, so there is hardly a State which is not touched in some way by the ghostly hands of those entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah*.

The fact that the entombed men of the U.S.S. *Utah* had not been recognized, as have the entombed men of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, by having the colors flown over the hulk of their battleship, was first called to my attention by a group of Utah women who visited Pearl Harbor. Then Mr. Bill Kreh, a writer for Navy Times, came to see me about it. So I stopped at Pearl Harbor on my way to the Orient, to see for myself what had, or had not, been done.

I found that the U.S.S. *Utah* lies half-submerged off Ford Island on the opposite side of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, over which a handsome memorial has been built. The *Utah* has only a small plaque in memory of its heroic dead. Erecting a simple flagpole on the *Utah*, and raising and lowering the colors each day, is little enough to do to honor the men who lie there.

The Navy Department insisted that the flag over the sunken *Arizona* flies for all the Pearl Harbor dead. This implies that if a flag were flown also over the *Utah* it would detract from the flag and the memorial over the *Arizona*. I do not agree. The *Utah* is on the opposite side of Ford Island, out of view of the *Arizona*. It is a separate ship in a separate location. Moreover, there are separate flags flying over other Pearl Harbor dead who are buried in the land cemeteries nearby—and the *Utah* is just as much a military cemetery as any plot of ground containing graves and granite markers and flowers. Flying the flag over the *Utah*, and raising and lowering it each day, would give that ship and its men the recognition which they deserve.

It is one of the ironies of history that the *Utah* was an unarmed target ship on Pearl Harbor day. It had been decommissioned and its great guns removed. But the *Utah* still had the contour and the battleship gray of a massive warship, and she did get underway to steam out of Pearl Harbor, so the Japanese targeted on her just as fiercely as on the other battleships. Scores of bombs and torpedoes were sent her way, bombs and torpedoes which could have been used to sink other ships which were later used to help bring the Japanese Empire to its knees. But the U.S.S. *Utah* took the bombs instead, and its crew died for their country just as surely as the men on the fully armed ships.

Even though the *Utah* spent her last days as a target ship, this does not detract from her proud history. Commissioned in 1911, she was once the best of the U.S. Navy. During World War I she served as a convoy ship, and in 1918 was one of the escort vessels which guarded President Wilson on his way to Europe. In the early 1920's the *Utah* served as the flagship of the Atlantic Fleet. And in 1928, she carried President

Hoover home from a good-will trip to South America. In 1930, the *Utah* was converted to a target ship, radio controlled, which meant she could be operated by radio from another command ship. During mock battles the *Utah* even laid down her own smokescreen. The people of Utah were proud of her during every one of her years of service to this country.

Mr. President, we have waited far too long to honor the illustrious dead of the U.S.S. *Utah*. I hope that the Senate will pass the bill without delay and that the House of Representatives will move quickly to pass it. Let us make it as our objective to raise the flag over the U.S.S. *Utah* before next December 7—the 29th anniversary of the day she was sunk.

HOUSE ACTION COMMENDABLE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I commend the House of Representatives for its rejection today of the Cooper-Church amendment relative to Cambodia, and also for the rejection of the section of the Senate version of the postal bill which would have allowed a compulsory union shop.

It was a great disappointment to me and to millions of Americans throughout the United States that we were unable to defeat these two measures in the Senate. The House action, in my opinion, deserves high praise, and I believe it will do much toward maintaining the confidence of the people in the Congress and in the legislative process.

The House voted today to instruct its conferees to refuse to accept the section of the Senate postal reorganization bill, which would have allowed compulsory unionism of postal workers. I understand the vote was 225 to 159. The House also rejected the Cooper-Church amendment, which some felt challenged the President's authority to have ordered American troops to attack enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia. I voted against both of these measures, and I also expressed my confidence that the House would in fact reject the Cooper-Church amendment. I hope that enemies of the United States have not been misled by the Senate action on that amendment, and I believe the House action should help clarify to the enemy that the Congress of the United States does support the President's Cambodian decision.

The vast majority of Wyomingites, and other Americans, believe that the right of Federal employees either to join or to refrain from joining a union must be protected. I also believe that most Americans recognize the wisdom of the Cambodian action in order to allow the successful implementation of the Vietnamization of the war and continued withdrawal of American troops.

NATIONAL AIRPORT CAN HANDLE THE 747 STRETCH JETS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the convenience of Washington National Airport makes this airport a great time saver for busy travelers, whether Members of Congress, other governmental employees, or businessmen.

In my traveling to and from my home in Florida, Washington National's advantages have clearly outweighed any disadvantages voiced in recent criticism of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Most recently, the attacks on the FAA have criticized it for allowing the so-called stretched model of the popular Boeing 727 jet to operate at Washington National.

Many people have erroneously compared the stretched 727, or the 727-200, with the forthcoming airbuses or the huge 747. They are mistaken. The stretched 727 is identical in most respects to the 727, which has been serving National Airport since 1966, when Washington abandoned the DC-3 and joined the jet age. The major difference in the 727 and the 727-200 is that the stretched version is slightly longer, allowing the accommodation of more passengers on fewer aircraft.

In my view, the FAA made good sense when it decided to allow the 727-200 to operate at National. By utilizing the stretched 727 throughout its entire route system—rather than having to avoid Washington National—an airline can operate its fleet more efficiently and conveniently for its passengers. Larger capacity aircraft will help decrease the need for extra sections—additional flights required to meet passenger demands in excess of scheduled flights—and will hopefully runaway congestion, pollution, and noise because fewer aircraft are required to carry the same number of people.

These benefits are shared by Washingtonians as well as Floridians and others who commute regularly to and from the Nation's Capital to do business with the Federal Government. I feel strongly that Dulles Airport is not being used to its fullest potential and I hope this state of affairs will improve naturally and normally. The use of stretched jets at National should not in any way impair or diminish service at Dulles.

In recent testimony before the Senate District Committee, the Air Transport Association presented discussion on Washington National Airports' role in the Nation's Capital. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF LEO SEYBOLD, VICE PRESIDENT, AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, I am Leo Seybold, Vice President of the Air Transport Association. Our membership includes virtually all the U.S. scheduled, certificated air carriers. Thank you for affording us the opportunity to comment on certain aspects of the operation of Washington National Airport. As I understand it, there are two major topics of discussion before the Committee today—the so-called "stretched" 727, or 727-200 and the Civil Aeronautics Board order terminating the investigation of the Washington-Baltimore airports with respect to congestion. I will speak to each of these issues in turn.

STRETCHED 727 AT NATIONAL AIRPORT

At the commencement of jet operation at Washington National Airport in 1966, the Federal Aviation Agency, now the Federal Aviation Administration, ruled out opera-

And, perhaps most dramatically, Indians have begun to adopt the confrontation tactics that have marked the dramatic emergence of other minorities in this decade. As the world knows now, a group of Indians occupied Alcatraz Island in San Francisco, demanding the island be turned over to them for educational facilities. Another Indian group has attempted to establish Alcatraz number two at Fort Lawton in the State of Washington. Indians have occupied BIA offices in Denver, Cleveland, Chicago and Minneapolis, in many cases, their efforts have been rebuffed. But they have begun to tell us that our long-standing policies toward the Indians in this nation amount to abject failure.

And what they are telling us is true. Before I became chairman of the Indian Education Subcommittee, that post was held by my brother, Robert Kennedy. He traveled America extensively in that role, exposing the severity and degradation of Indian poverty and the failure of this nation to help the Indian people.

He saw, as I have seen, the resilience of the Indian way of life, a way of life that has for many generations resisted destruction despite Government blunders that almost seem designed to stamp it out. My brother called America's treatment of the Indian "a national tragedy and a national disgrace."

I second that opinion. And I think it is past time to end this disgrace.

