

an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 1056. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 1057. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 1058. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1059. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H. Con. Res. 630. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 631. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of France to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 1056. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 168; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 15159. A bill for the relief of Young Ja Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15160. A bill for the relief of Antonio Costante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15161. A bill for the relief of Nunzia and Giuseppe Gatusso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15162. A bill for the relief of Paola Pellegrino and minor children, Rosa, Gaspare, Giovanni, and Antonia Pellegrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15163. A bill for the relief of Stefano Pisano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 15164. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Stachowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 15165. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cavaliere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15166. A bill for the relief of Nicola De Luca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15167. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Perna, his wife, Luigina Geltrude, and children, Vincenzo, Carmela Maria Rosaria, Antonio Nazario, and Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15168. A bill for the relief of Vincenza Perna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15169. A bill for the relief of Enrico Provenzano, his wife, Annina, and daughter, Carmela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15170. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Federico Reale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 15171. A bill for the relief of Michelangelo Livoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 15172. A bill for the relief of Matteo Cretella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 15173. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Siderakis, Maria Siderakis, and Sideras Siderakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 15174. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Jose Giro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15175. A bill for the relief of Dr. Heinz Joost; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15176. A bill for the relief of Andromachi S. Pamfili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 15177. A bill for the relief of Lee In Sook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15178. A bill for the relief of Kay Jacqueline Bawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 15179. A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

239. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Common Council, City of Buffalo, N.Y., relative to Federal funds to improve WPA streets, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Clarence Brown, Jr.,  
Before Detroit Ad Club

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, CLARENCE BROWN, JR., of Ohio, known affectionately by us as "Bud," on January 26 delivered an address before the Detroit Ad Club that had a tremendous impact on those attending the dinner meeting.

As we all know, BUD BROWN has had considerable experience in the publishing business. He, and his distinguished father before him, have been publishers of several newspapers in Ohio. What CLARENCE BROWN has to say about our modern advertising system merits attention. He speaks both as a Member of Congress and one who has a specialized knowledge of the advertising industry.

A point he makes cannot be too strongly emphasized: The smalltown media constitute a vital segment of our free enterprise system and it should be a matter of public policy, both on the part of government and on the part of advertisers themselves, to defend and promote these media as against a system of centralization.

Congressman Brown's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CLARENCE BROWN, JR., BEFORE DETROIT AD CLUB

"It would be in the best interests of our advertising business," wrote a foreign magazine editor not long ago, "to study the American experience."

"We must remember," the editor continued, "that the great Lenin told us to learn from the capitalists and adopt what is clever and profitable to build communism." End of quote.

This quotation comes from the Soviet Magazine, *Literary Gazette*. If nothing else, it reinforces a conclusion I've reached after some two years in our Nation's Capital as a Member of Congress—that like a prophet, a profitable system is without honor in its own country.

For while "the American experience" in advertising is being copied overseas by envious foreign systems, here at home it has come under increasing attack by government spokesmen in recent years.

Let's face it, ladies and gentlemen of the advertising profession: they may love you in Moscow—or at least flatter you by imitation—but your economic and social sex appeal is sagging badly back in your own capital of Washington.

Nor are your critics talking about you behind your back, boldly, insistently they're bringing their arguments into the open—and with growing vigor and confidence.

Why? Because—strange as it may seem to the Moscow Commissar assigned the job of finding out what's right about American advertising—no one here in the States is effectively refuting those critics who are busy telling us what's wrong with it.

Like nature itself, the ambitious critic of the system, is quick to fill a vacuum—with

his own arguments. Thus, in the absence of resistance from defenders of American advertising, your detractors grow more voluble each passing day.

Thus, having heard from your Moscow admirers, listen now to what the Washington detractors have to say about "the American experience" in advertising.

First, it increases the cost of products. Second, it helps create monopolies and thereby reduces the consumer's freedom of choice in the marketplace.

Third, it helps popularize and maintain faulty and harmful products in the marketplace.

Fourth, it poses a threat to free speech and the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution by leading to the control of news and editorial policy in our news media.

Fifth, it lowers public tastes in television and radio entertainment.

Sixth, it costs taxpayers unnecessary money in postal subsidies.

Seventh, it mars the beauty of our national landscape.

Eighth, it stimulates and creates artificial demands for products consumers actually don't need.

Ninth, it makes for unreal distinctions among brand named products which are essentially the same.

And as if the aforementioned nine points aren't enough:

Tenth, it also stimulates public and private vices, such as gambling, excessive use of alcohol and an overweening interest in sex.

Now, let me make it clear that these ten charges about modern advertising aren't products of my imagination. Each and every one has been stated publicly. They have

been made on the floor of Congress; by officials of Federal Executive Branch Agencies and Departments; and by self-proclaimed spokesmen for protection of the public interest, in testimony before Congressional Committees.

Since first coming to Congress two years ago, I have also heard proposals—many proposals—to correct these economic and social ills allegedly created and aggravated by modern product advertising.

Listen now to what your critics have proposed. You'll recognize that some of these ideas have *already* been enacted into law or put into effect by regulation in the recent past:

First, we should limit advertising budgets and/or advertising methods by law

Second, we ought to tax advertising expenditures or place an advertising use tax on media

Third, we ought to extend and strengthen the antitrust laws to cover advertising

Fourth, we need regulations on package design, content and labeling

Fifth, we ought to outlaw product brand names which might mislead or confuse consumers and require the manufacturer to market like products under generic names.

Sixth, require labels on certain products to warn the public of potential dangers in their use

Seventh, the Federal Government ought to subsidize information agencies and publications for the benefit of consumers

Eighth, the Federal Government should sponsor "reprisal" advertising to protect consumers from being misled by industry-sponsored advertising

Ninth, program content should be controlled or federally sponsored radio and television or subscription television should be fostered to give the consumer freedom from advertising

Tenth, advertising rates should be regulated and advertising content should be screened for questionable material.

There are only a few of the serious proposals aimed at providing a remedy for the economic and social ills that opponents ascribe to "the American experience" in product advertising. Needless to say, they are criticisms and proposals directly affecting every member of this audience—and, indeed, every American with a stake in our existing economic and social system.

My purpose today isn't to discuss in detail the substance, merit or lack of merit contained in these criticisms and proposals.

Instead, it's to warn that the critics who hold to these views, and who are successfully advancing these proposals in the Halls of Congress and the Executive Agencies, aren't being effectively answered by those who could—but don't present the affirmative side of the case.

Specifically, I mean you and people like yourself—those who have helped create and develop our unique and envied American System of product advertising—but who, through the years, have been far less effective in creating and developing public policy positions to defend that system from its detractors.

Does advertising run up the cost of products?

Is the American Consumer being given sufficient information through advertising to make intelligent cost and quality choices at the supermarket?

Are large corporate advertising budgets a pernicious force endangering our competitive marketing system?

These fundamental questions raised by the criticisms and proposals previously mentioned must be answered—and effectively—or far-reaching legal and regulatory curbs are sure to be placed on our present marketing and advertising system.

The first step toward providing such an-

swers is, of course, a long, hard look within the system itself to determine what merit, if any, there is to the criticisms I have outlined. Early industry action toward prevention and cure of any abuses and excesses in the system is, after all, the best defense against its critics.

Beyond this, there is the matter of providing the public—and those who represent the public—with the affirmative side of the story. The vacuum must be filled with facts, figures, in-depth information and arguments establishing the merits of the system for every American to see and understand.

Private industry and those who have the greatest stake in our existing marketing system have been laggard in providing such facts, figures and information and arguments in recent years. Perhaps it just never seemed to be necessary before. But perhaps if a better job had been done explaining the system in past years, the Washington followers of Lyndon might today be honoring it as are Moscow's followers of Lenin.

The fact is that American business has spent hundreds of millions of dollars to perfect its products and services and sell them to the American consumer, and that the advertising profession has developed its skills and techniques to multi-billion dollar levels. But we have taken for granted the system itself. We have done little to sell its merits, or to shore its defenses against the attacks of its opponents.

As a result, it isn't inaccurate to say that the public policy threat the advertising industry faces today—and will face for years to come—has its origins in the industry's failure years ago, to develop effective resources and allies to defend the system.

As a Member of Congress, I speak with first-hand knowledge about the end result of this failure. But as a businessman, I have also viewed the problem from another perspective.

And from this perspective, long before coming to Washington, I had reached certain conclusions about how the advertising industry might strengthen its position against the attacks of its opponents.

It may be that my view has been conditioned by my experience as the Editor and Publisher of what we in the mass market age call a small city daily. But then again, this isn't the worst perspective in the world from the standpoint of the American advertising industry.

After all, aside from Moscow's *Literary Gazette*—America's small city media is among the most enthusiastic supporters of our free enterprise system has.

Unfortunately, this support is largely a one-sided affair. For, ironically, the American advertising industry, which is under attack by advocates of centralized authority in government, in fact encourages the trend to centralization in our society through its own practices.

I refer to major advertisers' overlooking the so-called small market media—that is, the dailies and weeklies that identify with individual, neighborhood and local markets—in favor of playing what one advertising man himself recently termed "the numbers game".

The January 15 issue of *Ad Age* quotes a client as telling his agency that "one cannot reconcile numbers with impact, nor a statistic with a customer's point of view."

The author of the Article, Herbert Manloveg, concludes—and I quote: "It's time that we," that is, advertising men and women, "walked away from the warm refuge of statistics and honestly projected rationales based on what might create impact instead of just how many numbers we can develop."

My point simply is that a close, if not a casual, relationship exists between the political philosophy that thinks only in terms of masses and the need to centralize, and the marketing philosophy that thinks in terms of

reaching the individual American purchaser, not as a member of a community or neighborhood, but as a mere statistic.

Thus, while advertising practitioners certainly don't owe it to small town media to invest a share of their clients' revenue outside the mass market media, they may owe it to their clients—and to themselves.

Certainly the prospect of small town media slowly disappearing from the national scene as a result of the trend to "numbers games" and mass audience appeals isn't inviting.

The natural life would suffer through a diminution of choice in our free press system—our free enterprise system would be deprived of an important, indeed a vital segment of support—and the ultimate and total success of the advocates of centralized political and economic control in our country would be assured.

Today, these dealers in mass, centralized government and economics have brought their cause to high tide, in Washington and throughout the country. And make no mistake, their ultimate and total success will mean nothing less than the end of the free market system and "the American experience" in advertising as we have known and projected from it.

My responsibility as a Member of Congress who believes in our system—and in the contribution made to that system by your industry—is clear. Your own responsibility is no less clear, and your failure to meet it can only result in my failure, and that of my colleagues in Congress, to stem the tide toward a controlled economy.

For our system—"the American experience"—can only survive if American industry itself recognizes its responsibilities and interests in the field of public policy—responsibilities and interests which, when all is said and done, should reflect and encompass the larger interests of our nation's consuming public.

### False Optimism About Vietnam

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, false optimism and self-delusion continue to dominate official reports from both Washington and Saigon as to the effects of the onslaught being carried out by the Vietcong in major cities and provincial capitals of Vietnam.

The devastating attacks mounted by the insurgents—with the acquiescence or the complicity of many whose hearts and minds Ambassador Komer boasts are secure—cannot be dismissed as the enemy's death rattle.

Yet today General Westmoreland tells us that heavy enemy losses "may measurably shorten the war." I am sure that many Senators would like to know precisely what measurement the general is using. Has he determined, for instance, how many thousands of innocent civilians are included in these impressive body counts that flow from official quarters with nauseous regularity?

Mr. President, the tragic history of U.S. intervention in Vietnam is replete with Government declarations that we have at last "turned the corner." Seldom it is that the American public hears the unvarnished truth about a war that



has been described by my esteemed friend, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, RICHARD RUSSELL, as "one of the great tragedies of our history."

And seldom has a Member of this body done the physical and mental spadework about the sickening complexity that is Vietnam as has the senior Senator from Massachusetts, EDWARD M. KENNEDY. He has, with candor and objectivity, thoroughly analyzed the interplaying tragedy of millions of Vietnamese refugees whose plight is made the more desperate by indiscriminate American military operations and the bottomless corruption of the Saigon government.

Since his recent return from an exhaustive trip to Vietnam, Senator KENNEDY has examined the human cost of the war in terms of the homeless and the destitute. He has also put into proper perspective the damage being done the true interest of the Vietnamese, and U.S. objectives as well, by the self-serving clique that can only profit by our actions and the suffering of its people.

Senator KENNEDY speaks of the necessity of a "confrontation" with the Government of South Vietnam in order that they be made to realize that the present conflict is basically theirs to win or lose, and that reasonable conditions are going to be placed upon further American involvement unless they take immediate steps to put their house in order.

I might add, Mr. President, that the American people ought to demand a similar confrontation with the administration so that President Johnson can state in no uncertain terms what ends we now seek in Vietnam, in view of the limited means available to us. I would hope that this "new look" at a deteriorating situation there might offer the opportunity to lower our objectives, and raise the hopes of millions for an earlier rather than later termination of the war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two addresses by the senior Senator from Massachusetts be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY BEFORE THE WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF BOSTON ON HIS RECENT TRIP TO SOUTH VIETNAM, JANUARY 25, 1968

It is a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to appear before the World Affairs Council, to discuss my recent trip to Vietnam.

Vietnam is not the only nation in Southeast Asia that presents us with dangers in our foreign policy. We know of the continued insurgency in the Northeast corner of Thailand, of the invasion of Laos by North Vietnamese forces, and the increasing bellicosity of the North Koreans that resulted this week in an almost unprecedented seizure of an American Naval vessel. These must be matters of concern to us all and they are situations to be watched with care and treated with sound judgment. But Vietnam is where we have tied down so much of our manpower, our resources, our energies, and our hopes.

As Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, I went to Vietnam to investigate our progress, or lack of progress, in both our refugee and our civilian casualty programs. Within the next two or three weeks, I expect to make a detailed report to the Senate of my findings within

the area of these specific responsibilities. Today, I wish to be more general.

I certainly did not go to Vietnam expecting suddenly to find the solution to the war. I return with no blueprint for immediate success, no scheme for peace that others have missed.

But I believe I do return with a greater sensitivity, with greater feeling about our total efforts there. These I wish to share with you.

I last visited Vietnam in 1965, at the beginning of the massive buildup there of American presence. At that time, the Viet Cong threat was at a peak. The danger was imminent that they would take over the country, destroying in the process whatever free institutions the people enjoyed. The decision was made by the United States during this period to revise significantly our role in Southeast Asia. We have held to that decision with little change since then.

At that period in the struggle we took every claim of progress as a strong sign of hope—perhaps because the situation was so dismal. One left Saigon in 1965 feeling things were going to get better, simply because they could not get worse. I left at that time not with any hope of victory in the near future but at least with the hope that some real progress was on the horizon, that some real improvement, some easing of pain was in store for the people of Vietnam who had suffered so long—and for our people too.

On my return this year from Vietnam, I am forced to report to you, and to the people of the Commonwealth, that continued optimism cannot be justified. I am forced to conclude that the objectives we set forth to justify our initial involvement in that conflict, while still defensible, are now less clear and less attainable than they seemed in the past.

And I believe that if current policies relating to the nature of the war are not changed, and the assumptions underlying civilian programs are not revised, then the prospects for individual freedom and political stability in Vietnam in the foreseeable future are dim.

In essence, I found that the kind of war we are fighting in Vietnam will not gain our long-range objectives; that the pattern of destruction we are creating can only make a workable political future more difficult; and that the government we are supporting has given us no indication, and promises little, that it can win the lasting confidence of its own people.

The war in Vietnam is unlike the traditional wars in our history in which we were prepared to act alone. Our country was not attacked, our cities were not threatened. We do not seek to overthrow an enemy government, capture ground, or achieve an unconditional surrender. We seek only to allow the people a free choice. For these reasons the war is more nebulous, more vague in its ends, than the conflicts of our past. And for precisely these reasons, there is always the chance that our actions, if not fully considered, can exceed our needs. That is why we must be careful in applying the traditional canons of patriotism, or the clichés of the past, in judging this war. As our military effort must be more sophisticated than any other in the past, so must our views as citizens on the policy questions before us.

But before I elaborate on these points, let me share with you some of my personal impressions after observing the war in Vietnam.

First, I was deeply impressed by the American servicemen who are serving there. I had hours of discussion with them, from the Delta in the south to Danang in the north. The man who serves there today is in the tradition of his father who fought in the South Pacific and his brother who walked the length of the Korean Peninsula. Because of the greater opportunities he has had

at home, he is perhaps more professional, more intelligent and more aware of his own capabilities as a man and as a soldier. He is there to do a job, and he does it well.

Criticism of the war is not criticism of these individuals. They do not make policy; but no policy makers ever had better men to carry out their objectives. If bravery, skill and sheer force could win this war, these men would win it. But it is these very characteristics that should give us pause—these men whose lives are too precious to sacrifice endlessly or needlessly. We owe much to our fighting men. Our responsibilities to them are great and grave. To interpret criticism of our policies as a lack of support for our men is to suggest that we blindly abandon them to policies without an intelligent consideration of alternatives that may be open to us.

The valor of our troops is one impression I brought back with me from Vietnam. A second strong impression was radically different: the paradox of the city of Saigon.

Saigon has grown over the past three years by almost two million people. The contrasts there are painful. A small, privileged segment of Vietnamese society is thriving in this center of war economy. These privileged individuals are content with the status quo.

But those who have been driven in from the countryside and must now live in the streets and the hovels present a different picture. These people are not doing well in this war, and they know the price of the conflict very well. Vietnam is a nation in which reverence for the dead is the highest trait of character. Yet I saw people in Saigon who are forced to live in graveyards, and have even hollowed out tombs to find shelter. This is a city where thousands of young men 18 and 19 years old flash about the streets on their motorbikes, wearing cowboy hats and leather gloves, exempt from the war and oblivious to the sacrifices of others. Yet this is also a city where 40 per cent of the death toll is accounted for by children under two years of age, children killed primarily by dysentery or pneumonia.

The contrasts of the major city are reflected as well in the countryside. From the air, Vietnam is a beautiful land, but when you descend from the sky you see clearly the pockmarks of war, and when you walk through the villages you see the ravages of war in the faces of the sick and wounded children. Beyond the villages abandoned fields stretch to the horizon, and scorched outlines of houses burned to the ground sometimes cover more than half the land area of a province. Whole areas which have been bulldozed to the ground are commonplace, and so are wide corridors of defoliated forests, and fields that once produced food. Here and there are compounds of long sheds with shiny tin roofs—the refugee camps where thousands upon thousands of people have been herded together, uprooted from all they ever knew or wanted.

These are the people of Vietnam, the peasants of Vietnam. They are not a demanding people. Their simplicity is overwhelming, their wants meager. I had the opportunity to visit more than 25 refugee camps and talk to hundreds of their people. I was struck with the fact that they—and their fellow peasants who make up the vast majority of the population—have no ideological commitment to anything beyond their own families, and perhaps their hamlets or villages. The provincial government, and the central government in Saigon, are nothing but far-away titles to most of them. The debate over communism and freedom has little meaning.

I do not mean to suggest that the peasant of Vietnam would be unresponsive to any form of government. But I do suggest that their concerns and their hopes should not always be considered identical to ours. As a leading intellectual in Vietnam told me, "The peasant may have no political notion of democracy, but he does carry a strong de-

sire for justice." The form of government they want, according to him, is a just government. And none of the governments they have seen in their lifetime have been just to them. To them, the promises of the United States and the promises of the Viet Cong make little difference, even if ours are real and the others propaganda. What they are interested in is the way of life which causes the least further disruption in their already disrupted lives.

We tend to think of refugees as a small minority of people who have been caught in a passing conflict. But when I discuss the refugees in Vietnam, I am talking about literally 25 per cent of that nation's population, all of whom are disaffected, all of whom hold a strong resentment for whatever side tore them away from the simplicity of their lives to the squalor and the bureaucracy of the camps. Most of these people are totally disenchanted with the powers on both sides responsible for their fate. Vietnam today is a land of disenchanted people.

I found a great deal of resentment toward the United States among these people. I asked all of those to whom I spoke how and why they became refugees. The vast majority—I would judge over 80 per cent—claimed they were either deposited in camps by the Americans or fled to camps in fear of American airplanes and artillery. Only a handful claimed they were driven from their homes by the Viet Cong.

The French, one leader told me, committed many sins in Vietnam. But the French did not wipe out their villages, or burn down their homes, or herd them into enclosures in the name of security, when many felt more secure, with more food and less disease, where they were.

It is apparent to me that it is the refugees of Vietnam, and their brothers in the hamlets, whom we must win over for any policy to succeed. But all too often this task may be almost impossible, because of that one forgotten and seemingly insignificant act in a fast-moving war, the destruction of a home or a hamlet—and that most significant fact, that we displayed no compassion thereafter.

One further impression—and perhaps the strongest and most depressing—is the impression of the Viet Cong themselves. I spoke to Vietnamese and Americans alike who have either known the enemy from years of experience or have encountered him in the dark of night. The determination of the Viet Cong is awful to behold. They are capable of great cruelty. They often attack positions using the peasant and his home as a shield. They use the familiar tactics of the terrorist, relying upon fear when persuasion fails.

I met with one woman and her family of five in Ben Cat the morning after the Viet Cong had taken her husband from his bed and cut his throat, leaving him dying in the yard. He had done no wrong, but control of this refugee area was slipping from the Viet Cong, and they needed an example of discipline.

The Viet Cong are driven by a belief in the rightness of their cause that comes from years of colonial rule and injustice inflicted by passing governments. This belief has grown strong on a sense of nationalism carefully nurtured and promoted by communist political cadres. It is true that their forces have been depleted by our weapons; in the Delta, we are capturing 14 and 15 year old boys. But it is just as true that in the past six months there has been more enemy activity in that area than there was when the Viet Cong were at the height of their strength. We must face this Viet Cong determination realistically and for what it is.

While I was in their country I tried to assess the spirit with which the Vietnamese on our side conduct their part of the war. For we are in Vietnam because they are in peril; it is their country, their war, their future. Every other time in our history when we have gone into battle to help others stay

free the other nations have been dedicated to the cause. When they were threatened, as Britain and Russia and South Korea were, they fought valiantly. Where they were conquered, as the French, the Poles, the Scandinavians, the Filipinos were, they turned guerrillas and did the best they could to resist.

But at this stage of the war in Vietnam, I believe the people we are fighting for do not fully have their hearts in the struggle. And I believe as well that the government that rules them does not have its heart in the cause of the people. So we are being forced to make the effort for them and take the risks they should be taking themselves.

We are losing 9,000 lives and spending \$30 billion a year, and have twice come close to mobilizing our reserves because of the war in Vietnam. But Saigon—faced with an enemy which controls more than half of its land area—has yet to declare a state of national mobilization.

Half of the American boys fighting in Vietnam are draftees. But in Saigon, it is common knowledge that a young man can buy his way out of the draft, or if he is in service can buy his release.

There are thousands of American men fighting in Vietnam and risking their lives. But in the country our men are defending, in Vietnam, the police must march through the streets in a house-to-house search seeking eligibles for the army. And they do this only when pressure is applied by critics. While I was in the country the government of South Vietnam refused to permit the drafting of 18-year-olds, because it does not consider the country to have reached a state of national emergency. As one member of the Vietnamese assembly stated during their debate on the subject, he could see no reason why he should vote to draft 18-year-olds to support what was an American effort.

South Vietnam's civilians who have been injured as a result of the war are victims of the same lack of concern. Each year 150,000 civilians are wounded in the war, and more than 25,000 are killed. Only 150 Vietnamese doctors are available to treat these civilian casualties, and they must also serve the entire population of over 13 million. And yet I learned, in discussions with members of the government, that they plan to divert many of this meager number by drafting more doctors into the military.

Were it not for the private doctors from the United States and other free world nations who have gone to Vietnam on their own time; and were it not for the fact that the United States military has finally accepted some measure of responsibility for the civilians killed and injured in the fighting, there would be almost no doctors at all to help these people.

I tried to warn Vietnamese officials of the suffering that would result if they removed the skilled medical people from the civilian population. They did not appear to be impressed.

There are those who say that such a lack of compassion is normal in a continent which has seen so much suffering for so many centuries. In matters such as this, they maintain, we must make allowances for the Asian mind. But I visited more than twenty provincial hospitals and dispensaries. I entered pediatric wards at 11 o'clock at night and saw rats in the rafters and filth on the floors, windows without screens, children wide-eyed with pain, and no Vietnamese personnel to comfort them or care for them. And I cannot believe that this suffering is made any easier by the cultural background of the sufferers.

I say that the explanation for this terrible situation is not cultural but political. I say that most of the officials in Saigon do not care about these stricken people; that they are more interested in maintaining their own positions of power than in helping the victims of the war; and that from the way they

look upon the people outside Saigon, and the way they treat the peasants elsewhere, they have become much like the colonialists who trained them. They are truly colonialists in their own nation.

Along with this lack of urgency and this indifference toward the enemy and toward its own people, the government of South Vietnam is infested as well with corruption. It is almost impossible to go to Vietnam and speak with any candid American or South Vietnamese citizen without instantly becoming involved in a discussion of the corruption of the central government. Government jobs are bought and paid for by people seeking a return on their investments. Police accept bribes. Officials and their wives run operations in the black market. AID funds and hospital supplies are diverted into private pockets. Army vehicles are used for private purposes, supplies disappear and show up in the bootleg stores on the street.

Corruption pervades all aspects of Vietnamese life, and it is brazenly practiced. For example: our government decided it would be helpful if veterans of the Vietnamese army could come to the United States to study at American universities and learn about our country. We asked the government of South Vietnam to select some qualified men for this opportunity. The list they gave us consisted mainly of relatives of government officials. When we discovered this, we asked them to find other men, unrelated to them. But after the second list came in, it was discovered that all of the new applicants had been made to promise a percentage of their scholarship payments to the officials who chose them.

Let me detail some examples in the refugee field. We now have given South Vietnam \$30 million a year for refugee relief. In my many conversations with the hard-pressed American refugee personnel, it was estimated that only half of the supplies ever reach the refugee. The officials of the government of South Vietnam, and the province chiefs supported by them, have the keys to the warehouses, and they keep much of the goods for themselves. Each refugee is supposed to receive the equivalent of \$45 for resettlement. It was estimated to me by a U.S. official adviser to the refugee program that 75 per cent of this amount is siphoned off before it reaches these people.

Provincial officials are given a certain amount of money each year to spend on refugee relief. But instead of using it to provide for refugees, many of them lend this money at high rates of interest, collecting it back just in time to make the expenditures before the end of the budget year.

In the field of refugee care and in many other fields, the government of South Vietnam has been engaged in the systematic looting of its own people. Many of its officials have, as their overriding concern, taken as much as they can, while they can, from the treasure of American wealth. When we in America are being asked to pay a surtax of 10 per cent to support this war, we have a right to demand that these practices in South Vietnam stop.

Until the government of South Vietnam undertakes to reform itself; until it decides to work a seven-day week as the Americans are doing; until it resolves to mobilize the nation, to draft the young men who should be fighting for their country instead of playing in the cities, until it rids itself of the cancer of corruption—until it does these things, it will not be worthy of the respect of its people. It will not receive their support for the war, and the war will become more and more an American instead of a Vietnamese effort.

As I mentioned at the outset, I did not go to Vietnam in pursuit of a plan for peace. A short trip to Vietnam, even by someone who follows the issues closely, does not arm one with credentials and the information necessary to talk authoritatively of specific peace



moves and solutions. Nevertheless, I feel no report to the people of this state on my impressions on the war would be complete without some personal conclusions.

I do not wish to engage in speculation on whether or not we have been aggressive enough in grasping offers to negotiate an end to the war, but I would question the wisdom of some who feel that a great deal of the negotiations for peace must be carried out before the negotiating table is ever reached.

Admittedly, we are confronted with cunning men in Hanoi. But I have sufficient faith in our own ingenuity and bargaining ability to believe that we can discuss settlement before many major military issues are resolved. Negotiations will not be a quick or painless solution to the Vietnam war, but the sooner they begin, the sooner men of peace, rather than those concerned solely with military victory, will begin bringing their influence to bear on the ultimate result.

But if negotiations are not forthcoming, or if they face a great delay, we must ask ourselves whether the gains we can achieve are worth the staggering costs we now incur. American officials I talked to in Vietnam are emphatic that we must not expect too much from the central government, that the effort to win the people and discourage the VC will go slowly, and that we cannot hope for an end to our involvement for another five or ten years. It is easy to accept five to ten years in the abstract, but it becomes more difficult when years are translated into dollars—another \$150 to \$300 billion at the current level of spending. And I find it impossible to talk of our future in Vietnam in terms of another 50,000 to 100,000 young Americans dead. Last year, 9,000 boys died; this year we will lose 10,000. Unless we change the way we fight in this war, the death toll will grow even larger while the gains, computed by often meaningless statistics, will merely creep along, to mock the offering of this, the most precious gift we have.