In the course of my work on the Indian Education Subcommittee, I have seen statistics reflected in the faces of thousands of Indians. Their lives are hard and often filled with despair. Their average income is about \$1,500 a year. Their teen-agers are three times as likely to take their own lives as are young people outside the Indian community. They have 12.2 times the chance of an alcohol-related arrest as the average white American. Their children are plagued with disease. (One Indian leader told our committee he had lost eight children to disease. "... it is a lot of kinds of sickness they die from. Not only one kind. Mostly with whooping cough and measles all together. It hit them one at a time and that way they die.") And their pride decays into a passive wariness of the white man and his misguided attempts to help.

America has been frustrated by the "Indian problem" since the dawn of the nation. This despite the high regard that early leaders such as Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin held for the Indians' political institutions. This despite the contributions that Indians made to our society—their early brand of federalism among their nations; their concept that elected leaders are the servants and not the masters of the people; their insistence that society must respect individual diversity.

With all this as part of our common heritage, we have still given the Indian the back of our hand.

First, we embarked on a policy of isolation, marching entire Indian nations to desolate reservations. Later, we turned toward assimilation, but for the wrong reason—to exploit and expropriate Indian land and Indian resources. We shouldered the "white man's burden" initially by herding separate Indian nations together against their will—then turned around and plunged them headlong into the white man's society, thereby helping to tear them apart. But in any case, so the feeling went, the Indians would be off our conscience, off our land, out of our pocketbooks.

Well, it hasn't worked. Our casual paternalism has done more to hurt than to help. It has disorganized or destroyed this country's Indian communities. It has created a mere and self-perpetuating cycle of poverty for most Indians. And it has brought about an enormous, ineffective bureaucracy that seems to treat the elimination of In-

dian poverty as a gross waste of Federal funds.

The work of our committee was confined to an examination of how the Federal Government is carrying out its responsibility to educate Indian children. The Government assumed this responsibility through treaties and other agreements with Indian peoples in exchange for land relinquished by them. It was our task to assess the Government's performance.

Children are mirrors of their environments. By studying the educational systems, we learned much more about the Indian communities than simply the ABC's of the classrooms. We saw the statistics I have mentioned etched in the faces of these children.

Yet even if we had learned nothing more than our subcommittee's mandate required, we would have been appalled enough. For even in the classroom—and perhaps most importantly there—the American Indian is a poor relation.

The average educational level for Indian children under Federal supervision is five school years—and the Indian dropout rate is twice the national average. Only 18 percent of the students in Federal Indian schools go on to college, against a much higher national average. And only three percent of these Indians graduate. The BIA spends only \$18 per year per child on textbooks and supplies—compared to a national average of \$40.

And when this same agency began a crash program to improve education for Navajo children in 1953, it emerged 14 years later with a budget that showed supervisory school positions increased by 144 percent, but actual teaching positions increased by a mere 20 percent.

So it is clear that the Indian child is being shortchanged. It is clear that the American Indian has the cards stacked against him. And it is clear as well that the BIA isn't doing much to help.

Throughout the 1960's, the Federal Government groped toward a more enlightened national policy. The results can be measured largely in terms of words rather than action. Numerous studies, reports and commissions have come forth with their "solutions" for the Indian problem. But the crucial ingredient that has always been missing is the concept that the Indian can speak for himself, can say what is wrong, what he wants and needs, and what our policies should be in his regard.

On numerous occasions, the Federal Government has suffered the embarrassment of putting forth grand schemes to solve Indian problems without really permitting the Indian to determine the policies and programs for himself. This is not only a hypocritical charade that breeds cynicism and frustration on both sides, it is also, more importantly, a perpetuation of our cumulative failures.

The vast Federal bureaucracy charged with "managing" Indians for the United States can never, as presently structured, be expected to change our tragic Indian policies. This is a harsh conclusion. It brings no satisfaction to Americans who believe that ours is a land of equality and justice for all. It brings no solace to Americans who believe that the special attention given to Indians in this country is beneficial in practice as well as theory. But it is true nonetheless. Even two of the recent Commissioners of Indian Affairs have expressed their frustration at the lack of sensitivity to the Indian problem all through the Government. It is this lack of national will that keeps American Indians prisoners of wars long past.

So, is there anywhere to turn? We might try turning to the American Indian himself.

That's what he is asking. That's what he is demanding. And ultimately, that's what we must recognize as the best solution.

Just in the area of schools, our subcommittee has discovered that the rule of self-

determination is the most just and the most effective. Consider the Rough Rock Indian School on the Navajo Reservation in Chinle, Ariz.

Established in July, 1966, the Rough Rock School is a private, nonprofit organization. It is run by a five-member Navajo school board. Only two of the school-board members have had any formal education, and the weekly meetings of the board are conducted in the Navajo language.

Yet this—the only Indian-controlled school in the United States—is also the most innovative Indian school in the nation. It carries on extensive community and parental participation in school affairs. It uses Navajo teachers and teachers' aides in the classroom. It employs bilingual instruction and course material reflecting the richness of the Navajo culture. Rather than extinguishing Navajo traditions, it enhances them; and its staff has been trained to respect, understand and respond to the community it serves.

The Rough Rock School, as a demonstration project, has played a noteworthy role in the overall reform movement in Indian education. But beyond that, it has become a symbol of the value and indeed the absolute necessity of Indian participation in and control over their own programs and their own lives.

And its success has spawned further advances of this particular tribe. In early April, the Navajo School Board in Ramah, N.M., completed negotiations with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to bring the community's children home from boarding school to an Indian-controlled high school. With additional private and governmental commitments, the school board expects the school to open by September. How far this principle is extended depends on the continued support and commitment of the BIA, the Congress and the Indian community.

Similar gains are being made in other areas of Indian life. Major economic development plans are being put forward by the Zuni in New Mexico and the Seneca in New York State. The Crow tribe in Montana is moving toward extensive development of its mineral resources; the Lummi in Washington are experimenting with advanced agriculture; and natives at Bethel, Alaska, continue their cooperative fishing ventures. So, progress is possible—if the Indians manage their own affairs.

The Subcommittee on Indian Education, in its report issued late last year, made 60 recommendations to the Congress. They are diverse and comprehensive, but perhaps best summed up by this statement from the Subcommittee:

"The Federal Government must commit itself to a national policy of educational excellence for Indian children, maximum participation and control by Indian adults and communities, and the development of new legislation and substantial increases in appropriations to achieve these goals."

In other words, we must help the Indian people take an active and vigorous part in managing their own lives. And, because they are starting with so little, they will need a great deal of help.

CRIME INSURANCE PROBLEM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, no one who has seen the front page of a newspaper or viewed the news on television in the past year can help knowing about the tremendous increase in crime in our cities. Every night stores are robbed and homes are burglarized. The storeowner or home dweller increasingly lives in a world of danger.

At the same time that this danger from crime increases, the vital protection against crime losses—insurance cover-

July 9, 1970

ing robbery and burglary—has rapidly disappeared. Just when our city's merchants and homeowners need the help most, it has been stripped away from them. In cities across the country, home and business crime insurance policies have been abruptly canceled, or the premiums have been raised by 300 percent or more—well out of the reach of the average city dweller. Evidently the insurance industry has decided to move out of this field and into more profitable areas.

This collapse of insurance coverage against urban crime comes in spite of the assurances made by the industry during the passage of the FAIR plan title to Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. In the wake of the 1967 riots Congress moved to provide Federal backing of the reinsurance market offering relief from riot losses, while it developed a plan to provide city riot and crime insurance to businesses and homeowners.

We wanted to establish a program so that all city residents and businessmen could obtain access to essential property insurance. Relying upon promises of industry cooperation, we forged a cooperative program, the so-called FAIR plans, which would provide ground rules for the fair and equitable marketing of insurance. A special target was the insidious "red lining" practice which would exclude whole areas from insurance regardless of the individual risk. Second, for those who could not obtain insurance from private sources, the plans provided for a voluntary insurance pool established by the industry under supervision of the State commissioner.

The FAIR plans had two purposes: First, to provide insurance for those who suffered most from the ravages of riot and crime; the small businessman and the city homeowner; and, second, the lack of insurance has led to the stagnation and decline of our cities' economies. Without insurance, businesses cannot start, they cannot obtain financing for improvements or inventory, and they cannot sustain high crime losses. So our small businessmen leave our cities and the inner city begins to die. This measure was drafted to help revive our cities.