And so it is that the rising cost of American lives and the damage, both political and physical, that we inflict on the people, cause me to view current military actions with great dismay. As a result, I believe that if we cannot achieve negotiations in the very near future, we should begin immediately to moderate significantly our military activities in South Vietnam to levels more tolerable to all and more commensurate with our limited aims. Our overriding goal should be to maximize the safety and security of the Vietnamese people and our own soldiers, rather than to search out the enemy in his territory and on his terms. To produce a flow of statistics of enemy killed, roads opened, hamlets secured, is not our goal in Vietnam, and it is not worthy of our effort. To seek to justify a war by such meaningless numbers is not only new to the American experience—it is unbecoming to a great nation.

The adoption of a more defensive military posture, one designed to protect and hold areas of heavy population rather than to seek out the enemy, has, I found, some support among our military leaders in Vietnam. And at the same time—as essential to this strategy—we would have to demand more from the South Vietnamese government in the basic political effort of gaining the allegiance of the people who would be under the protection of the U.S. and other free world forces.

This task can only be successfully fulfilled by the government of South Vietnam. But given our expenditure of lives and treasure, and the threat of Vietnam to our own domestic tranquility, it is largely our responsibility to see that they accomplish this task. For too long we have tolerated not only government corruption but government indifference to the people. We have refused to confront Sai-

gon with the same determined fury we have unleashed on Hanoi. But they too must face the hard demands of war—and those demands should be placed before them by us in clear and concrete terms.

I would urge a confrontation between our government and the government of South Vietnam on the entire question of corruption, inefficiency, waste of American resources and the future of "the other war". They should be told in terms that will leave no doubt that if they find it impossible to attract the people of Vietnam to their own constitutional government, the American people will rightfully demand serious alterations in the nature of the United States involvement.

We can have an enormous influence over the government of South Vietnam if only we choose to use it. They know that if we were not there they would collapse. We came to their aid because their people were in danger of a communist takeover. But today many of their officials believe that, because of our fear of China and of our deep concern about communist advances in Southeast Asia, we are tied to Vietnam irrevocably. As a result, I believe they feel they can act as they wish towards the war and towards their own people, confident we will fill the gaps they will leave.

They must be disabused of the belief that American men and American money are a fixture in Vietnam. There is no lack of will in this country to assist others anxious to help themselves, but Saigon should know that American resources are not infinite and that patience has its limits. Above all else, the American people will not be content with the giving of lives, with making the ultimate sacrifice for a government which refuses to share proportionately in that sacrifice.

So it should be made clear to the elected government of South Vietnam that we cannot continue, year after year, picking up the pieces of their failures. We should as a nation do all that is necessary to prepare that government to take over their true responsibilities. But if they are unwilling to accept them, they should be aware that the American people, with great justification, may well consider their responsibilities fulfilled.

Almost two centuries ago, Thomas Paine, a man who wrote of our own struggle as a young nation, stated, "those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it." That lesson still holds today. No nation has done more in the last quarter century than the United States to promote and preserve freedom in this world. We have done so because peace under freedom was the watchword in the creation of our own republic and is the highest aspiration of all men. Our word is good to all who share that aspiration with us and to all who will work with us to attain it now and maintain it in the future.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY  
BEFORE THE AMERICAN ADVERTISING FEDERATION,  
WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1968

It is a pleasure for me to have an opportunity to address the Tenth Annual Conference of the American Advertising Federation.

I am aware that your gathering in Washington this year is concerned with the effects of public policy on the advertising industry. I wish to speak today, however, of a subject far removed from the topics of this conference, but a subject that is first in the minds of all Americans—Vietnam.

I recently returned from my second visit to Vietnam. As Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, I went to that country to investigate both the refugee and civilian casualty aspects of the war, as well as the programs that have been devised to meet these problems. Upon my return I made a report to the people of the Commonwealth of Mas-

sachusetts, before the World Affairs Council in Boston. The burden of that report was that after two weeks of travel over the entire country of Vietnam, after hours of discussions with our military leaders, our civilian officials, members of the South Vietnamese government, other Vietnamese leaders and hundreds of peasants in their fields and homes, I came back less optimistic than when I left. I returned with the feeling that, regardless of how many men, planes, artillery and tons of equipment we poured into that country, little real progress has been made, and little could be expected, as long as our overall military response remained the prime answer to the challenge we face.

This is not to say that Vietnam would have remained free of communist control had our presence there not been great. It is true that in 1965 that nation and its armies were on the verge of collapse. Only our presence in great numbers forestalled the disintegration of the government. Since then, however, we have relied totally upon the fact of our presence there as a guarantee of eventual success. Once the continued life of the nation as we knew it was assured by our presence, we did not really seize the opportunity to guarantee its future in our absence. We succumbed, I believe, to the theory that enough American men and enough American machines can change the tide of events by sheer weight alone. We saw this happen before when the homes and industry of America changed the course of modern history. But Vietnam is not a challenge that lends itself to solution by traditional methods of warfare. Man and machines deployed in the assistance of a foreign people facing internal attack must be matched by the will and determination of the people being defended. Without that, our gifts of life and treasure will have little meaning and little success.

Vietnam is a place of contradictions, glaring contrasts and inconsistencies. One returns with varied impressions about the war, the people, their government, and the nature of the enemy. The only constant impression, the only one stable element in Vietnam that can be recognized throughout, is the impression gained of the United States fighting man.

The American soldier in Vietnam has a most difficult, a most dangerous and often a most frustrating assignment. It is fortunate for us that, because of advances in our own society, today's serviceman is more professional, more intelligent and more aware of his own capabilities as a man and soldier. These men cannot be faulted for the progress or lack of progress of the war; neither can they be judged by critics of the war for policies they do not make. If bravery, skill and sheer force could win in Vietnam that struggle would have been won long ago. But because we have much to be proud of in these men we also have a grave responsibility to be sure beyond doubt that we do not ask them to give needlessly or endlessly in this struggle.

During my stay in Vietnam I had the opportunity to travel the entire length of the country and to observe how the war differs from place to place, not only in terms of the nature of the fighting, but in the reactions upon the Vietnamese people whose nation we are seeking to secure. Unfortunately, many of the provincial capitals and towns that I travelled to suffered heavily last week, and I am sure that many of the people to whom I spoke did not survive the onslaught.

In the Delta of the south—in Can Tho, My Tho, Ben Tre—the struggle is, and may prove to be in the future, the most difficult of all. There is the saying that the war began in the Delta and it must end there. This is the richest land in Southeast Asia. It can produce enough rice to feed all Vietnam and still be a major exporter. But today rice is imported, paddies are flooded by large bomb-shell craters and Viet Cong activity was, even

before last week, as great as ever in the past. Here, to a greater extent than anywhere else in Vietnam, the enemy is imbedded in the people. Friend and foe are truly indistinguishable. And with such unfavorable natural terrain and heavy concentrations of people I was told that any American effort to completely secure the Delta alone would require a doubling of our total commitment in Vietnam. Military actions in the Delta are small, but especially cruel. The Delta people are especially tired of constant warfare. They, like others seek peace not for the benefit of this or that government, but peace for its own sake.

In the Southern and Central part of the country, from Bien Hoa to Nha Trang and Qui Nhon, the war is fought more openly, the refugee camps are larger, the civilian casualties more numerous. The very size of the American presence comes into view—vast airfields, countless planes and helicopters, supply depots, administration buildings form vast islands of technology across the landscape. The cities and towns house the native employees of the United States and have grown large with the new bars built by the enterprising Vietnamese, often with the help and materials supplied through the channels of corruption.

Beyond the cities and bases, thousands and thousands of acres of forest and food-producing fields have been stripped by defoliants, and the area known as the Iron Triangle has been literally plowed into the ground. While ecologists debate the impact of these procedures of war on the future agricultural well-being of Vietnam, many of the people live in camps and, denied refugee food rations by maladministration and theft, risk the return to their fields to harvest under the fire of war. They care little for communism or democracy, and less for war. Years of suffering have produced an apathy that could be as dangerous to us as any ideology.

In the northern part of the country, from Pleiku to Da Nang and above to the Demilitarized Zone, the ravages of all-out war are easily seen. More than half of all the rural dwellings that existed in Quang Ngai province are gone, and the population has been clustered in groups of eight to ten thousand at the many refugee sites. This is I Corps, a place of mammoth military installations, cities strongly guarded, harbors filled with ships unloading into barges, and the threat of large scale military action always present. This is the territory of the Marines, a place of bravery and heroic stands, where the invading pressures from the North have made us familiar with the names of Conthien and Khesanh. It is also the area surrounding the ancient imperial city of Hue—the one city in Vietnam that contains all the pride, culture and ties to past glories the Vietnamese ever had, and ever will have for a long time to come.

But there is no city in Vietnam that is as complex and distressing as Saigon. There, thousands of young men eighteen or nineteen years old race through the streets on their motor bikes, exempt from the war and oblivious to the agony of their own nation. There resides a privileged segment of Vietnamese society, thriving on a war economy. But Saigon is also full of the helpless driven in by war, and as we have learned this week, by the Viet Cong sympathizer. Of all the cities hit in the recent attacks the shock had to be greatest in Saigon—so long immune to the pain of war. It remains to be seen whether the shock of street fighting in Saigon and deaths within their own families will awaken the Saigon cowboy, the profiteer and those in leisure to the fact that their nation is burning, or whether they will simply wait for the streets to be reopened to continue the good life while American boys give their good lives in the countryside.

I was in Saigon just three weeks ago unaware, as were too many others, that

the city then was an arsenal of VC weapons and the home of an attacking force. One could not tell from the bustle and the gaiety, the business as usual, the thriving black market and the long siestas and lunch hours that there was a war on, and Saigon had already been invaded in the night.

All across Vietnam the soldiers of the Viet Cong were lying in wait to attack more than half of the provincial capitals, the city of Saigon, our Embassy and major military installations. It has been estimated that more than 35,000 of the enemy were involved in what has proven to be one of the most stunning blows of the war. One week after the attack fighting raged in the outskirts of Saigon, Can Tho and Kontum and the VC flag was still visible above the walls of Hue. The enemy suffered a heavy death toll. But the act was committed and latest reports now are that the enemy has the strength and will do it again.

Yet before I left Vietnam, after eight days in the field, I spent my last day attending official military briefings, briefings that are usually given when one arrives in the country. I attended similar presentations in 1965—there was little difference between the two. It was pointed out again that the enemy was demoralized, that great overall progress was being made. The Viet Cong were still on their last legs and any accomplishments of theirs could only be a last gasp. The hallmark of the VC effort in 1968, as it was in 1965, was desperation. They were still forcing into their service 14 and 15 years olds. Clearly they were at the bottom of the barrel. We had made great inroads in penetrating their intelligence system. We knew more of their capabilities than ever before, and, while no promises were made about the end of the war, it was clearly all downhill.

I was shown multi-colored maps of roads that had been secured, or partly secured; of canals and rivers that had been opened, or partly opened. In 1965 I was told that the Viet Cong defection rate was increasing because the enemy's morale was so low; in 1968 I was told that the Viet Cong defection rate was decreasing because enemy morale was so low that negotiations were a possibility and the potential defector was now waiting for the solution.

I learned of a new computer system that prints out the status of 12,650 hamlets in the country. This system relied upon monthly worksheets filled out by people at the district level. In one recent month this computer digested a quarter-million bits of information to tell us that 66.9 per cent of the population in hamlets is secure, pretty secure or almost secure, the rest being contested or VC controlled. But now we have seen that after six years of fighting, the presence of half a million American men, more than 16,000 American boys killed and 100,000 wounded, there is no place in Vietnam that is secure—from the smallest hamlet in the jungle to the new indoor skating rink in Saigon.

I do not wish my criticism of the official reports I received in Vietnam to be misconstrued. There were no attempts made to deceive; no progress report was given without some basis in fact. What I did feel was that the conclusions of progress were drawn from chosen facts—facts that did not represent the total war in Vietnam. Those who talked to me of progress were talking of military things. Most of their estimates of success were based on military gains and losses, military hopes and military promises for the future.

But I had spent long days in the field talking with the Vietnamese peasant, with frustrated American civilians who share the danger of the night with the people—and they spoke of political things. They spoke of political promises that were never fulfilled, of VC propaganda that attacked a corrupt government in Saigon, of terrorism by the enemy and the political impact of villages

bombed, and of supplies and funds that were destined to assist the people in times of hardship and pain—supplies and funds that never got to the people but simply enriched the holdings of many Vietnamese officials.

Those in the field told me that the vast population of Vietnam could give their political allegiance and support to no one, for no one had earned it. But in the turmoil of this war the one who came closest to holding the grudging respect of the people was the enemy himself. I realize it would be most difficult to record these impressions in a computer, for they are not as easily measured as body counts and miles of road. They are, however, political indications of people, and nothing could be more important in Vietnam.

For the war in Vietnam is a political war. It is a war that is being waged over which formula of government will control the lives of 16 million people. As such, while military activities can surely kill the proponents of one formula or another, such actions alone can never eradicate the idealism and the ideology from which the formula springs. As no nation, however powerful, could tear the spark of democracy from the American people, no force, however strong, will ever change the minds of those committed to communism. Only example, only deeds that demonstrate compassion, concern, and the best interests of the people, will attract a society to the government in power.

We have long recognized that the war in Vietnam was different from American involvement of the past. We never at any point set out to meet the usual goals of war—the overthrow of a government, the capturing of land in any other nation or the unconditional surrender of our foe. But while we have in theory viewed the war as different from wars of the past, I believe we have reacted to and evaluated progress in Vietnam mostly in military terms. This past week, for example, our first reaction to the raids on the cities was that the enemy had failed to take Saigon or most of the provincial capitals and hence they suffered a military defeat. We have stressed the numbers of enemy dead—a staggering total, yet unconfirmed, of 15,000 Viet Cong killed and four to five thousand captured—as another indication, that they failed. We have even implied that those in Hanoi or in the VC command in the South are in for another blow to their morale once they tally up the staggering losses of the week.

All of these evaluations may have some merit. But I suggest that we would be wiser as a nation to recognize that during the past week the Viet Cong and their allies from the North achieved an outstanding political victory. Such recognition would not be a sign of weakness on our part. It would be a most prudent act at this time of decision. A refusal to recognize the events of this week for what they were carries with it the possibility that our national reaction to these events may be inappropriate, wasteful, and perhaps dangerous.

The people of Vietnam now know better than we that there is no haven from the VC. To the people of Saigon the eventual announcement that our Embassy was secure did not mean as much as the fact that for hours it was not in our hands. And to the Vietnamese who look upon the City of Hue as the very symbol of their heritage it matters little that the enemy is finally being driven from the city. What is politically important is that the VC held it for a week and in its liberation one of the last monuments to Vietnam's past was all but destroyed.

I believe that to fully face up to the fact that what we and the South Vietnamese experienced was a heavy political blow will cause us to recognize that our response must be more political in nature than military.



I am sure there will be strong pressures upon the President and his Administration at this time to undertake some retaliatory steps that would match the heat of the moment. There are those who feel that the brazen acts of the enemy call for the commitment of additional American troops, or a more intensive use of our air power against the North, or even the encouragement for some ground actions beyond the borders of South Vietnam. This reaction is normal among a people that have been told of substantial progress in Vietnam—a nation that was told as recently as three months ago by the commander of our forces in Vietnam that the situation was "very, very encouraging."

The real fact of the matter appears to be that the Viet Cong did nothing last week that could be considered beyond their usual capabilities. They could have performed this act at any time in the past, and there is some likelihood that they will be able to do it again, regardless of the size of our commitment. For history has shown us before, and it has now been made painfully clear in Vietnam, that there is no foolproof military defense against an offense undertaken for pure political impact. The fact that our nation was taken aback by the ferocity of their actions stems more perhaps from our own optimistic evaluations of progress than from any increased strength of the enemy. We have, in essence, been relying on barometers that were measuring the strengths and weaknesses of the wrong storm.

Another difficult fact to be faced is that what the VC accomplished last week they could not have accomplished without the complicity of a sizeable share of the population. Major assaults were made on 26 provincial capitals, countless numbers of district headquarters, villages and U.S. bases with sophisticated weapons and sophisticated planning. Thirty-five thousand men were involved in an operation that must have demanded months of coordination. Prior to the attacks these men had to mass together, stockpile weapons and ammunition, eat, sleep and keep in communication.

Yet while we knew that plans were in effect for some kind of an offensive, we did not know where or when. This could not have been accomplished if there were a population of South Vietnamese that felt even a reasonable allegiance to its own government. Unless we assume that the enemy has the strongest internal security system known, it would have to be said that there was no one in those 26 cities and Saigon who felt compelled to inform the central government of the time and place and extent of even one of the attacks. The government was so unaware, it was reported, that in the capital city of Saigon fewer than half of the Vietnamese troops were in barracks and 50 per cent of the police were enjoying the holiday.

When I returned from Vietnam I reported the contempt of many Vietnamese for a government that was corrupt and ineffectual. I stated that the people we are fighting for do not fully have their hearts in the struggle, and the government that rules them does not have its heart in the cause of the people. I was simply reporting broadly-held sentiments that I encountered. I am convinced that we have felt the full weight of those sentiments in the past eight days.

What then of our response? I would urge that our reaction to the current crisis be one that attacks the deadly apathy of the people toward their government. The offensive of the near future must come from the government of Vietnam. If that government would set about the task—not in word but in deed—to reform itself, to make itself worthy of the respect of the people of South Vietnam, their response would be the equivalent of 100,000 or even 300,000 additional young Americans to police every street, house and structure of importance.

But I am afraid that if the government of South Vietnam cannot be a government of the people, if it cannot find a way to broaden its political base and eliminate its highly tuned corruption network, if it cannot stir the motivation of the people and what little is left of their idealism, then another million Americans cannot secure that country. It should be plain now to those who have lived off corruption that the good life can be wiped out. Unfortunately it also will be plain to those who look to Saigon for protection that as Saigon now stands, they will receive little.

Two years ago our government met with the government of South Vietnam in Hawaii. A year and a half ago there was a meeting in Manila, and ten months ago a gathering in Guam. It may well be timely for the powers in question to come together again—not simply for another meeting, but for a serious confrontation. The crisis of the moment, the increases in the losses of American lives, and the amount of national treasure flowing to Vietnam with a dangerous impact upon our own domestic tranquility demand such a confrontation.

It should be clearly stated to those with whom we have allied ourselves, those to whom we have given so much, that they cannot ask for additional American men to extricate them from a situation that only they can solve. They should be told that unless they have sufficient interest in the survival of their own country to mobilize that country for war, to draft their own young men at 18 and 19 years of age, to stop the sale of deferments, to place themselves on a seven-day week as do the members of the American mission and to eliminate the system of buying positions of military and political power—unless they have this kind of interest, they cannot long expect us to maintain ours.

I also firmly believe they should be informed that, should they fail to be an ally worthy of our efforts and our lives, we can not, we will not, continue to be the only people in Vietnam that fully support the present government of South Vietnam. They should be fully aware that, if they are unwilling to accept their responsibilities, then the American people, with great justification, may well consider their responsibilities fulfilled.

The Secretary of Defense in a report to the Congress during the past week stated: "No matter how great be the resources we commit to the struggle we cannot provide the South Vietnamese with the will to survive as an independent nation, with a sense of national purpose transcending the claims of family, friendship or regional origin; or with the ability and self-discipline a people must have to govern themselves. These qualities and attributes are essential contributions to the struggle only the people of South Vietnam themselves can supply."

That is the essence of the struggle in Vietnam. A timely indication by the government of South Vietnam that they are willing to render such a contribution would be the only meaningful and lasting answer to the challenge of the past week.

#### President Johnson's Message on Education

#### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my support for the package of educational measures President Johnson put before the Congress yesterday, a package

of measures designed to clear away the barriers now keeping the Nation's poor and disadvantaged from going to college.

Millions of Americans, ranging from the slum child trapped in grinding poverty to the suburban child tied to a lean family budget, now face knotty financial problems they cannot untangle in seeking a college education.

The programs President Johnson called for yesterday—programs made as trim and tight as possible in this year of financial burden—would give new hope to needy students throughout the Nation.

One new measure would provide \$15 million to establish programs of tutoring, counseling and special services aimed at giving financially troubled students an opportunity to succeed in college.

Almost 1.5 million young men and women would be helped to achieve their college goals next year through student aid programs. President Johnson has proposed to make available more scholarships and guaranteed bank loans.

In an effort to help colleges reduce the growing financial burdens they must shoulder, President Johnson has asked for a Network for Knowledge Act designed to encourage institutions of higher learning to share their facilities and faculties.

The President has recommended broadening and strengthening many higher education and national defense education laws that have proved potent weapons in the fight to make a college education available to more citizens.

In addition, he has asked for more funds to shore up the Teacher Corps, to solve the dropout problem, to remove the barriers holding back bilingual students and handicapped students, to help strengthen adult education and early childhood education.

Pointing out the many financial problems now looming before private colleges and universities, President Johnson called for a long-range administration study to find ways of helping these private institutions of higher learning.

President Johnson's proposals—the steps we need to take if the United States is to achieve its full educational potential—deserve the support of every Member of the House.

I feel sure my colleagues join me in urging swift and favorable action on these measures.

#### The Seizure of the "Pueblo": Some International Law Aspects

#### HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Alfred P. Rubin, associate professor of law at the School of Law of the University of Oregon, has sent me a most useful and interesting analysis he prepared of the international law implications of the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

Professor Rubin's analysis hinges upon the facts and possibilities of what happened that have appeared in print. Some

of his memorandum deals with the possibilities of what may have occurred.

I have found it valuable myself in judging the implications of this incident, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, so others may also have the benefit of its contents.

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

THE SEIZURE OF THE "PUEBLO": SOME INTERNATIONAL LAW ASPECTS

(By Alfred P. Rubin)

On January 24, 1968, the seizure of the U.S. Navy Ship Pueblo by North Korean military forces was announced. While this is being written the disposition of the vessel and the 83 men on board have not been determined. Three legal questions are posed: (1) To what extent was the seizure of the Pueblo justifiable in international law; (2) Regardless of the rights or wrongs involved in the seizure, what is the legal status of the 83 man ship's complement and the vessel itself; and (3) What is the United States' legal recourse to seek a satisfactory settlement of the situation. In the discussion that follows these three questions will be handled separately.

I. THE SEIZURE

A. Assuming the seizure and all actions of the Pueblo immediately preliminary to it took place about 15 miles from the nearest land, they would have taken place beyond the zone in which a coastal state has the right under customary international law as codified by the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone dated April 29, 1958,<sup>1</sup> to exercise the control necessary to prevent infringement of its customs, fiscal, immigration or sanitary regulations.<sup>2</sup> Only one basis of right is recognized in international law to justify the exercise of jurisdiction over a foreign vessel beyond that zone in time of peace: self-defense.<sup>3</sup> The concept of self-defense in international law rests upon the immediacy of the danger and the unavailability of other recourse.<sup>4</sup> Complete knowledge as to the activities of the Pueblo is not available to the general public. Steps taken by the North Koreans to argue for their cessation by the United States before recourse was had to seizure make it possible that the seizure was a last resort. In order to determine whether an "overwhelming" threat existed it would be necessary to know the full range of the Pueblo's activities. Such a threat might be construed, for example, if the Pueblo were an integral part of a communications net giving orders or receiving reports from non-Communist military agents in North Korea. In the classical case of the *Caroline* the British were finally considered to be justified in sinking an American vessel in an American port on the Great Lakes where that vessel was the headquarters of Canadian rebels but was not in fact a gunboat.

In fact, the relations between the United States and North Korea are not relations "in time of peace". The hostilities which pitted United Nations forces led by the United States<sup>5</sup> against North Korea and Red Chinese "volunteers" were ended by an armistice agreement signed at Panmunjom on July 27, 1953<sup>6</sup>, but it is accepted in international law that an armistice does not end the legal status of belligerency<sup>7</sup> and that each side therefore retains belligerent rights vis-a-vis the other to the extent the armistice agreement does not prohibit the exercise of those rights. Furthermore, even though the armistice agreement orders a complete cessation of naval hostilities<sup>8</sup>, the United States has argued strongly that any violation of the agreement justifies an equivalent countervailing action on the part of the other side.<sup>9</sup>

If the activities of the Pueblo violated the armistice agreement it would be difficult to say that measured and proportionate actions of North Korea to counter that violation were forbidden by the agreement.

The Panmunjom Agreement provides<sup>10</sup> that the opposing "naval forces shall respect the waters contiguous to the Demilitarized Zone and to the land area of Korea under the military control of the opposing side". The word "contiguous" here is undefined and need not be taken to be identical in extent with the zone defined in the Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone within which certain police authority may be exercised. Although the word "contiguous" is the same in indentifying the zone in both documents, the Geneva Convention was concluded five years after the Panmunjom armistice and with other contexts in mind. There may be a genuine disagreement between the United States and its allies on the one hand and North Korea and its allies on the other as to the extent seaward of the waters "contiguous to the . . . land area of Korea under the military control of the opposing side". This is not to say that the North Koreans' interpretation is correct, merely that some additional knowledge is necessary as to the basis for North Korean assertions that the Pueblo was in waters forbidden to United States naval vessels before it is possible to assert with complete assurance that the North Korean seizure violated the armistice agreement.

Even if it were clear that the "contiguous" waters referred to in the armistice agreement were limited to twelve miles from the Korean coastal baseline and the Pueblo had not entered those waters, it would have to be known whether the seizure were a measured response to some other action of the United States taken in violation of the armistice agreement before it could be confidently asserted that the North Korean seizure violated international law.

In fact, reprisals by North Korea against the Pueblo might be justified if the United States had violated international law apart from the Panmunjom Agreement. The theoretical scope of justifiable reprisals will be discussed in Section III below. For present purposes it need be noted merely that if the North Korean seizure was a measured and proportional step in a series of escalations and counter-escalations, it would be difficult to classify it as a violation of international law.

B. What would be the legal situation if in fact the Pueblo had approached closer than twelve miles to the baselines from which the Contiguous Zone of North Korea is measured under the customary international law codified by the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone?

Under the Panmunjom Agreement the Commanders of the opposing sides are required to "withdraw all of their military forces, supplies and equipment from the rear and the coastal islands and waters of Korea of the other side", and if the military forces are not withdrawn the other side has "the right to take any action which it deems necessary for the maintenance of security and order".<sup>11</sup> The term "coastal . . . waters" is not defined except to the extent that it can be inferred that the term is identical in meaning to the term "waters contiguous" that appears elsewhere in the Agreement.<sup>12</sup> In fact, the United Nations Command's military forces were withdrawn from proximity to North Korea and the provision for withdrawal can be assumed to have been completely carried out; the provision for withdrawal appears to have related to the mechanics of the cease-fire, not the regime that was to apply after the cease-fire became effective. At the time the agreement was negotiated it was expected that the regime set up by it would be temporary.<sup>14</sup> It may be

concluded that the provision cited above is not pertinent to the present question.

Nonetheless, a question is raised by the activities of the Pueblo that might have brought her into the contiguous zone mentioned in the Geneva Convention regarding permissible measures available to North Korea to oppose that apparent violation. Since any violation of that "Contiguous Zone" would also seem to be a violation of the provision of the Panmunjom Agreement requiring naval forces to respect the waters contiguous to the land held by the opposing side, unless a more precise interpretation of that agreement is made known to the public, the legal effects of that hypothesized violation will also be discussed.

It may be noted that mere eavesdropping on communications is not normally considered to be an international wrong; many nations, including the USSR, send vessels equipped with radio interception gear and passive electronic receivers able to "hear" other emissions (such as radar emissions) to waters quite close to the land areas of foreign countries. Mere passive reception of radio emissions does not seem to be considered a violation of international law and no diplomatic correspondence calling it so seems to have been published, although many states seem sensitive to the efforts of others in this line.<sup>15</sup>

Leaving aside for the moment the hypothesized violation of the armistice agreement, and assuming that the only action of the Pueblo colorably threatening the security of North Korea was eavesdropping, there is a question whether eavesdropping is an action which customary international law forbids within the Contiguous Zone referred to in the Geneva Convention of 1958. As noted above, the Convention itself applies in terms only to violations of customs, fiscal, immigration or sanitary regulations, and does not seem to apply to other activities which may violate the municipal law of the coastal state. However, recent actions of the United States in applying its municipal fishing regulations to its Contiguous Zone<sup>16</sup> cast some doubt on the continued validity of the Geneva Convention as an exclusive definition of what regulations a coastal state may enforce in that zone.<sup>17</sup>

In the present case, North Korea claims a twelve mile territorial sea, and it can argue with some conviction that the rights it exercised in seizing the Pueblo were rights of a coastal state to prevent "non-innocent passage" through its territorial sea rather than the exercise of municipal law jurisdiction in a contiguous zone established under the customary law analogue of the permissive terms of the Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone. The Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone provides that "if any warship does not comply with the regulations of the coastal state concerning passage through the territorial sea and disregards any request for compliance which is made to it, the coastal State may require the warship to leave the territorial sea".<sup>18</sup> From all available information it appears that the Pueblo is a "warship" within the meaning of the Convention. It has been reported that in the weeks prior to the seizure North Korea did in fact protest the presence of the Pueblo along its coast; the protests were apparently ignored by the United States.