The theory of the act, while still valid, has not worked in practice. For example, many companies are still refusing to write in inner-city areas; after the law was signed, many companies arbitrarily canceled policies and dumped those policies into the FAIR plans; the FAIR rates are doubled and sometimes quadrupled the normal manual rates for such policies; many inner city property owners have no knowledge of the availability of FAIR plan insurance; brokers and agents are reluctant to put policies in the FAIR plan because the commissions for such policies are much lower than the commissions paid by private industry; and the inner-city property owners in most cases are left to the so-called high-risk writers.

Last month I met with Baltimore businessmen about this problem. The story they told was grim:

A successful restaurateur, insured for 50 years without a claim, could not re-

new. He now pays 2 or 2½ times the rate for fire and extended coverage. He was forced to cancel expansion plans and is thinking of moving into the suburbs.

An independent insurance broker told of the virtual disappearance of insurance in the inner-city market. He told how it was impossible for businesses to obtain loans without this insurance. Even the fire and extended coverage sold through the FAIR plan is difficult to place; often a 2-month delay occurs which can spell disaster.

A small business association found that 10 percent of its members had closed or moved from the inner Baltimore area—all these after the 1968 civil disturbances.

A pawnbroker who never had a loss for over 45 years had to file suit to obtain settlement for minimal riot losses. Now he can buy no insurance.

A furniture store owner, with no losses for 24 years, had a 400 percent increase in his premiums.

A liquor dealer, in business for 22 years without a loss, had premiums rise by a factor of six.

I could go on for hours. As chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I know that the situation in Washington is just as grave. Hearings that the House Committee on Banking and Currency held in Chicago last year revealed the same crisis.

This is the situation as reported in many cities of our Nation. The plight of the small, independent entrepreneur is extreme. The men we depend upon to provide us with food and goods in our city must live in constant physical danger and with the economic fate of their businesses left to the whim of criminal behavior. These are the people, more than anyone else, who bear the burden of our crime explosion. One robbery or theft can mean the loss of months of work. Repeated crime will mean the destruction of a business, perhaps a lifetime's work wiped out.

We must act to provide insurance for the city businessman because it is only just. Why should these hardworking members of our community be forced to pay for crime with their profits and livelihood? They must be given protection against those who so easily prey upon the law-abiding citizen.

If we do not act, our stores and businesses will close, and our cities will become dark and lifeless monuments of once great centers of our society. We need our local stores to supply the daily needs of those who cannot afford a shopping trip by car of the long ride by bus—our poor and elderly. And we need our large stores and restaurants to keep our city vibrant and alive and prevent a business flight to the suburbs.

The loss of local businesses will destroy the neighborhoods in our cities. Without local shopping, there are no places for people to meet. Streets become dark and deserted. The street life and friendships of the area disappear. The network of neighborhood groups, clubs, and associations will whither. And with this our neighborhoods will die. With the basic units of the city gone, it will become an overwhelming impersonal, huge, and

hostile place to live. There will be no human scale in the lives of our cities. If we cannot halt the deterioration of our neighborhoods, the battle to make our cities more livable will be lost before it begins.

To remedy the total failure of the present FAIR plans and to guarantee that the victims of crime can obtain protection by insurance, I am introducing the Crime Insurance Act of 1970, which alters substantially the FAIR provisions of the Housing Act. The bill has been introduced in the House by Representative ANNUNZIO and is cosponsored by nearly 100 Representatives.

My bill meets many of the crime insurance problems head on. Its dominant provision calls for the direct Federal writing of essential property insurance, including crime lines, if the rates for such insurance in the private market exceeds 175 percent of the manual rate. The premium for such policies will be 175 percent of the manual rate. No policy will be written if the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines that the property is uninsurable, or if the State commissioner can justify the excessive rate.

The FAIR plans are continued. However, I include, in addition to fire and extended coverage, vandalism, malicious mischief, burglary, and theft in the FAIR plan. As you can imagine, these lines of insurance are most important to inner city property owners.

Other much-needed reforms contained in the bill are:

First. Eliminates discrimination in brokers' and agents' commissions. This will encourage brokers and agents to sell the FAIR plan insurance.

Second. Provides Federal guarantees for performance bonds for small business construction contractors and subcontractors. For over a year, black contractors have complained about their inability to engage in so-called black entrepreneurship programs because they cannot get performance bonds.

Third. Provides for reinsurance of losses which occur during the construction or rehabilitation of habitational property. I am amazed to learn that homes and apartments being constructed or rehabilitated, even under our Federal programs, are uninsured during the building or remodeling period. By offering the same kind of insurance against such losses that is now provided for riot losses, these properties will be insured during the crucial construction stage.

Fourth. Eliminate State sharing in riot loss payments. Present law provides that the States must pay up to 5 percent of the total property premiums written in the State toward riot losses. Many States have been very reluctant to assume this obligation since they do not have the money. Yet, unless the State enacts legislation, providing for this State share the insurance companies in that State are ineligible for riot reinsurance. One of the purposes of this State share was to encourage the States to take measures to eliminate riots and civil disorders. Experience has taught us that the benefits of such endeavors far outweighs the advantage to be gained.

conducted in Vietnam, including the destruction of food crops.

The administration is reported to have weighed the questions of harassing gases and herbicides very carefully in deciding upon the action it has taken today. Indeed, it is reliably reported that it was the effort to resolve precisely these problems which has delayed submission of the protocol until this late date in the congressional session.

Quite frankly, I would have preferred for the President to have interpreted the protocol in accordance with the position adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in an 80-to-3 vote last December, as prohibiting the use of harassing gases and herbicides. While he did not do so, I am nevertheless pleased that in submitting the protocol he did not formally reserve the U.S. position with regard to those weapons.

There are ways other than action on the protocol by which the Senate can express its views on these issues. One of these ways is by our action on the herbicide amendment to the Defense procurement authorization bill sponsored by Senators NELSON and GOODELL. Passage of their amendment would be an effective means of curtailing the use of herbicidal agents by the military in Vietnam.

Too little is known about the long range effects of these chemicals on the environment or on human beings to justify their continued use at this time. What little we do know about some of the chemicals being used in Vietnam has led to their being prohibited for civilian use in this country. Until these questions are more fully studied, it is in my view unthinkable that we would continue to inflict them upon the long suffering Vietnamese.

I intend to support the ratification of the Geneva protocol. Before taking a final position on all of its interpretations, however, I believe that the Senate should make a careful study of the complicated legal, technical, humanitarian questions involved. While this need not be as lengthy as the executive branch review of these same issues, there are many points of view which deserve to be heard and considered.

Finally, I wish to commend the President again for the decisions which he took last November and for the action which he has taken today. Together they have moved U.S. policy a considerable distance toward conformity with the remainder of the world community.

INDIAN AFFAIRS LEGISLATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last month President Nixon sent to the Congress a message on Indian affairs. This was a significant statement by our Nation's Chief Executive. It was a statement deserving of attention and, in many respects, deserving of praise.

It is too early to tell how much of the President's message will be rhetoric and how much will be turned into action. But it is encouraging to note that the administration has submitted to Congress three bills which would implement some of the President's recommendations.

On July 20, the Forum, the newspaper serving Fargo, N. Dak., Moorhead, Minn., and the surrounding areas, published an editorial analyzing the statement. The editorial succinctly summarized the key points of the message and recognized the significance of self-determination if the Indian is to progress beyond the state of poverty in which so many of our Nation's first citizens are forced to dwell.

I ask unanimous consent that the Forum's editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIXON'S MESSAGE IN INDIAN AFFAIRS CONTAINS PROPOSALS WHICH SHOULD BE ACTED UPON

President Nixon's message to Congress on Indian affairs contained recommendations which we hope are enacted into law.