If the Pueblo had gone within three miles of the baseline from which North Korean territorial waters are measured there would presumably be no question that North Korean complaints about the Pueblo's activities would have been interpreted by the United States to relate to activities within territorial waters even if the North Korean words left that unclear. If the complaints referred to activities of the Pueblo undertaken beyond any known North Korean claim to territorial waters, or "contiguous" waters

Footnotes at end of article.



within the meaning of the armistice agreement, then there could be little doubt that the North Korean complaint would be ill based in international law. It is doubted that "eavesdropping" alone is felt by the international community to be illegal; most states have an affirmative long range interest in the broadest definition of "freedom of the seas", particularly those states which carry on electronic eavesdropping themselves on the high seas.<sup>20</sup>

However, in view of the questions surrounding the rights of the coastal state to inhibit eavesdropping in the Contiguous Zone as defined in the Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone, and the North Korean claim to a twelve mile territorial sea, it would seem clear that any United States action within twelve miles of the baseline from which North Korean territorial waters are measured can be asserted by North Korea to be incursions into territorial waters, and the issue of eavesdropping as a possibly legitimate action will be enveloped in the issue of what rights a state can assert within its territorial waters against a foreign warship. The many countries which advocate extensions of territorial waters to twelve miles may be expected to refrain from supporting the United States for fear of jeopardizing their economic interests and their own security interests, regardless of their attitudes towards eavesdropping as a possibly legitimate action on the high seas.

If it is once accepted that the Pueblo penetrated North Korean territorial waters, there can be little question of some North Korean rights. The sovereignty of the coastal state extends fully to its territorial waters subject only to limited rights of "innocent passage" by foreign vessels.<sup>21</sup> To be "innocent" the passage must not be "prejudicial to the . . . security of the coastal state."<sup>22</sup> To be "passage", there must be a purpose of traversing, with stopping and anchoring permitted only when incidental to ordinary navigation or when rendered necessary by force majeure.<sup>23</sup> It may be doubted that the voyage of the Pueblo can be construed convincingly as "innocent passage". If it were not "innocent passage", then the coastal state would have the right "to take the necessary steps in its territorial sea" to prevent the passage;<sup>24</sup> a warship may be required to leave the territorial sea.<sup>25</sup> There is, however, a question as to whether the coastal state may arrest the vessel or apply its criminal law to acts occurring on board the vessel.<sup>26</sup> The recourse of the North Koreans might properly have been complaints to the Government of the United States, and limited military action to force the Pueblo to leave territorial waters if necessary.

Thus, it may be concluded that to the extent the North Korean action rests upon purported violations by the United States of North Korea's territorial sea the action of seizing the vessel went beyond the action justifiable under a strict reading of the Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone. The reported practice of states prior to the conclusion of that Convention appears to lead to the same results.<sup>27</sup>

On the other hand, as noted above the relations between North Korea and the United States are not technically peaceful. The hypothesized incursion of the Pueblo into waters contiguous to the coast of North Korea would be a violation of the Panmunjom Agreement. Assuming that violation not to be justifiable as a measured reprisal against prior violations by North Korea, and viewing the history of fruitless North Korean attempts to have the United States withdraw the ship, the seizure with minimum force (and apparently no loss of life attributable

to North Korean action) might well be viewed as a measured and proportional reprisal or, even more convincingly, a counteraction justified by the prior United States violation of the Agreement regardless of whether it fulfills all the legal requirements for the classification of reprisal. The United States violation of the armistice agreement which is hypothesized would have been best viewed as a belligerent act, and the continued state of hostilities between the United States and North Korea make it justifiable for North Korea to respond with appropriate force. As noted above, this would merely continue the practice of both the United States and Korea under the imperfectly observed regime of the Panmunjom Agreement.<sup>28</sup>

To compare the actions of the North Koreans to "piracy" is wholly misconceived. The North Korean action was certainly done under color of state authority. The only actions done under color of state authority in modern times that have been assimilated to "piracy" in any definition to achieve serious consideration by states are acts involving some forms of submarine warfare.<sup>29</sup> The current international law definitions of piracy exclude other state actions.<sup>30</sup>

## II. THE STATUS OF THE SHIP'S COMPLEMENT

The company of the Pueblo appears to have consisted of 81 uniformed members of the United States armed forces and two "civilians". It would appear that both the military and civilian members of the ship's complement are entitled to the status of prisoners of war under the terms of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War dated August 12, 1949.<sup>31</sup> To the extent that North Korean actions are sought to be justified as an application of belligerent rights there can be little serious question that the Convention applies.<sup>32</sup> It is hard to imagine an armed conflict in which one of the parties is acting in the name of a second state being supposed not to be an armed conflict of "international character", and thus its military personnel and accompanying civilians falling into the power of the enemy being entitled to the full range of protection provided for prisoners of war.<sup>33</sup> Doubts as to the status of either of the two civilians, or any members of the ship's complement accused of having committed "belligerent acts" must be resolved in favor of prisoner of war status "until such time as their status has been determined by a competent tribunal."<sup>34</sup>

As prisoners of war under the Geneva Convention of 1949, the Pueblo's complement is subject to the military law of the Detaining Power.<sup>35</sup> In view of the possibility that North Korea may want to try some or all members of the complement for "war crimes", it becomes necessary to examine the rights held by North Korea under the Convention to try and punish accused "war criminals".

North Korea's accession to the prisoner of war Convention of 1949 was made subject to several reservations.<sup>36</sup> The only one pertinent to the present discussion is the reservation to Article 85. Article 85 states:

"Prisoners of war prosecuted under the laws of the Detaining Power for acts committed prior to capture shall retain, even if convicted, the benefits of the present Convention".

The North Korean reservation, which is identical in substance to the reservations made to this Article by Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Red China, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and the USSR, says:

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will not be bound by Article 85, in regard to the treatment of prisoners of war convicted under the laws of the Detaining Power of a prisoner of war for having committed war crimes or inhuman offenses, based on the principles of Nuremberg and the Tokyo Far East International Military Tribunal."<sup>37</sup>

It is different to conceive that taking part in eavesdropping activity, even in the territorial waters of the victim state, can be considered an "inhuman" offense. Furthermore, the two International Military Tribunals were constituted to try "crimes against the peace", "war crimes", "crimes against humanity" and "conspiracy" to commit any of the substantive crimes listed. It is extremely difficult to see how the complement of the Pueblo can be considered to have committed crimes against humanity or crimes against the peace merely by their having been members of the complement of a vessel engaged in eavesdropping even assuming the vessel also violated North Korean territorial waters. To the extent North Korea asserts the eavesdropping and the purported violation of territorial waters constitute "waging aggressive war" or some such general crime, it will be apparent that North Korea will have departed from a language usage normally accepted by others.

It seems extremely unlikely that any generally acknowledged "war crime" can be charged against any member of that complement (including the Captain). The term "war crime" normally means violation of the laws of warfare. Examples would include treacherous request for quarter, abuse of or firing on a flag of truce, firing on undefended localities, etc.<sup>38</sup>

There is, of course, always the chance that some war crime was in fact committed by some member of the complement, and nothing in the foregoing is intended to imply that the North Koreans do not have the right to try an accused for it. In that case, whether the outcome of the trial is proper will depend upon the actual charge, the evidence presented, and the procedure of the trial. It is impossible to prejudice that issue without betraying bias.

It may be noted that the North Korean reservation to Article 85 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War does not relieve North Korea of its responsibilities toward "war criminals" prior to conviction. Thus, the protections accorded by the Convention must be given prisoners of war against whom judicial proceedings are ordered. Those protections are many, and include the right to call witnesses, to the assistance of a qualified advocate or counsel, to three weeks notice of trial, and to the presence of a representative of a neutral "Protecting Power" unless the interest of North Korean state security requires *in camera* proceedings.<sup>39</sup>

One further point may be made. The repatriation of prisoners of war does not depend on the cessation of a state of war, but merely upon the cessation "of active hostilities".<sup>40</sup> In view of the large exchange of prisoners concluded immediately after the signing of the Panmunjom Agreement in 1953, it would seem difficult for the North Koreans to claim that active hostilities within the context of the prisoner of war Convention continue in Korea. On the other hand, the continued infiltrations of South Korea by military personnel of North Korea certainly imply some continued active hostilities, and it may be supposed that United States and South Korean counter-actions, including eavesdropping missions such as that of the Pueblo, indicate that there are terms of the armistice agreement that are no longer observed by either side.

But even if first violations can be convincingly shown to be attributable to North Korean action the prisoner of war Convention requires the return of prisoners of war "after the cessation of active hostilities" regardless of the causes of those hostilities. The result may be that a state can find the legal requirement to return prisoners of war lifted by its own illegal actions to commence or continue active hostilities. This situation is in a sense anomalous, but it may be doubted that a state will resort to "active

Footnotes at end of article.

hostilities" merely to avoid repatriating prisoners of war. In this connection, it would be interesting to know whether South Korea returns to North Korea the North Korean infiltrators it captures on military missions in South Korea.

To the extent North Koreans captured in South Korea are properly classifiable as prisoners of war as defined by Article 4 of the prisoners of war Convention, failure by South Korea to treat them as such might well explain North Korean continued withholding of the Pueblo's complement despite the terms of the Convention forbidding reprisals against prisoners of war.<sup>41</sup>

But suppose the complement of the Pueblo or any of it are not within the definition of prisoners of war set out in the Convention? It is certainly conceivable that the two civilians, for example, may prove not to have the identity card proving their authorization as apparently required by the prisoners of war Convention.<sup>42</sup> Without such authorization, and possibly merely without the card (the wording of the Convention is unclear) there would not appear to be any category in the Convention defining persons entitled to prisoner of war status which fits the two civilians. In that case they apparently would fall into the class of persons "who, at a given moment and in any manner whatsoever, find themselves, in case of a conflict . . . , in the hands of a Party to the conflict . . . of which they are not nationals."<sup>43</sup> It can hardly be doubted that the current state of uneasy truce in Korea constitutes "a conflict" within the meaning of the Convention.<sup>44</sup> Although the protection of the Civilian Convention is stated to be withdrawn from civilians "definitely suspected of or engaged in activities hostile to the security" of a Party to the conflict "in the territory of" that Party,<sup>45</sup> that withdrawal does not apply to the terms of the Civilian Convention prescribing a fair and regular trial. If the two hurdles can be overcome by North Korea, jurisdictional and fair trial, there do not appear to be any rules of international law to limit the punishment that can be imposed.<sup>46</sup>

### III. LEGAL RECOURSE OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States is bound by Article 33 of the United Nations Charter to seek a solution by peaceful means to "any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security." To the extent that this commitment has a customary international law analogue North Korea would be equivalently bound. However, North Korea is not a member of the United Nations and may argue that there is no customary law prescribing direct negotiations to achieve a peaceful resolution of disputes arising out of breaches of an armistice. Certainly the recent statements of Arab and Communist and some other officials with regard to the purported violations of the Armistice in Palestine by Israel in June of 1966 would lend color to such a claim even as an interpretation of the United Nations Charter.<sup>47</sup>

Refusal of North Korea to enter into attempts at peaceful settlement would seem to raise questions as to the obligations of the United Nations Organization itself. Article 2(3) of the Charter of the United Nations requires all Members to settle their international disputes by peaceful means, Article 2(4) requires all Members to refrain from the use of force "in any . . . manner inconsistent with the Purpose of the United Nations," and Article 2(6) of the Charter appears to *oblige* the Organization to ensure that states which are not Members act in accordance with the Principles laid down in Article 2. Should the United Nations be unable or unwilling to discharge its apparent obligation under Article 2(6) of the Charter, it can certainly be argued that the United States would not be violating its obligations in seeking other re-

course than peaceful settlement as prescribed by the Charter. It should be emphasized, however, that the provisions for peaceful settlement do not compel either side to a dispute to yield its legal rights, and the recourse the United States might have to force will involve the United States in arguments as to the legitimacy of the use of force when in fact North Korea has not refused to meet with the United States to discuss the Pueblo affair. There are cases in which the intransigence of a negotiator has been used to justify military action, but the arguments may not strike all observers as convincing.<sup>48</sup>

Assuming that the use of force by the United States can be justified there are many restrictions on that use of force in customary international law.<sup>49</sup> It should be mentioned that the armistice agreement expressly forbids "blockade of any kind of Korea"<sup>50</sup> but it may be supposed that such express limitations on the scope of American counteraction would be ignored or justified on the basis of permissible reprisals.

Reprisals are a resort to force otherwise illegal which is considered legally justifiable in the light of prior illegal action on the part of the complaining state. An example would be the Corfu Channel Case.<sup>51</sup> In the leading case discussing the international law of reprisal<sup>52</sup> the requirement of proportionality is clearly laid out as well as the need for the state resorting to force to demonstrate the prior illegality of the action purportedly justifying the reprisal. The reprisal state must also show that attempts at peaceful settlement have failed.

It is a fact, fortunate or not depending on one's point of view, that some apparent international wrongs are not illegal, and that effective redress for actions that violate international law is not always available. In the circumstances of the Pueblo incident, even assuming North Korea to have acted illegally in seizing the vessel or in refusing to return the ship's complement and the ship itself, it is not clear that the United States could justify reprisal while attempts at peaceful settlement continue: *a fortiori* if there is doubt as to the illegality of the North Korean action and it appears that the peaceful settlement is blocked merely because the two sides remain adamant in their positions.

Of course, nothing in the foregoing analysis should be taken to imply that there is any likelihood that the use of force by the United States, even if justifiable and applied with measured care, will lead to the release of the Pueblo or its complement. The determination whether such a use of force is likely to harden the North Korean position or, on the contrary, to deter North Korea from testing the reactions of the United States with still further forcible acts of its own, is one which can be made only by decision makers with evidence of North Korean intentions which may be presumed to be more reliable than the evidence (or lack of evidence) available to the general public.

### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> T.I.A.S. 5639. North Korea is not a party to this Convention.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, article 24, defines that Zone as extending seaward twelve miles from the baseline from which the breadth of the Territorial Sea is measured.

<sup>3</sup> Even in the case of self-defense most narrowly defined there is some rather unrealistic question raised as to the legal rights of the defending state to act on the high seas in time of peace. 1 Gidel, *Le Droit International Public de la Mer* 355 (1932).

<sup>4</sup> The classical formulation allows self-defense action when "the necessity of that self-defense is instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation. See 2 Moore, *A Digest of International Law* (Washington, 1906) 412; R. Y. Jennings, "The *Caroline* and *McLeod* Cases",

32 *American Journal of International Law* (A.J.I.L.) 82 (1938).

<sup>5</sup> R. R. Baxter, "Constitutional Forms and Some Legal Problems of International Military Command", 29 *British Year Book of International Law* (B.Y.I.L.) 325, esp. pp. 333 *et seq.* (1952). Professor Baxter concludes that the United Nations Command was legally the United States, which was authorized to use the name and flag of the United Nations but which acted as the United States, not as agent for the United Nations, coordinating the activities of all countries sending forces in response to the Security Council's Resolution recommending members of the United Nations assisting the Republic of Korea make their forces available "to a unified command under the United States". U.N. Doc. S/1588 dated July 7, 1950.

<sup>6</sup> T.I.A.S. 2782.

<sup>7</sup> Hague Convention with respect to the Laws and Customs of War on Land dated July 29, 1899, 2 Malloy 2042. Article 40 of the Annex to this Convention gives a belligerent the right to recommence hostilities in case of a "serious violation" of the armistice. "Serious violation" is left undefined in the Convention. See 2 Lauterpacht, *Oppenheim's International Law* 546-547 (7th ed. 1952).

<sup>8</sup> Article II.A, paragraph 12.

<sup>9</sup> B. P. Sinha, *Unilateral Denunciation of Treaty Because of Prior Violations of Obligations by the Other Party* 200-202, 204 (1966).

<sup>10</sup> Article II.A, paragraph 15.

<sup>11</sup> Article II.A, paragraph 13(b).

<sup>12</sup> Article II.A, paragraph 15.

<sup>13</sup> Article IV, paragraph 60, envisaged a "political conference" aimed at "the peaceful settlement of the Korean question" after the armistice had become effective. That conference was in fact held, but failed to achieve a settlement. See Parl. Papers, Cmd. 9186, *Documents Relating to the Discussions of Korea and Indo-China at the Geneva Conference, April 27-June 15, 1954*, Miscellaneous No. 16 (1954), especially the Sixteen Nation Declaration of June 15, 1954, set out on pp. 100-101.

<sup>14</sup> Consider, for example, the correspondence following the Soviet destruction of an American aircraft purportedly containing radio gear capable of receiving sensitive emissions on July 1, 1960. The U.S.S.R. reportedly justified its actions not on the "spying" mission of the aircraft alone, but on its purportedly pursuing the mission in Soviet airspace. O. J. Lissitzyn, "Some Legal Implications of the U-2 and RB-47 Incidents", 56 *A.J.I.L.* 135 (1962).

<sup>15</sup> P.L. 89-658; 80 Stat. 908.

<sup>17</sup> In private correspondence dated December 13, 1967, a member of the Office of the Legal Adviser to the United States Department of State explained the extrinsic evidence relied upon by the Department for its assertions that extending exclusive fisheries zones nine miles beyond the territorial sea "would not affect such traditional freedoms of the sea as freedom of navigation or of overflight." Cited in a letter from the Acting Director, Legislative Division, Department of the Navy, dated May 25, 1966, H.R. Rep. NO. 2086, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. 13-14 (1966). The effect of the State Department position is apparently to change the plain meaning of the provision of the Geneva Convention of 1958 on the High Seas, concluded the same time as the Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone, which declares "freedom of fishing" to be a part of the "freedom of the high seas". The extrinsic evidence cited relates to the contemplation of a further conference to consider the problems of fisheries and the extent of territorial waters, which latter problem was left wholly unresolved by the 1958 Conventions. The second conference in fact resolved neither question. D. W. Bowett, "The Second United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea", 9(3) *International and Com-*



parative Law Quarterly (I.C.L.Q.) 415 (1960). Many States have interpreted this impasse as leaving them free to extend exclusive fisheries regardless of the express words of the 1958 Conventions. G. Weissberg, "Fisheries, Foreign Assistance, Custom and Conventions", 16(3) I.C.L.Q. 704 (1967). It is unclear how the Department of State intends to argue that they are not equally free to extend their territorial waters, now that the United States is itself exercising sovereignty over fisheries out to twelve miles from its coastal baselines. To claim that extrinsic evidence and later practice of a very few years can legally derogate from the clear terms of a treaty seems a more difficult legal step than to claim a breadth of territorial waters which no treaty purports to define and no overwhelming practice prescribes.

<sup>25</sup> Article 23.  
<sup>26</sup> As noted above, the international law in this area may be changing. It is hard to understand why the Office of the Legal Adviser to the United States Department of State feels other states will accept the United States action extending a protective fisheries zone into what the United States claims to regard as the high seas without using the United States action as a justification for their own extensions of other substantive parts of their territorial jurisdiction into the "Contiguous Zone". This, of course, is precisely what happened when the United States declared an extension of sovereignty over parts of the high seas superjacent to its continental shelf for the limited purpose of protecting natural resources; eight other countries shortly thereafter claimed complete territorial rights in their continental shelves' superjacent seas. See Colombos. The International Law of the Sea (4th ed.) (London, 1959) 129-130. While the more exaggerated claims do not seem to have been generally accepted they have created considerable practical difficulty in some cases. See *Hearings on S. 2218 Before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Senate Committee on Commerce*, "Twelve Mile Fishery Zone", 89th Cong., 2d Sess., passim (1966).

<sup>27</sup> Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, articles 1 and 14-23.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*, article 14(4).  
<sup>29</sup> *Id.*, articles 14(2) and (3).

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*, article 16(1).

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*, article 23.

<sup>32</sup> Criminal jurisdiction can be applied in some cases to persons on board merchant vessels. *Id.*, article 19. But those exceptional cases do not appear to apply to warships. See below. State vessels acting *jure imperii* are unanimously agreed to be exempt from the *in rem* jurisdiction of the coastal state. Cf. COLOMBOS, *loc. cit.*, pp. 226 *et seq.*

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*, pp. 227-228.

<sup>34</sup> *Loc. cit.* note 9 above.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Genet, "The Charge of Piracy in the Spanish Civil War, 32 A.J.I.L. 253 (1938).

<sup>36</sup> For an analysis of this aspect of current definitions of "piracy" see B. Forman, "International Law of Piracy", 15 (8) *JAG Journal* 153 (1961).

<sup>37</sup> T.I.A.S. 3364. The United States regards North Korea as a Party to this Convention, U.S. Department of State, Treaties, in Force (1967).

<sup>38</sup> Article 2 of the Convention expressly makes it applicable to "any . . . armed conflict". The word "conflict" is not defined, apparently in a deliberate effort by the drafters to make the Convention applicable to as many situations as possible. If that was the intent, then it can hardly be denied that the current situation in Korea is a "conflict" within the meaning of the Convention; and that part of it characterized by the North Korean seizure of the Pueblo appears to have been "armed".

<sup>39</sup> The pertinent parts of the definition

of persons entitled to prisoner of war treatment are in article 4.A(1) and (4) of the Convention. Were the conflict deemed not to be of an international character article 3 would apply requiring at least humanitarian treatment can be accorded the captives.

<sup>40</sup> Article 5.

<sup>41</sup> Article 82.

<sup>42</sup> 278 U.N. Treaty Series 264.

<sup>43</sup> *Id.* The effect of reservations to multilateral conventions when the reservation is compatible with the object and purpose of the convention is analysed in detail in the Reservations to the Convention on Genocide Case, I.C.J. Reports 1951. For present purposes it can be assumed that North Korea and the United States are each bound to observe the terms of the 1949 Geneva Convention with regard to each other's captured military personnel, and that North Korea's reservation to article 85 is effective. For the United States to argue that the North Korea reservation is incompatible with the Convention would be to argue that the North Korean accession, conditioned on that reservation, is invalid. In that case the protection prisoners of war detained by North Korea could claim would be subject to the legal doubts the Convention was designed to eliminate. It is hardly likely the United States will find it in its interest to open this question.

<sup>44</sup> A partial list of 20 "war crimes" appears in Part III, Manual of Military Law (H. Lauterpacht and G. I. A. D. Draper eds.) (London 1958) 175. One "crime" in that list is "participation in hostilities by civilians". It may be doubted that without further qualification civilian "participation" in hostilities can properly be considered a "war crime", particularly since the prisoner of war Convention itself envisages civilians closely cooperating with military forces.

<sup>45</sup> See generally Chapter III of the prisoner of war Convention.

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*, article 118.

<sup>47</sup> Article 13.

<sup>48</sup> Article 4.A(4).

<sup>49</sup> Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War dated August 12, 1949 (T.I.A.S. 3365), article 4. North Korea is a Party, U.S. Department of State, Treaties in Force (1967).

<sup>50</sup> If there were no legal "conflict" within the meaning of the Convention it may be supposed that the civilians in North Korea would be subject to the municipal law of North Korea with regard to acts performed within the land territory of North Korea. With regard to their acts done in a foreign ship even if in the territorial waters of North Korea there would be considerable doubt as to North Korean jurisdiction. There is a question as to whether a territorial sovereign can exercise jurisdiction with regard to acts occurring in a foreign warship even in the territorial waters of the coastal state in the absence of a waiver by the ship's flag state of its own jurisdiction. *Chung Chi Cheung v. The King* (1939) A.C. 160. In that leading case, the territorial sovereign exercised jurisdiction only after the court construed a waiver of the flag state's primary jurisdiction. The case involved acts criminal by the law of both the sovereigns. Query, the legal situation when the acts for which the civilians would be tried are acts against the law of the coastal state but not against the law of the flag state. Presumably the coastal state would not be entitled to exercise jurisdiction *a fortiori*.

<sup>51</sup> Article 5.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. R. R. Baxter, "So-Called 'Unprivileged Belligerency': Spies, Guerrillas, and Saboteurs", 28 B.Y.I.L. 323 at 328, 329-333 (1951). Of course, at least minimum standards of justice would have to be applied in any trial of foreign nationals, but these are probably

best considered included in the "fair and regular" prescription of the Convention. Failure to accord a trial to an accused spy is probably a war crime. Manual of Military Law 72, 175.

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, the statement of the Iraqi representative to the United Nations General Assembly on October 11, 1967, Meeting 1586. Some (of many) recent United Nations documents dealing with each side's resort to force in response to what it considers breaches of the cease-fire by the other include S/8203 dated October 21, S/8204 and S/8205 dated October 22 and S/8207 and S/8208 dated October 24, 1967.

<sup>54</sup> The Indian seizure of Goa in 1961 is a case in point. The United States position in that case was that India's action was a use of force in violation of article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter despite Portugal's adamant refusal to negotiate the cession of Goa to India. See Security Council Official Records, XVI, Meetings 986 and 988.

<sup>55</sup> See generally J. Stone, Legal Controls of International Conflict (1954).

<sup>56</sup> Article 15.

<sup>57</sup> International Court of Justice Reports 1949.

<sup>58</sup> The Naullaa Case, 2 U.N. Reports of International Arbitral Awards 1011 (1949); 1927-1928 Annual Digest 256 (No. 360).

## Boaz Wins National Honors

### HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1968

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Boaz, Ala., which is in my congressional district, has been named one of the cleanest towns in the United States in its population category.

Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with a recent editorial in the Gadsden Times which points out that no civic undertaking, whether it wins national honors or not, is more immediately and permanently rewarding than endeavors that make and keep a city clean and beautiful.

I heartily congratulate all the citizens of Boaz for their hard work and resourcefulness in winning this award. And under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD two articles appearing in the Boaz Leader and the Gadsden Times, which tell the story of Boaz' accomplishments:

[From the Boaz (Ala.) Leader]

#### BOAZ WINS NATIONAL HONORS

Boaz has been judged to have one of the top ten clean up, civic improvement beautification programs among all communities in the United States with population of less than 25,000. The city singled out for its outstanding accomplishments among many other cities and towns in the 1967 National Clean Up Contest was the only one of its size selected in the Southeast, and according to a conversation with Mayor Sanford on Monday from Washington, D.C. is the only town in Alabama to win at any time to the present.

Mayor B. B. Sanford instigated this project by recommendation to the Chamber of Commerce, and as a result the Boaz Beautification Association was organized in the spring of 1967 with Ollin Hayes, principal of the Boaz Junior High School as president.

He and Truman Glasco, Elementary School principal, who was publicity chairman worked toward a complete litter clean up, and sponsored a fun game with the young people and children when all the litter in one area was collected and a trial was held, with the verdict to burn Miss Trash.

After the litter campaign every car in town was given a litter bag, and when one forgot and dropped something on the city streets a note was sent to ask this person to send a dollar and become a member of the BBA. Areas in need of improvement were photographed and written up in the local paper. The street signs, and the stop signs were painted. A program was begun to start a plant-up.

An ornamental horticulturist was invited to tour the town with representatives of the BBA and make recommendations. He spoke to the BBA and to the Garden Club giving suggestions. Marion Jackson, vocation teacher at Boaz High School was named as chairman of the plant-up program, and work to beautify public areas got under way, as well as individuals beginning a planned program in the residential area. The park, the wooded area behind the High School, near the Pony League Baseball Field, were among the places where the undergrowth was cleaned up.

In further recognition of its excellence, the program has been selected for a featured spot at the National Cleanest Town Conference, which will be held in Washington, D.C., February 18-20. Among those from Boaz who will be on hand at the awards ceremony to accept the trophy will be Mayor Sanford, President Hayes, and Col. Ralph Stringer, who has worked with the scrapbook entry, which was the basis of the decision to name Boaz in the top ten spot by the distinguished judge panel.

F. T. Mastin, Jr., was named by the BBA as container chairman, and got containers for every area of town to keep litter off the streets. A yard of the month program was begun in June, and Mrs. Jeff Roberts was named chairman of this committee which created much interest. L. C. Stamps, started a membership drive for both residents and businesses which was successful; Ralph McGee, Chamber of Commerce president and Bill Amberson, the downtown chairman worked with Mrs. John Alexander, C of C secretary, who also served as scrapbook chairman, kept pace with the activities in every phase, thus making an outstanding record for the panel of judges. Mrs. Harold Young served as secretary, Mrs. Bobby Nunn as correspondence chairman, City Clerk Earl B. Robinson is the legal chairman, and Buddy Adams, vice president.