Mr. Nixon's program can best be described as one of self-determination for the Indian. It condemns both paternalism and neglect in government policies. Mr. Nixon stated that Indians are "the most deprived and most isolated minority group in our nation." The chief executive stated that even the federal programs which are intended to meet the needs of Indians "have frequently proven to be ineffective and demeaning."

One of the nation's leading spokesmen on behalf of the Indian, Democratic Sen. Walter Mondale of Minnesota, had praise for the President's message. Mondale, a member of the Senate subcommittee on Indian education, has long been a champion of many of the reforms Mr. Nixon recommends.

The President asked Congress to renounce its previous endorsement of the "termination" policy which promoted the weakening and ultimate finish of the reservation system. Instead, Mr. Nixon would affirm that "the historic relationship" between Indians and the government cannot be abridged without Indian consent.

"Even as we reject the goal of forced termination, so must we reject the suffocating pattern of paternalism. We must assure the Indian that he can assume control of his own life without being separated involuntarily from the tribal group," said the President.

Mr. Nixon proposed that Indian tribes be empowered to take over the control or operation of present federally run programs if they choose without loss of federal funds.

For example, Johnson-O'Malley school aid would go directly to Indian tribes and communities as well as to public schools in order to prevent misuse of these funds. Many school districts, after receiving the Johnson-O'Malley Act federal funds for Indian education, have turned the money into the general fund, with Indians getting little benefit.

President Nixon, in his message, recognized the fact that many Indians are turning from rural to urban life, going to the cities where they are meeting special problems of unemployment and lack of social inaction. Mr. Nixon proposes to expand the operation of urban Indian centers, such as exist on a limited basis in Minneapolis and other large cities.

The President presented an impressive list of other measures which would help the Indian meet social, economic, education and health needs.

Throughout the message, the emphasis was on self-determination, giving the Indian the opportunity to live in dignity whether he chooses the reservation system or wants to enter the mainstream of American life.

The Indian himself has become more and more vocal for self-determination and participation. He wants some of the decision making power which too long has been in the hands of an impersonal bureaucracy.

With favorable action by Congress and new and eager leadership among the Indian population, perhaps we will see some strides which will help both the Indian who chooses to retain his tribal way of life, and the Indian who would rather integrate into the larger society of American life.

TAKING AGRICULTURE FOR GRANTED

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, sometimes it takes a catastrophe—a near disaster—to bring us to our senses—to bring us back in touch with reality.

Such is the case now with a serious blight affecting cornfields across the Nation.

Although exact figures are not yet available, apparently we are going to lose a substantial portion of the 1970 crop. Estimates of nationwide losses now range from as low as 10 percent to as high as 50 percent. In Illinois, last year's leading corn-producing State, the State department of agriculture estimates that fully one-fourth of the crop has been seriously damaged. We will not know the full extent of the damage until USDA surveys now underway have been completed.

I have discussed this problem with officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Educational Institute for Agriculture, a nonprofit organization which seeks better public understanding of farm issues, and I believe enough is known to draw some useful and important conclusions.

First—and this is foremost—American agriculture is being taken for granted; if nothing else, what has happened should alert us to this fact. U.S. agriculture is one of the real miracles of the modern age; farmers have broken record after record; and agriculture has become so dependable that the thought of going without needed food or fiber almost never occurs to anyone in this country any more.

A blight that may well ruin one-half of the largest crop our country produces—the largest both in terms of value and volume—is a very serious matter, yet in the larger sense it tells us just how lucky we really are.

In America even a 50-percent loss—a staggering figure by any standard—is not really a disaster. Anywhere else in the world it would be unthinkable.

In America we have combined research and reserve capacity to prevent the tragedies that occur elsewhere from natural causes.

Our extensive agricultural research facilities, and the people who man them, are the world's best—and given time, they will find a way to prevent damage from the fungus that is causing the current blight. And once the cure is found, our farmers will apply it immediately and effectively, because they know the value of research, and over the years have learned to utilize it well.

In America, the average citizen can afford to be unconcerned that severe shortages of basic products may occur—he does not need to race his neighbors to the nearest grocery store to stockpile staples to guard against an impending emergency—but only because adequate food and fiber reserves protect us all.

sure wished she wasn't. You know everybody knows this and wished you could run out of the room but Mrs. Brown has a strong grip on your other hand. Later, while the children are getting their afternoon drink you can see the little girls pointing at you and giggling. You ask Carlos what they are saying and you're told they are laughing at your pants and shoes. So what, they were good enough for Manuel and Jose, why not me? And what if your shoes did have cardboard in them. You know you must make them last as there is not enough money in the winter when there are no crops to pick. You were clean though. Mama had washed all of your clothes special because you were going to school and you knew this was a job for Mama who had to carry the water from the big cistern in the camp. You then looked at your hands and knew why the little girl had not wanted to hold yours. Sure they had blisters on top of blisters but that is what you get when you hoe sugar beets. In your family, if you're big enough to hoe beets you work, even if the hoe has a sawed-off handle.

Soon the day ends and you must walk back the way you came to the place where you were told you would be picked up by the man who owns the camp your family is now living in. At this place you must wait and wait and wait. Finally he comes, you climb into the back of the truck and as it pulls into camp never did anything look so good as to see Mama, Papa and the babies in front of your cabin. "Como esta, Juanito" you hear Mama calling. Spanish. It was the best sound in the whole wide world. Now you knew you were really home.

In many schools around this nation where the Spanish-American migrant child attends they are being drastically short-changed. We, as educators, speak of meeting the needs of all the children, of planning behavioral objectives and yet, in many areas, the Spanish-American are a foreign entity and just don't "fit in". Many Spanish-American children are suffering from acute learning disabilities, many of these physiological in nature. You spoke of the conductive hearing loss. This exists but I feel there is a problem far more pressing than this. It is the permanent loss of intellectual capacity due to prenatal and postnatal malnutrition. If these children do not get the proper amount of protein at the optimum time (prenatal period and the first 12 months of life) they can develop permanent learning disabilities. After this period of time, there can still be some damage but not as extensive. This has serious implications as to their ability to integrate material correctly, hence, being able to read and write. I became fascinated with this area because I had a little boy in my room who was severely malnourished in early life and as a result, was totally apathetic (minimal autism) at the age of 5½. I am not working with these children any more but they are still very much on my mind . . . and in my heart. I am trying to help them in another way by working on a M.Ed. specializing in specific learning disabilities children develop because of a lack of early protein in the diet. This is a new and open field, but one that needs to be looked into more severely. There are implications here for why children in "poop-up programs" such as Headstart do not maintain their acceleration, why many people of this lifestyle are so apathetic in attitude and why the cycle of decadence evolves. I choose to feel that it all does not depend on the socio-environmental conditions as does Hurley.¹ Research says that there are now definite physiological changes in the biochemical and neurological makeup of individuals subject to early malnutrition. If you are interested in this area there are many competent men who can give you in-

tense detail. May I suggest the work of Dr. Joaquin Cravito of Mexico City, Dr. Fernando Monckeberg of Santiago, Chile and Drs. Delbert Dayton and Merrill Read of the National Institute of Child Health and Development, Growth and Development Branch.

I will close this letter to you by saying, thank you again for your interest. I call these children, "the little children with the dancing eyes and singing names". Please sir, please . . . help them to get their fair break in life.

Most Appreciatively,

ELAINE J. OYLER,
Seattle, Wash.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, statements by organizations dedicated to the advancement of human rights was an integral part of last spring's hearings on the Genocide Convention by a special Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Bayard Rustin, the distinguished chairman of the Executive Committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and Mrs. Katherine L. Camp, president, U.S. section, of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom have been strong supporters of the Genocide Convention. Their statements stress the importance of ratifying the convention in order to reaffirm the fundamental U.S. commitment to human rights and human dignity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF BAYARD RUSTIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Executive Committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, at its meeting on April 29, 1970, unanimously endorsed ratification of the Genocide Convention.

Many of the 125 national civil rights, labor, religious and civil groups that participate in the work of the Leadership Conference have already expressed their individual support of ratification. It is our hope that endorsement by the Leadership Conference will help focus the Senate's attention on ratification of the Genocide Convention as a civil rights issue.