[From the Gadsden (Ala.) Times]

#### SPOTLIGHT ON BOAZ

Clean up, paint up, fix up . . .

One Northeast Alabama town did exactly that—and consequently is basking happily in the favorable glow of the national spotlight.

Boaz has been named one of the cleanest towns in the United States in its population category, the under-25,000 group. It shares the honor with nine small cities in such far-flung states as Arizona, Indiana, South Dakota and Missouri. Larger cities competed in their own category.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall will award trophies to representatives of each of the winning cities at the Cleanest Town Conference in Washington, Feb. 18-20.

To the enterprising leadership and resourceful citizenry of Boaz, who planned and carried out the projects that impressed the National Clean-up, Paint-up, Fix-up Bureau sponsoring the annual event, The Times offers warmest congratulations. We rejoice with our neighbor in this achievement.

No civic undertaking, whether it wins national honors or not, is more immediately and permanently rewarding than endeavors that make and keep a city clean and beautiful.

### Atlanta: A Giant Among Cities

## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one is almost overwhelmed with a sense of pride as well as amazement with the growth and progress of Atlanta, Ga., in recent years.

Atlanta is truly a city on the move in every area of commercial, economic, cultural, and educational endeavors. Atlanta, the capital city of Georgia and the gateway to the South, has indeed become a giant among cities.

It was my privilege and high honor Monday to address the Atlanta Rotary Club and to trace Atlanta's phenomenal economic growth. All Georgians are proud of their capital city, and I know that Members of the Senate who visit Atlanta find it warm and hospitable, and at the same time booming.

Atlanta, in my opinion, is fast on its way to becoming one of America's most important cities. I bring my address to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

It is a special privilege and a high honor to address the Atlanta Rotary Club—because your aim is service, and because you do serve. This Rotary Club has served the City of Atlanta, in thousands of ways, for three generations.

Your very presence in Atlanta—in the front ranks of business, civic, and cultural leadership—is in itself a significant factor in the economic growth and social progress that we see taking place in this city.

The Atlanta Rotary Club represents the best of the most desirable citizens in the nation. You have brought talent, dedication, and good judgment—in great abundance—to Atlanta.

Atlanta Rotarians come from 33 states and 7 countries. Except for sons of members, only 18 per cent of you were born in Atlanta, with 22 per cent of you born elsewhere in Georgia and 60 per cent born outside Georgia.

These to me are very impressive statistics which emphasize the cosmopolitan quality of this community.

Atlanta Rotarians—hundreds of whom I have known and worked with for many years—are a major part of Atlanta's leadership. You lead, and you lead actively and wisely, in virtually everything important to the greatness, to the growth, and to the success of Atlanta—past, present, and future.

This community feels the guiding hand of the Rotary Club every day. Atlanta's booming businesses, its offices, its plants, churches, schools, hospitals, culture centers and sports arenas—these are your daily concern. And all of them are much better because of your interest and activity.

Because of your position of leadership in Atlanta, and because of Atlanta's position of leadership in American life, I want to talk with you today about Atlanta.

I want to talk to you about where Atlanta is today. I want us to think about where Atlanta is heading.

I want to make it clear at the outset: I don't intend to be modest about Atlanta. Like all Georgians, I feel a great deal of pride in this great city.

I know that you share this pride. So I do not think you will object if I brag a little about your city.

The strategic location of Atlanta in the Appalachian foothills played a large part in helping the city get where it is today. This geographic advantage has been important to establishing Atlanta as the economic capital of the entire Southeast.

This factor, combined with others, will, within a relatively short span of time, push Atlanta even higher toward the top.

I have no doubt that in the not-too-distant future Atlanta will rank as one of the four or five largest, busiest and most productive centers of commerce in the nation.

I mean that Atlanta is destined to be one of the four or five pivots on which the rest of the American economy will rest. The other major centers will be New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and probably Dallas.

The emergence and development of New York, Chicago and Los Angeles as the country's three super-cities today foretells much for Atlanta.

During the first important 50 years of this nation's growth—from 1800 to 1850—New England and the Middle Atlantic states moved out front. During this period New York outstripped Boston and Philadelphia to become the business center for a region of eight to ten states. This is an area today that has about 55 million people.

During the second 50 years—from 1850 to 1900—the North Central states, from the Ohio River to the Rocky Mountains—became our second major region to grow and prosper. Chicago took the lead and became the hub of commerce for about eight or ten states that now contain some 45 million people.

America's third 50 years—from 1900 to 1950—saw Los Angeles become the nation's third super-city.

These three cities, then—New York, Chicago and Los Angeles—today are the nation's three greatest urban economic centers. They are the headquarters for trade, transportation, business, and industry that affect the lives and well-being of tens of millions of people in surrounding areas.

The fourth 50 years of America, and the last third of this century, belong to Atlanta—and in turn to the Southeast.

Economic indicators show—as clearly as they did for New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles—that Atlanta is on its way to becoming the nation's fourth super-city . . . Possibly not fourth in sheer numbers of people, but definitely fourth as a hub of business activity.

I believe it could already be proved that Atlanta today has more business activity per capita than any major city anywhere. By that I mean that there are more commercial transactions per person per year in Atlanta today than in any major city in the world.

There are three main reasons for the present and future greatness of Atlanta in national commerce.

First, Atlanta is the centrally located city of a large and rapidly-growing area. The city is closely tied to more than 30 million people in this region by road, rail and air.

Atlanta's area of 30 million corresponds to New York's 55 million and Chicago's 45 million. It corresponds similarly to a Dallas area of 16 million and the Los Angeles region of 14 million.

Second, Atlanta has already asserted itself as the absolute and unrivaled business center for the entire Southeast that has made gigantic strides since 1950 in freeing itself



from a century of expensive economic shackles.

And third, the Southeast is growing at a phenomenal rate far ahead of the rest of the nation. From the standpoint of people who are better schooled, more ambitious, and more willing to work, the Southeast has an abundance of productive human resources to assure even greater prosperity in the future.

Regional growth and prosperity naturally generate a need for more and better services from Atlanta.

Atlanta's leap since World War II into the nation's forefront can be traced by examining standards which are generally used to measure basic economic development.

I have selected federal indicators in five basic fields . . . transportation . . . communications . . . sales . . . banking . . . and construction. We can take Atlanta's position in 1950 and compare it today with that of the nation's other 25 largest cities.

The results are impressive.

In transportation, air passenger travel is a splendid index of 20th Century business. In 1950, Atlanta ranked 10th in the number of passengers served. Today, it is 5th, having passed Washington, Dallas, Boston and Detroit.

The Atlanta Airport . . . growing faster than any American airport has ever grown . . . appears certain to also surpass San Francisco and Los Angeles to become the nation's third largest air center, following only New York and Chicago.

I want to make a point or two about the Atlanta Airport to show how we need to plan for its future growth.

Beyond any question, Atlanta's commercial business is closely tied to the operations of its airport.

Ten years ago, the City of Atlanta began to make plans for our present airport. At that time, the airport enplaned about one million passengers a year. Plans were based on a projection of two million enplaned passengers by 1968.

But look what happened.

Instead of the projected two million, Atlanta in 1968 will enplane almost 7 million. The increase has been six times what they thought it would be. And we can look for several times this growth in the years ahead.

The Federal Aviation Agency recently forecast that in 1980—only 12 years away—Atlanta will enplane more than 20 million passengers, or three times today's volume.

If we are going to serve 20 million in 12 years, how many must we be able to serve in 25 years?

The increasing passenger load, however, constitutes only part of the Atlanta airport problem. The need to handle staggering quantities of air mail and air freight . . . each of which is also vital to the future of Atlanta and to Georgia . . . must also be taken into full account.

For some time now, the Post Office has been speeding delivery by transfer of long distance mail to air service. As a result, the volume of mail at the airport has tripled in the last three years, and postal officials already have asked that they be given four times as much space at the airport as they now have.

Atlanta's growth is so unusual that the Post Office is hesitant about making a long-range forecast. They will state, however, that the volume of Atlanta's air mail 25 years from now will be enormous, in every sense of that term.

Our airport, therefore, must be able to handle it, and it must do so in first-rate fashion.

The growth of air freight in Atlanta has been just as dramatic as the increase of passengers and air mail. The volume of air freight at your airport has more than tripled during the past five years. And, as you heard from Lockheed's Tom May last week, this is only the beginning.

Those of you who have seen the Lockheed C-5 know just what I mean. With a little imagination, you can readily see that the C-5 will exert a mammoth influence on present methods of freight transportation in this nation and throughout the world.

The development of the C-5, plus the fact that Atlanta's airport can become America's air freight gateway from South America and Africa, could very well give Atlanta an opportunity to become the world's largest handler of air freight.

The future of Atlanta's airport is not only vital, but it involves an extremely complex problem of planning. You have to consider runways, terminal facilities, parking and road access for tens of thousands of inter-related transactions of people and machinery everyday. Solutions to these problems will no doubt involve untold millions of dollars. They must get primary attention of the best and the most informed minds that can be put to the problem.

Atlanta cannot afford to misplan or to underplan its airport.

In communications, the amount of mail a city handles and the long distance use of its telephones are two other very good indicators of commercial activity.

In 1950, Atlanta's mail volume ranked 17th among American cities. Today it ranks 9th. In the past decade or so, Atlanta has passed Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Kansas City, Dallas, Cleveland and St. Louis.

In 1967, the Atlanta Post Office handled more than two billion pieces of mail and nearly seven million pieces on the average business day.

Several years ago, we began to consider a new mail handling facility for Atlanta. At that time, postal officials were thinking in terms of a \$3 million expenditure to meet the need. It didn't take long to see, the way Atlanta is growing, that this would not come anywhere near meeting the City's postal needs.

Thus, in an effort in which Senator Russell and I actively participated, we have assured for Atlanta the nation's most mechanized mail handling facility, which is due to be ready in 1972. It will cost closer to \$30 million than the early estimates of \$3 million.

Before reaching its peak, Atlanta's volume of mail will probably be the fourth or fifth largest in the nation, following only New York, Chicago and Los Angeles.

Unfortunately, there is no comparable standard for measuring long distance telephone activity in the nation's cities. However, it is highly significant to note that between 1950 and 1965 long distance calls in Atlanta rose seven fold—from five million to nearly 35 million. And though the figure is not available, I am confident that long distance calls in 1967, due to direct dialing, probably exceeded 50 million.

Wholesale sales have long been used to measure a regional city. In the special federal census of 1948, Atlanta's \$2.2 billion in sales ranked only 21st among the nation's cities. In the special census of 1963 Atlanta's \$5.7 billion had brought Atlanta up to 11th. I feel certain that the 1968 census will find Atlanta in 8th place.

As in the field of transportation and communications, Atlanta also appears destined for a permanent rank of 4th or 5th in wholesale sales—again following only New York, Chicago and maybe Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Bank clearings are almost always used as a key indicator. In 1950 Atlanta's banks cleared \$13 billion, placing it 16th among American cities. Last year, clearing over \$42 billion, nearly \$200 million a day, Atlanta rose to 9th place, having now surpassed Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Baltimore, Minneapolis, Kansas City and Houston.

Construction is possibly the best of all

measures of urban growth. The number of new residences, schools, offices, stores, plants, warehouses, etc. tells a vivid story.

In 1950 Atlanta ranked 17th in volume of construction. I do not yet have final 1967 figures for the metropolitan area, but it appears that last year Atlanta ranked 7th in total construction, and more than 20,000 new units elevated it to 5th place in the nation in residential construction—following only New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and the Washington area.

These five examples are keystones of a total pattern—showing Atlanta's rapid rise as a national center of business—from 10th, 17th, 21st, 16th and 17th positions in 1950, to 5th, 9th, 8th, 10th and 7th positions in 1967.

This pattern of great growth—firmly founded and firmly fixed—is virtually certain to elevate Atlanta into 4th or 5th place before another generation passes.

Many look with wonder at all the evidence of Atlanta's recent growth—the new office buildings, industrial complexes, shopping centers, apartments and subdivisions. And the many problems which this new growth has generated at times seem overwhelming.

But I assure you that the volume of growth of the past 20 years, amazing as it now appears, is but a token of the volume that the community will experience during the next 20 years.

Metropolitan population, doubled since 1950, will double again, totaling 2½ million residents.

Motor vehicles, 125,000 when expressways began and 700,000 now, will be approaching two million in 20 years—enormously increasing needs for effective streets and parking.

And it also calls for sound planning. For example, it was projected that by 1971, approximately 43,000 cars a day would travel the expressway at Fourteenth Street, which is considered the peak point. As it turned out, by 1963, 106,000 vehicles were traveling the expressway at this point, and today it is estimated to be nearly 150,000.

Today's 30- and 40-story office building will be topped by 50- and 60-story buildings.

Today's 20,000 new residences built a year will be more than 50,000.

Today's seven million pieces of mail a day will be nearer 20 million a day.

And on and on it goes. Every other key business activity will rise in comparable proportion.

Atlanta must plan for this growth. All the ensuing problems, as costly as they will be, will have to be solved.

I want to reiterate what I told the General Assembly last month. Traffic and transportation are not the least of Atlanta's problems. In many respects, they are the most crucial. I am confident that rapid transit and rapid bussing will be given careful consideration. And I also hope that a study will be given to expanding Atlanta's expressway system.

But these and all other problems can be solved—because, along with all Atlanta's new people and all its new business will come even larger amounts of new dollars.

The buying income of Atlantans—\$500 million in 1945 and seven times that sum last year—will have an even brighter future. Atlanta, more than any community I know, will have the money to pay for its problems of growth.

As I view the total picture, I see for Atlanta one magnificent advantage—the advantage of being able to see, and to understand, its great growth before it happens—and the opportunity to plan and to shape this growth.

And I see also for Atlanta another equally great advantage. Atlanta has the people—the leadership—capable of seeing this growth, capable of understanding it, capable of planning for it—and capable of handling it.

Many such leaders are in this room at this moment.

I offer to each of you, and to all of you, my best effort in helping to solve any Atlanta problem which gains your attention.

**Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn., Plays Vital Role in Testing of Space, Defense Missiles, and Aircraft Development**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech before the National Space Club in Washington, Gen. James Ferguson, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, paid tribute to the importance of the work being done at Arnold Engineering Development Center, near Tullahoma, Tenn.