When the United Nations, our own country included, adopted the Genocide Convention in 1948, it was in direct response to the most heinous crime of this century: the murder by Nazi Germany of more than 6 million men, women and children, simply because of religious, ethnic or political minorities. The intervening years have only made ratification of the Convention more imperative and the reluctance of the U.S. Senate to act, in more than 20 years, a matter almost beyond comprehension.

Lately in this country we have heard members of the black minority express the fear that concentration camps and gas chambers may someday be prepared for them. It is a pernicious fear; and it persists in spite of disavowals by the highest officials of government.

One way to demonstrate that the fear is groundless is for the Senate of the United States to ratify the Genocide Convention.

Seventy-five countries have already ratified the Convention. We must, too, if we are to convince our citizens and the world that we mean what we say; that we are ready to go beyond mere professions of high principle and take an unequivocal stand against the monstrous destruction of groups of people because of their birth or their beliefs.

We urge the Senate to take prompt action in ratifying the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

STATEMENT BY KATHERINE L. CAMP, PRESIDENT, U.S. SECTION, WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom strongly urges ratification of the U.N. Convention on Genocide. This Convention manifests man's striving for a more humanitarian way of life by condemning the organized destruction of any racial or religious group. The U.N. unanimously adopted the Convention on Genocide in 1948 and since that time 75 countries have ratified it. Both the Secretary of State and the Attorney General have stated that there are no Constitutional obstacles to U.S. ratification.

Man's goal of living in a world without war, with freedom and justice for all, can only be realized if we build a firm foundation of international law. The Genocide Convention is a vital part of such a foundation. This Convention embodies the revulsion of all civilized men at the systematic destruction of any group of people because of their racial or religious origin. U.S. ratification of the Genocide Convention would demonstrate our commitment to abide by the decent opinion of mankind everywhere.

Since the U.S. Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom first endorsed the Genocide Convention in 1949, we have repeatedly urged the United States to ratify it. Ratification of the U.N. Convention on Genocide this year would be a particularly fitting manner to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

GENEVA PROTOCOL OF 1925 SUBMITTED TO THE SENATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am pleased that the President, in fulfillment of his promise of last November, has today submitted the Geneva Protocol of 1925 to the Senate for its advice and consent. This action, together with the President's previous renunciation of the use and possession of biological warfare agents by the United States, will substantially strengthen the barriers protecting mankind from the horrors of chemical and biological warfare.

The dimensions of the danger posed by the existence of these frightful agents has been amply illustrated during the past few days as a result of the Army's disposal of a shipment of deadly nerve gas. More than anything else, the episode of the nerve gas underscores the potentially suicidal absurdity of producing weapons which are too dangerous even to destroy.

Fortunately, the President's actions over the past few months have had the effect of removing major chemical and biological weapons from their previous place in our military planning. In my opinion they should never have been there in the first place but the President deserves full credit for having initiated a comprehensive review of our chemical and biological programs.

At the same time there is still widespread concern over the erosion of U.S. restraint with regard to the use of agents at the lower end of the spectrum of chemical warfare. I refer specifically to the heavy United States use of harassing gases in Vietnam and to the extensive defoliation operations which we have

¹ Rodger Hurley, *Poverty and Mental Retardation: A Causal Relationship* (New York: Vintage Books, 1969).

istration forces are going to destroy it. Will the present Postmaster be able to administer a postal corporation with better results than he had administered the Post Office? I submit that he will not be able to do so. The passage of the postal reorganization bill may prove to be the worst piece of legislation in the history of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. B. E. Loyd's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

MULESHOE STATE BANK,
Muleshoe, Tex., July 8, 1970.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am sure that you are aware that we are having considerable difficulty with our mail situation in Muleshoe. It is taking 3 days to get a letter delivered from one business to another here in Muleshoe and taking 5 and 6 days for mail to be delivered to other points in Texas where we used to get mail delivered in 2 to 3 days.

I cannot believe that the Post Office Department can save money by having all the mail sent from Muleshoe to Lubbock to be sorted and then returned to Muleshoe.

We would appreciate very much your checking into this and if anything could be done to help the situation we would be most grateful. Thanking you for your attention in this matter, I remain

Yours sincerely,

B. E. LOYD,
President.

THE INDIAN AS A FELLOW HUMAN BEING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the principal findings of the Senate Indian Education Subcommittee was that the existence of myths and stereotypes about Indians was a significant factor in the public's refusal to accept the Indian as a fellow human being.

The subcommittee recommended that school curriculums must change to reflect the true history and culture of Indians, rather than contribute to the propagation of damaging, derogatory—and untrue—stereotypes.

I do not know how many school officials and teachers have taken that recommendation to heart, but I fear the number is far too small. I think we can get some sense of the problem by looking at the answers given by suburban Minneapolis elementary schoolchildren when they were asked what they knew about Indians.

Their responses: They kill white men. They take scalps. They tell lies and fibs. They are mean. They have funny names. They eat all raw meat.

These were the kinds of answers a University of Minnesota survey team found.

In response to this survey the university is preparing an Indian education college-credit course for viewing on statewide educational television. It is being designed to assist teachers in the preparation of curriculum units. Similar curriculum units will also be sent to districts throughout the State.

This is a significant response to a major problem, and I applaud the uni-

versity's efforts in this area. I ask unanimous consent that a Minneapolis Tribune editorial of July 3, 1970, regarding the university survey and proposed TV course, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE INDIANS AS SEEN IN SUBURBS

What do white suburban grade school students think about Indians? Indians mean big trouble. They killed white men. They take scalps. They tell lies and fibs. They are mean. They have funny names. They eat all raw meat. These attitudes, ironically, were expressed by students at Indian Mounds Elementary School in Bloomington.

The students were asked to write "What I Know About Indians" in a one-page essay as part of a survey by the University of Minnesota's Training Center for Community Programs. The survey produced 643 essays from eight grade schools in Bloomington.

The results, reported recently by the training center, are not all as negative as the expressions by some of the students at Indian Mounds. Pupils at Indian Mounds and other schools also mentioned the injustices inflicted by whites on Indian people, referred to Indians in a positive manner, and expressed admiration for Indians. "We didn't treat them as we ought to," wrote a sixth-grader at Brookside School.

But the generalizations in the essays were negative enough, said the authors of the report, to validate the conclusions of a recent U.S. Senate Indian Education subcommittee study. The subcommittee contended that the public schools present a picture of American and inaccurate. In Bloomington, said the university report, the students showed a depressing lack of facts about the present condition of Indians. The survey also indicated that some teachers were inclined to single out and overemphasize certain "facts" to the exclusion of the broader picture of past and present Indian life styles.

Although the survey was conducted in Bloomington, the results should not be construed as a specific indictment of that school district. Similar results likely could be found in most school districts of the state. Old textbooks containing distorted references to Indians are still in use. A balanced treatment of Indian history often has not been integrated into the curriculum. Not enough contemporary material on Indians is available to teachers.

As a result of the Bloomington survey, the university plans to offer a nine-credit Indian-education college course on educational television stations throughout the state next fall. The purpose of the course will be to give teachers the tools to develop curriculum units for their classrooms. At the same time, the university will be sending a series of curriculum units, produced by teachers, to all school districts in the state.

These and other efforts should help to prevent what the university report terms "a new round in the old cycle of myth creation and maintenance about the American Indian." But, as the report also points out, the schools can't do it all. Distorted perceptions of the Indian in the white family, peer group and media all help to explain why a Brookside fourth grader wrote, "If I saw an Indian, I'd be scared stiff."

ONE OF NATION'S OUTSTANDING EDUCATORS TO RETIRE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) entitled, "One of Nation's Outstanding Educators To Retire."

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

ONE OF NATION'S OUTSTANDING EDUCATORS TO RETIRE

(Statement by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to salute one of our Nation's outstanding educators, Dr. Mason Gross. Dr. Gross has announced that he plans to retire after 11 years as president of Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey.

During his tenure as president, he has guided Rutgers through a period of tremendous growth. But his dedication has not been to growth alone. His overriding goal has been the quality and, most importantly, the relevancy of education.

Dr. Gross has been a precursor; he has set the patterns. When he assumed the role of President, he urged creation of a curricula in Asian and African studies. Today, such studies are commonplace but this was not the situation 11 years ago.

That speech set a pattern which did not vary. Dr. Gross has remained in the forefront of the most innovative educators in America.

To cite all of his accomplishments, would require a major volume.

However, I should like to mention that it was Mason Gross who established the first urban-oriented college in America, the Livingston College of Rutgers University. And it was Dr. Gross who opened the doors of university education to the disadvantaged.

As is true generally of university presidents, Dr. Gross has had his share of problems. And he has met them forthrightly and with success.

Perhaps the finest tribute that could be paid to Mason Gross is to realize that in an age when young people say "Don't trust anyone over 30," he was not only trusted but respected by his students.

While Dr. Gross is retiring as President of Rutgers, I have no doubt that he will continue to lend his great ability and dedication to the cause of quality education in America. In the meantime, I think the people of New Jersey join in thanking Dr. Gross for a job well done.

How well he served is reflected in editorials which have appeared in New Jersey newspapers.

DR. GROSS SETS DATE

Like most college presidents, Mason W. Gross has not escaped controversy and conflict in this era when educational institutions are undergoing violent upheaval.

Now, after what will be 25 years with the university, including 12 years as president, he plans to step down from his Rutgers post in September 1971, by which time he will be 60 years old and eligible for retirement.

Few will blame Dr. Gross for seeking a quieter and more contemplative life. Although he declares his decision to retire was not influenced by recent events, certainly his view of the burdens he has carried must have undergone changes as the pressures mounted, and along with them, the inevitable criticism.

The dispute with Gov. Cahill over combining Rutgers Medical School with the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry was only the latest of a series of conflicts. Rutgers and its administration have also been targets of criticism, some of it justified and some not, over the Urban University Program and the way it was launched, over discontinuance of ROTC, over student takeovers and other disorders, and over relations with the Legislature and other Trenton officials.

Nevertheless, the tall, scholarly and professorial figure of Dr. Gross has been a popular one on the Rutgers campuses and unquestionably he argued well the case for

greater understanding of students' viewpoints and for accommodations allowing youth a larger role in university affairs. He has been a pioneer in pushing for increased focus on the needs of students from disadvantaged groups and in trying to make Rutgers more responsive to the needs of a changing society.

At the same time, Dr. Gross has been a dedicated leader in guiding Rutgers through an 11-year period of unprecedented expansion while it was developing its newly found role as the state university. In the process, it increased its national stature.

For those achievements, and for bearing the recent awesomely difficult burdens with his usual courtliness and grace, Dr. Gross merits gratitude and thanks.

A SUBSTANTIAL LOSS

Dr. Mason Welch Gross at the moment is probably better known to most New Jersey residents for the last two years of his long and distinguished tenure as Rutgers University president than for the previous nine in which the institution had grown appreciably and taken on academic stature.

Controversy has a way of making a celebrity of a person. It was something that Dr. Gross neither sought nor wanted. He was a college president who like numerous colleagues in other universities was caught up in the vortex of violent social change, a mood that was and is deeply rooted in the nation's institutions of higher learning.

Rutgers has been disrupted by demonstrations and protest, but hardly in the clamorous and virulent dimensions that afflicted other universities. And despite the criticism of legislators, Dr. Gross was able to deal with these incidents in most instances with an admirable degree of restraint and understanding.

The period of stress on the Rutgers campus in a fuller, positive sense, was a stern test of the university's administration under Dr. Gross' guidance. And it is apparent that the school not only has survived but has grown with the experience.

The brief tumultuous period in the school's history may currently tend to obscure Dr. Gross' substantial contributions to the school's academic maturity and substance.

But controversy and differences are part of an institution's changing role in a society that is undergoing radical social change. It was apparent that Dr. Gross was acutely cognizant of the new and greater responsibility that American academe has had to assume in this transition. Open enrollment, a program that dramatically broadened educational opportunities for economically disenfranchised students from urban areas, was a major innovation instituted at Rutgers under Dr. Gross' administration.

Any appraisal of his tenure at Rutgers must include his unrelenting and courageous resistance to political incursion of the state university, an issue on which Dr. Gross and legislators have locked horns on a number of occasions. His most recent experience in this area was his opposition to the legislative passage of a measure that would transfer control of the school's two-year medical school to a new statewide medical education board.

This newspaper favored the revamped medical education program initiated by Gov. Cahill to improve the delivery of health care for the whole state, but it recognized that these differences stemmed from genuine conflicts on fundamental issues. Dr. Gross' primary concern was develop the university's medical school into a four year institution under Rutgers' control; we subscribed to the thinking behind the governor's proposal to integrate medical education because it was addressed to the more urgent problem of meeting health care needs in fullest dimension with available resources.

None of this diminishes the enormous influence he brought to bear during his 11-

year incumbency in which Rutgers has achieved impressive growth, from a relatively small college to a large, multi-campus university that has gained increasing respect in the academic community. His retirement represents a substantial loss in New Jersey higher learning, but even more so for the state university.

ENVIRONMENTAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, since Earth Day, there has been a great deal of talk about the cleaning of our environment and making it livable for future generations. Numerous ideas, many of them sound, have been put forth as suggestions for accomplishing this enormous task.

Yet some of the most basic, yet beautiful thoughts on saving our already ravaged earth, came from Barbara Wadsworth, Richard Perdue, Elizabeth Moran, and the students of Carolyn Roth, biology teacher, North High School in Minneapolis, Minn.

They call it the "Environmental Bill of Rights."

I ask unanimous consent that this effort be printed in the Record along with the names of the students who signed the document.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL BILL OF RIGHTS

We, being of sound mind and body, do hereby submit these suggestions, while there is still air to breathe, for an environmental Bill of Rights.

(a) No man shall have the right to pollute another man's property without his consent. Nor shall a man be able to pollute his own property in such a way as to endanger his neighbor's property.

(b) The government shall not have the right to infringe on any man's right to a pure environment, (pure environment being of clean water, air free from major pollutants, land free from corrosive misuse.)

(c) Man shall not be permitted to endanger earth's natural species to the point of extinction.

Phillip E. Demry, Susan Heimkes, Mary Madson, Megan Jones, Edwin B. Mudge, Burnadette Pettiford, Billie Bolden, Brian Babb, Becky Shostrom, and Marilyn Magnuson.

Steve Smith, Sandra Demry, Carol Temple, Simon Bank, Mike Allen, Jim Thompson, Charles Williams, Suzy Burke, Terry Minard, and Karl Hanson. Steven Peterson, R. Jacobson, Carolyn Carter, Rose Ann Genich, Jane Lang, Bud Brophy, Barb Glimmer, Sandi Glimmer, Debby Anderson, and Debbie Comeau.

Gary Pribyl, Suzanne Murschell, Kenn Masica, Charles Varone, Gary Caviness, Tara Lockwood, Richard Z. Woldorsky, David Steen, Greg Olson, and Kathy Voller.

Lyle Gelmendinger, Anita Uruina, Marti Lawrence, Lester Hall, Bill Tollifson, Phillip McElhaney, Larry Shackles, Terry Letourneau, John Duyer, and Barb Wadsworth.

Ray Turner, Gary Gibbs, Linda Heimen-dinger, Elizabeth Moran, Susan Hart-fiel, Elizabeth Dahl, Nancy Stachowski, Roxanne Schmidt, Forrest Little, and Cathy Johnson.

Mary Huseby, Kim Hutchins, Pam Hunter, Richard Hunter, J. Jones, Joan Campion, Rocky Yurch, Peter M. Nikiel, Alan Dupary, and Michael Bellfield.

William Patterson, Joanne Davis, Gerri Johnson, Dave Schmidt, Todd Stenson, Ida Johnson, Jerry Lease, David Baltus, Elizabeth Gordon, Pam Lindquist, Dave Nelson, Lois Edwards, and Ric Campbell.

PUERTO RICO CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement by the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) on Puerto Rico Constitution Day.

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

PUERTO RICO CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, July 25th is a day to honor and salute the people of Puerto Rico, for it was 18 years ago that this small nation achieved Commonwealth status.

The long journey toward self-government, however, was not an easy one. During more than 400 years of its existence—from discovery until United States control in 1898—Puerto Rico was ruled by approximately 140 Spanish governors.

Although not always mistreated, the Puerto Ricans were denied the privilege of self-rule. Even after the United States assumed control following the Spanish-American conflict, Puerto Rican political power did not become predominate. It was not until 1917 that an act of Congress created there the start of a self-governing and free-trading society.

The next several years lead the way to great social change and economic improvement. Governmental dominance was soon channeled through political organizations, guiding Puerto Rico to its first democratic election in 1948, wherein Luis Manoz Ma was elected governor. And on July 25, 1968, climaxing many years of continued determination, a democratic constitution was adopted. Significantly created was a legislative body that has enacted and provided enforcement for all laws, a process that still prevails on this modern and progressive island.

Mr. President, for all Puerto Ricans, Constitution Day is a reminder of the sturdy foundation of their present democratic system. To acknowledge and praise the accomplishments of these people, we in the United States honor the traditions to which all free men aspire.

IS FREEDOM DYING IN AMERICA?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Look magazine for July 14 contains an article, written by the noted historian Henry Steele Commager, which is extremely relevant to the debate on the pending bill.

The article is entitled "Is Freedom Dying in America?" In it, the author discusses emerging threats to the freedoms and values enshrined in our Bill of Rights.

One particularly noteworthy passage reads as follows:

Let us turn then to practical and particular issues and ask, in each case, what are and will be the consequences of policies that repress freedom, discourage independence and impair justice in American society, and what are, and will be, the consequences of applying to politics and society those standards and habits of free inquiry that we ap, as a matter of course to scientific inquiry?

Consider the erosion of due process of law—that complex of rules and safeguards

munists would do such a thing, and now they are behind the government.

"Our Government took back the land the French had stolen from us and gave it back to the people. Land reform was the thing we needed most, and now they're fighting for it."

"America is very far away and I think too many of your people do not understand this war. You are angry over what some of your men did at My Lai, but you do not realize that was a free-fire zone where there were no known friendlies. Our men might have done the same thing."

"What we cannot understand is how you can be angry over an accident like that and not be angry over what the Communists did deliberately at Hue during Tet."

Maj. Man also had something to say about Vietnamization of the war.

"What you see now is only the beginning, not the end."

The Vietnamese have not yet won their war. They still have an agonizingly long way to go.

But they are beginning to move.

JUSTICE FOR ALASKAN INDIANS AND ESKIMOS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a bill relating to the Alaska native land claims will be before the Senate in the near future. We will have the opportunity in that bill to treat Alaskan Indians and Eskimos with a justice we never provided for the American Indian of "the lower 48."

The president and council of the King Island Village, located just outside Nome, have put together a most eloquent statement of their feelings on the land claims issue. In that document they state their goal as sharing "in the development of the progress of the State of Alaska as first-class citizens rather than wards of the government." The natives claim that if that is not possible, "you might as well move us to the moon."

I believe the King Island Village statement provides us with an important insight into the native culture and enables us to better understand the role land plays in their life. I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

KING ISLAND VILLAGE COUNCIL

Congressman Howard Pollock and other Congressmen from other States come to Alaska to hear our point of view about Land Claims. The meeting was very short and they did not hear what all the people had to say.

We of King Island Village, as you very well know, have literally been forced to move elsewhere from our Island and have been nomads ever since. And according to Organic Act of 1884 we are entitled to own our title to land used and occupied and claimed, and by Statehood Act our rights are protected. We as occupiers of the land know what we need and use better than anyone else.

So often we have asked ourselves when and where we were originally from. Anthropologists think that we might have come across through what they called the land bridge between Siberia and Alaska in the Bering Straits. If this was true? How long ago did this happen? (Anybody have any idea when or what year that was?) It must have been the time when human beings don't think of claiming what their foot step on, or what you might say when the first persons or be-

ings set their first step on the great land what they called now Alaska. Yes, Alaska is a great land, the last frontier. Our ancestors must have courage in those days otherwise the explorers would not have found Natives in the year 1741.

What the Native did not know was that there was gold in the earth, also oil and other valuable minerals. Just imagine if your ancestors had any knowledge of what was in store in mining and oil products. Would they have let the white man come and take advantage of them? The white man thinks the Native is ignorant, but just see in how many ways to native life he has adapted himself.

As far back as the Eskimo can remember the land has been theirs. They used it to hunt and fish. The land as it was before the white man came and claimed it was sort of developed already. The Natives gathered their stores of greens, several kinds, and also several kinds of berries, for their winter supply. As one Congressman asked us, if we wanted to own the blocks of land we were sitting on, where does he expect us to gather greens and berries, and hunt, for our winter supplies. So the land is of necessity needed by Natives. Land where the subsistence have not already been damaged by the white man.

We want land to live on as others in Lower 48 would live on land. The people down Lower 48 use their land to farm. Up here we can use land just as others would not just by farming but hunting, fishing, berry picking, camping, and land development. The Congressman ask how many of us people would like to have a deed to our houses. He has only one thing in mind. To give us land only in the spot where our houses are built. There are many reasons why we need the land. If the Congress people were in our position and we ask them why they need the land, their reasons for wanting the land would be ten (10) times less than our reasons, not counting the other Villages reasons. Each Village has different reasons because they have different way of doing things.

The younger people don't depend on hunting and fishing for their livelihood, even though they do a lot of hunting, but we are looking forward to obtaining a fair settlement in lands which would be used for economic purposes to untie us from the wardship of the government. We don't see any reason why the Congress would not make a reasonable settlement on land when the money from it would be spend for the benefit of all concern. Without land the Native would not be independent. He would be under Welfare. We all been told by Congressmen that they would like to see Natives become independent of the government, but if we do not get a fair settlement in land we still will be where we began in 1867 and the Organic Act of 1884 will just become one of the many broken acts of the government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

As for the \$500 million, we believe it is essential for the development of the land, housing, education, developing industry, legal services and social programs. In the past we have received a lot of social programs from federal and State, but they have not been too effective as all the planning have been done by the man behind the desk that may not be familiar with Village life. The 2% overriding royalty is essential to keep our programs going over the years.

Governor Miller is playing politics with the Land Claims. He is not concerned with Natives, but with his own politics and that the State get all the best of our land. His Land Claims position is unrealistic and unacceptable to us because it does not meet what we need. His using Anchorage and Juneau as examples is unrealistic because land use is different there and has nothing to do with life in the bush. Nome is a Native Village—80% Native! He is wrong about

"non-Native Village" people not getting land. All Natives should share on land, they are in cities partly because they can't own land in Villages except for small 160 acres. He is wrong about small withdrawals—they should be large to guarantee that we get what we need before the State takes it all. To insure a fair settlement. He is wrong about taxes—land and money should be tax-exempt for a while because it takes time to develop land and for us to learn about taxes, and so land won't be re-possessed putting us back where we were before settlement.

It is not much for what we ask compared to all of the land that will be taken by federal and State. All we ask is 10% of the land (40 million acres) for 20% of the population, and we are willing to let you have the rest of the land for 70-cents per acre (\$500 million) and a 2% overriding royalty.

We are asking you to support a fair Land Claims settlement as proposed by our representatives, the Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) so we can share in the development of the progress of the State of Alaska as first-class citizens rather than wards of the government.

If a fair settlement is not possible, you might as well move us to the moon.

This letter was written and approved by the whole King Island Village people, and signed by our representatives on the Village Council.

In accordance with the desires and request of the people of King Island Village we set our hand hereto:

PETER J. SEEGANNA,
Village Council President.
MIKE SACLAMANNA,

Vice-President.

MARGARET SEEGANNA,
Secretary-Treasurer.

JOHN PULLOCK,
Councilman.

GABRIEL MUKTOYUK,
Councilman.

JOHN TAXAC,
Councilman.

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Central Utah project is the key to development of Utah's resources for the next 100 years. It provides for the beneficial use of most of Utah's remaining undeveloped share of Colorado River water.

Essentially, the plan calls for intercepting south-flowing streams on the slopes of the Uintas and channeling available water to croplands and cities in the Uinta Basin and central Utah.

The Bonneville unit is by far the largest and most complex of the authorized units of the Central Utah project. It will make water available to sustain continued economic, industrial, and population growth in Utah.

It has been my privilege for many years to fight to get this project funded at a realistic, economic level. I was delighted, therefore, to learn that President Nixon had recommended a construction program of \$12,910,000 in fiscal year 1971 for the Bonneville unit of the Central Utah project.

I fully support this budget request. So that Senators might be aware of how these funds will be used, I ask unanimous consent that the Central Utah Water Conservancy District's resolution supporting the President's budget request be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the President's budget recommends a construction program of \$12,910,000 in Fiscal Year 1971 for the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project, and

Whereas, the recommended program provides for the completion of construction on the Water Hollow Tunnel and Open Channel No. 2, acquisition of land and rights for Soldier Creek Dam, Strawberry Reservoir enlargement and collection works; the awarding of contracts for Currant Creek Dam; Currant Creek Road rehabilitation, second reach; relocation of the Forest Service road; Soldier Creek Dam; Water Hollow Diversion Dam, feeder pipe and pipeline; Layout Tunnel and access road; Layout Creek Diversion Dam, pipeline and feeder pipe; Currant Tunnel and access road; Vat Tunnel; and the relocation of U.S. Highway 40 to bypass the enlarged Strawberry reservoir; initial acquisition of land and rights for Jordan Aqueduct System, and the awarding of a contract for construction of Jordan Aqueduct Section No. 1, and for other associated works; and

Whereas, the President's budget includes as a part of the Central Utah Project, \$500,000 for the start of construction on the Jensen Unit, \$233,000 for the construction of drains on the Vernal Unit, \$75,000 to complete construction of the Bottle Hollow Dams and dike, and \$270,000 to continue Feasibility Investigations on the Ute Indian Unit;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District does hereby support the President's Budget and program, and requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds as recommended by the President; and,

Be it further resolved, that the Executive Department in the Federal Government make all the appropriated funds available so that the program, as recommended, can be carried out during fiscal year 1971; and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Reclamation, Members of the Congressional Appropriations Committees, Governor of the State of Utah, Utah's Congressional Delegation, Executive Director of the Utah Department of Natural Resources, Executive Director of the Upper Colorado River Commission, Director of the Utah Division of Water Resources, Ute Indian Tribe, and other interested parties.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District on April 6, 1970.

LYNN S. LUDLOW,

Secretary.

OPERATION RESCUE LINE—TO AID AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, on February 18, 1970, a prisoner of war resolution was passed unanimously expressing the sense of the U.S. Congress in protesting the treatment of U.S. servicemen held prisoner by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, calling upon them to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention, and approving and endorsing efforts by the U.S. Government, the United Nations, the International Red

Cross, and other leaders and peoples of the world to obtain humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war.

As one who, with like-minded Members of Congress, has long labored to focus world public opinion upon the need for demanding proper protection for prisoners of war, I am indeed gratified at passage of the measure, which embodied the essence of my own Senate resolution protesting these violations of international law.

Senators and Representatives of Congress subsequently joined with thousands of concerned Americans and family members on May 1 in Constitution Hall in Washington to reaffirm a common declaration—that those who have fallen into the hands of the enemy will not be forgotten. It was all the more appropriate that the deeply moving May 1 appeal for international justice should have taken place on Law Day, for this example of North Vietnamese inhumaneness should and must result in the outraged sense of humanitarianism under accepted standards of international law of all nations of the free world.

Our voices must continue to be heard throughout the world in behalf of these prisoners and their families. Among those who are continuing to work in meaningful ways to aid American captives is the Santa Fe wife of an American prisoner of war in North Vietnam—Mrs. Dottie Hughes, the wife of Air Force Col. James Lindberg Hughes.

Last year, I had the opportunity of meeting with a group of POW wives who reside in my State of New Mexico and who are suffering deep mental anguish as they await anxiously the safe return of their loved ones. As a result of my suggestions at those meetings and through subsequent correspondence, Mrs. Hughes has initiated a most commendable campaign to secure release of the hundreds of known American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and almost a thousand other Americans listed as missing in action. She has established an organization known as "Rescue Line," to accept contributions and channel them into projects that will directly work for the freedom of American captives. Still another purpose of Rescue Line's mission is to urge concerned persons to write national officials in Washington, their congressional delegations, and the North Vietnamese negotiators in Paris.

Mrs. Hughes' efforts are all the more praiseworthy in view of the fact that they are designed to assist the wives and families of American POW's in other parts of the Nation as well. Thus far, people all over New Mexico, as well as elsewhere, have been responding very sympathetically and positively to Rescue Line's objectives.

Mr. President, Dottie Hughes has prepared for me a summerization which sets forth more eloquently than I could the purposes of Rescue Line. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks. I also urge Members of both Houses of Congress to publicize the nature of this effort in their periodic newsletters to their constituents, so that all Americans may have an opportunity to

take a stand on and assist in behalf of this crucial humane issue.

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

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON A NEW MEXICO ORGANIZATION FORMED TO WORK FOR THE RELEASE OF THE AMERICAN MILITARY MEN BEING HELD PRISONER IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

During the strangest conflict in history occurring in Southeast Asia, husbands of military families have become trapped in an even stranger diplomatic-political limbo where one government defies all the international rules relative to the treatment of prisoners of war and relegates them to the position of being human hostages. It had taken most families until spring of 1969 to realize that any movement at all would have to come by their own efforts and here in New Mexico where there are at least 20 families in this category, we originated the idea of creating an organization called Rescue Line which is simply a vehicle whereby citizens of the state can participate by contributing to a central working fund which is used to promote projects all over the world in an effort to rescue these trapped men. The project initially began with an advertisement in the Albuquerque Journal during December 1969 and many New Mexicans responded by contributing funds. Almost immediately these funds were used to partially pay for advertisement inserted in a Hong Kong Chinese newspaper—Wah Kiu Yat Po, asking for every point outlined in the International Red Cross Geneva Conventions . . . release of the sick and wounded . . . lists of captured personnel . . . free flow of mail . . . impartial inspection of camps by neutral forces and these ads were directed to the leaders of North Vietnam. Rescue Line also partially paid for another advertisement inserted in the Bangkok Post on February 4th of this year . . . just before the Tet Lunar New Year holiday and this ad was the direct reason for a taped recording of my husband's voice (Lt. Colonel James Lindberg Hughes) which was broadcast over Hanoi Hanh's English speaking program on February 5th and beamed to the troops in Southeast Asia. This was the first indication I had had in nearly two years that he was alive . . . this direct message in his distinctive phraseology.

I feel we have a very important mission to accomplish here in New Mexico . . . we must continue to press for information . . . to probe and confront these people who hold our men as hostages to be used for bargaining power. We must also continue to request funds so that we can continue our New Mexico effort to free all the 1,406 men unaccounted for in Southeast Asia . . . and we will succeed because human compassion is a quality that is so highly contagious that it just might spread from our little embryonic idea here in New Mexico to the far corners of the world.

Mrs. JAMES LINDBERG HUGHES.

HARD TIMES IN THE COUNTRY—A COMMENTARY ON THE FLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on April 13, 1970, the National Educational Television network presented a timely and hard-hitting documentary entitled "Hard Times in the Country," which dramatized the difficulties confronting the American farmer and his family.

As the program correctly pointed out, in a time of skyrocketing consumer food prices, the farmer is receiving less profit for his production than he did 2 years ago. The major reason for this decline in



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org