The Arnold Engineering Development Center is performing a vital and essential function necessary for programs in national defense, space exploration and aircraft development.

Because of the great interest of my colleagues and the American people in technological development, I include excerpts from General Ferguson's speech in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

The excerpts follow:

"... At our Arnold Center we have some \$400-million worth of wind tunnels, high altitude test cells, and vacuum chambers which have been used in support of many national priority programs, ranging from the Army's Jupiter and the Navy's Vanguard to NASA's Apollo.

"For example, in the 38 environmental test units now in operation at the Center we are working on projects for the Army, the Navy, NASA, the Federal Aviation Agency and industry, as well as numerous Air Force programs.

"In the large engine test cell we began shakedown recently for the 15-month qualification tests leading to the acceptance of the 40,000-pound-thrust TF-39 engine for the C-5A transport.

"Plume work on the Minuteman II is being conducted in the Mark I space chamber, the only place in the country where such testing can be performed.

"We're doing rigid load tests on a one-twelfth scale F-111 to determine that aircraft's ability to carry conventional stores. We're also involved in aerodynamic heat transfer tests on the reentry vehicle portion of the Navy's Poseidon; we're running 'aging' tests on the Minuteman; and we have some aerodynamic studies going in our supersonic tunnel on the 'Sprint' element of the Nike anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system.

"In preparation for source selection procedures, we're acquiring engine inlet performance data for the three contractors engaged in the advanced manned strategic aircraft (AMSA) program. And we're preparing to use the large wind tunnel for engine/inlet capability tests for the supersonic transport (SST). Later, we expect to test the entire GE-4 engine for the SST, following completion of the C-5A work.

"Tests for the J-2 engine for the S-IVB stage of the Saturn will continue through next June. These development and qualifica-

tion tests have been going very well, as I indicated earlier.

"These current projects and the hundreds of similarly vital projects, which have been carried out at Arnold over the years, attest to the truly national character of these unique and indispensable facilities."

**The "Pueblo" Incident**

**HON. STROM THURMOND**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last week I inserted a number of editorials from newspapers in the South to show the strength of the grassroots, feeling over the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

Today, I should like to add to this documentation by inserting in the RECORD the following editorials:

"Test of Character," the State, Columbia, S.C., January 31, 1968;

"Why Soviets Wanted the *Pueblo*," the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., February 1, 1968;

"A Pearl Harbor in Miniature," the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., February 2, 1968;

"Let's Stop Playing Patsy," the Augusta Herald, Augusta, Ga., February 1, 1968.

All of these show the resolve of the people, and their wish to defend the honor of the country.

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

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

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Jan. 31, 1968]

**TEST OF CHARACTER**

Weep no more for the departed glory that was England's, or France's in the bygone days when they stood proud and forceful on the world scene.

Weep, instead, for the United States of America, a giant in physical strength but a pigmy in national resolve. Never in history has so powerful a nation indulged so much disrespect at home and disdain abroad. The ultimate in effrontery now has been reached. The third rate country of North Korea has seized an American vessel in international waters, captured its crew, and—in effect—dared Uncle Sam to do anything about it.

Thus far, we have fluttered about in the dove cotes of the United Nations and blustered about with a show of military strength in the Sea of Japan. But neither our fluttering nor our blustering has brought back the USS *Pueblo* or the 80-odd American crewmen held captive by Communist North Korea.

Our own thoughts run backward through time, by-passing American involvement as a potent nation in World Wars I and II, to the days when the United States was but a fledgling nation at the outset of the 19th century. We reconstruct in our mind's eye the piratical acts of the North Africans along the Barbary Coast—the demands for tribute from American vessels plying the Mediterranean—the Tripolitan declaration of war against the United States for refusing to pay tribute, and finally, the seizure of the USS Philadelphia and its crew when that warship foundered on rocks in the harbor of Tripoli.

Proud history tells the sequence of events:

How a newcomer among the nations of the world mustered its strength to reclaim its nationals, how Stephen Decatur slipped into the harbor of Tripoli with a sloop bearing the apt name (for itself and its crew) Intrepid and blew up the Philadelphia, and how the United States forced a halt to the business of piracy and payment of tribute.

We think also of another episode a few years earlier, when the French sought to extract payments from the United States under duress. The South Carolinian, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, was minister to France at the time and uttered the declaration which, in its original version, proclaimed the American policy of "millions for defense but not a damned penny for tribute."

But pride turns to shame when we read that Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield declares his willingness to admit—even while knowing it to be untrue—that the *Pueblo* was in North Korean waters "if we could avoid a new war by a concession of this kind."

Such a craven statement besmirches the nation. America wants no more of war, but even less does America want peace at any price. The cost of cowardice runs high—too high for a people who prize liberty over life.

So long as the *Pueblo* and its crew are held hostage, just so long does the United States forfeit the heritage of its past and the promise of its future.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Feb. 1, 1968]

**WHY SOVIETS WANTED THE "PUEBLO"**

Anyone willing to believe facts over his wishful thinking or ideological bias knows that the Soviet Union, with the Red Chinese possibly playing some part, is behind the audacious seizure of the USS *Pueblo* by the North Koreans in international waters.

Furthermore, no one should be fooled now by evidence of some relenting on the part of the Russians on their initial refusal to do anything to assist the United States in getting the ship and its crew back.

It is likewise folly for the United States to consider any change in its policies in Vietnam, Korea or toward the Communists anywhere else as a sort of ransom for the unlawfully hi-jacked ship and its kidnapped crew.

We were surprised and dismayed by the professed willingness of Sen. Mike Mansfield of Montana, Majority Leader of the Senate, to have the United States admit the ship was where it had no business, even if it told a falsehood in "confessing" that the *Pueblo* was within North Korea's territorial waters.

To do this, or to pay blackmail in any form would invite more such incidents and more serious encroachments by the Communists on American rights and ever graver threats to its security. The "loss of face" in the eyes of Orientals alone would be worse than a major battlefield setback or a total defeat in the United Nations or at some other international bargaining table.

Furthermore, the Soviets by now have gotten what they wanted from the *Pueblo*, namely technical secrets, unless the officers and crew were able to do a better job of wrecking the equipment than they apparently had time to do.

In addition, the Soviets wanted the *Pueblo* removed from the scene. If they get away with this piratical "job" they will be tempted to try the same thing on other ships of the United States Navy.

From Washington columnist Paul Scott, who has good sources of inside information, we learn that the principal mission of the *Pueblo* involved checking on Russian ships bound for North Vietnam. Starting early in December, the vessel had been keeping an electronic eye of freighters carrying sophisticated weaponry from Vladivostok to Haiphong.



American intelligence had learned that Russia was planning to send into North Vietnam new types of missiles capable of carrying atomic warheads and of reaching targets deep in South Vietnam. This is a reasonable assumption, since the Communists have been using battlefield rockets—and they certainly weren't made in either North Vietnam or Red China.

In addition to advanced radar and radio listening devices, the Pueblo was carrying gear capable of detecting any nuclear material carried by passing ships. Communications to and from the ships were monitored.

It is reported that the Pueblo had learned that Soviet ships passing through the Sea of Japan en route to Vietnam were carrying surface-to-surface missiles. No nuclear materials were detected, but the next ship or ships might well be doing so—and the presence of Soviet missile technicians in North Vietnam is suspected.

So, the Soviet Union had two reasons for fomenting the incident, aside from their policy of causing trouble and embarrassment for the United States. One was to take the Pueblo out of action. The other was to steal her secret equipment.

Simple deduction reveals the culprit, and underscores the importance of a no-nonsense stand on the part of the United States.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News,  
Feb. 2, 1968]

#### A PEARL HARBOR IN MINIATURE

We hate to say it, because it reflects in part on men of the military profession for whom we have the highest esteem and a fellow feeling. But a recapitulation of the facts, so far as they are now known, indicates that the hi-jacking of the USS Pueblo and kidnapping of its crew was no less than a "Pearl Harbor" in miniature.

It was that because the Communists were successful in carrying off the "snatch" in the first instance. It seems that the officers and crew of the Pueblo simply did not believe the North Koreans, or the Russians whom they were watching, would dare to make the attack. (They simply swarmed aboard and took over the vessel.)

The fault may lie with them, or it may lie with higher headquarters, but even though they were in what we back here would consider a relatively safe situation near a major combat zone, they took too much for granted. They were poorly prepared to defend themselves and their ship and apparently made no efforts at evasive action until too late.

That is what happened at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

To continue the analogy, messages from the Pueblo about the presence and the movements, and subsequent reinforcement of the North Korean patrol boats which made the first approach, were sent and received, but there were delays in relaying them. Consequently, there seems to have been no way of sending assistance to the ship and crew. Even one attack bomber could have done something, maybe even breaking up the Communist show.

The analogy holds, also, because the Communist success has done the United States damage the extent of which is hard to assess, but we must concede that it is great. The Pueblo carried advanced intelligence gear, some of it described as being so sophisticated as to be almost unbelievable. We can be sure that most of it now is in the hands of the Soviets.

Messages received from the Pueblo and made public in part indicate that the crew made a valiant effort to destroy this gear, and may have been hurt in the effort. But the mechanisms were not equipped with self-destructive devices which the men could activate upon proper orders to do a complete job.

All military units, and naval vessels, along

with land and sea installations of all kinds, have Standard Operating Procedures (SOP's) to deal with almost any contingency. The Pueblo obviously had such, and the crew tried to follow them, but they were not complete.

We can only hope that the ground, air and naval units still untouched in the Pacific have a complete SOP, with authority, or direct orders, to put them into effect without delay in the event of further unexpected and threatening developments in Korea or elsewhere.

Capture and stripping or analysis of the Pueblo and its secrets made the venture worthwhile for the Communists, but it is becoming more clear each day that, as we wrote nearly a week ago, this incident was primarily a diversionary tactic.

It was the signal for what has happened since in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, as well as along the border between North and South Korea.

The enemy is stepping up his terroristic tactics in Vietnam, employing well-trained suicide task forces in coordinated attacks on towns and villages and even the Embassy in Saigon.

Simultaneously, the Communists are increasing tensions and assuming more threatening attitudes elsewhere even as they add to the military pressure in Vietnam and neighboring states.

There will be more incidents, more terroristic attacks, so long as the United States allows the Soviets to continue creating them without direct involvement on their part. There is no way to deal with these tactics, except to strike back with maximum force and not to let up on the counterattack once it is launched.

It could be that civilian control of every significant move, and the necessity for awaiting decisions at the White House level to react to changes in the situation have too much inhibited decision-making in the combat zone.

The administration should know by now that it can't run every detail of the anti-Communist war in the Far East from Washington. It should concentrate on forcing the Soviet Union to get out of it.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald, Feb. 1,  
1968]

#### LET'S STOP PLAYING PATSY

So much for phony truces and cease-fires in Vietnam. . . .

Thrice-fooled and then some, the United States finally has suffered the indignity of having its Saigon embassy seized by an armed Viet Cong suicide squad and portions of the embassy compound held for six hours until special airlifted U.S. troops could crush the attack. This should be education enough even for so inept a pupil in the arts of treachery as the United States has shown itself to be.

But will it be enough? One gets the depressing feeling that the Viet Cong or the North Vietnamese would have but to coo again for the United States to succumb once more to the siren call. Though all past experience has shown the enemy to be unmeriting of trust, and though every alarm bell has sounded its warning against further ventures into unrewarding trucemaking with that enemy, the United States seems to show an unflagging disposition to play the patsy in this bloody game of "Trick Me."

Meanwhile, as we pursue our policy of treading softly while carrying a willow wand, talk goes on about bringing the Communists to the peace table, even at the price of further concessions in halting the bombing of North Vietnam. Already the Administration has backed away from its previous strong stand against admitting the Viet Cong to the conferences, if and when held. Now the word is that all bombing of North Vietnam—except for the area just north of the demilitarized zone—would be halted if talks would

take place right away. We are still going on the supposition that the enemy is capable of honor, that he is as desirous of peace as we are, that we could arrive through mutual effort with him at something better than the kind of stand-off that has dragged on for a decade and a half in Korea.

The State Department has had many weeks now to "study" the supposed peace feeler extended by Hanoi and to which President Johnson referred hopefully in his State of the Union message—yet the diplomats have given no indication that it amounted to anything more than a semantic tease.

In that same speech, President Johnson said of the enemy's attitude:

"He continues to hope that America's will to persevere will be broken"—and that seems to sum his attitude up precisely. How can he fail to doubt America's will to persevere so long as this country continues to pussyfoot around the issue of victory? The indecision and vacillation at the highest level in U.S. policy-making can only embolden the enemy. It certainly will never intimidate him.

Let us have done with the phony truces and the ululations for peace, and get on with the job. The strength is on our side, certainly; but time, staying power, and psychology are on the side of the enemy. All will work to his increasing advantage unless we apply the power necessary to break his will and war-making capability—and do it soon.

The growing feeling of exasperation in this country at the course of the war was put into words, and not altogether rhetorical ones, by an irate Sen. Strom Thurmond on the floor of the U.S. Senate Tuesday upon hearing of the embassy raid:

"How much longer are we going to wait?"  
How much longer, indeed, can we afford to wait?

#### Congress Against Itself

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the attention being given in the press to the issue of congressional reform. It is vitally important that the public be made aware of the efforts of Congress to reform itself, and that debate be focused on the functions and potential functions of the Congress as the first branch of the Government.

The Legislative Reorganization Act, reported unanimously by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and passed overwhelmingly by the Senate, is a significant step toward congressional reform. There is much more that needs to be done. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has rendered an important service in its editorial of January 30, 1968, in calling attention to the work of one of my colleagues on the joint committee, Representative JAMES CLEVELAND, to get the reform proposals considered by the House.

The editorial follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch,  
Jan. 30, 1968]

#### CONGRESS AGAINST ITSELF

Representative Cleveland of New Hampshire may be making some partisan hay in urging the Democrat leadership to bring the congressional reorganization bill to the floor, being himself a Republican, but it is legitimate hay, with solid food content. The bill

is a modest one. It was passed 75 to 9 by the Senate nearly a year ago, and has since been bottled up in the House Rules Committee.

The Democratic majority on that committee could, if it would, report the bill for discussion and vote. That this is not done is of a piece with the old dictatorial rule of the committee by Howard Smith of Virginia, whom the voters eventually retired. Representative Cleveland says truly that the equality of the Legislative branch is the issue at stake. The Executive branch has far outstripped it, largely because of being more knowledgeable. This bill would only close the gap a tiny part of the way, but without it the trend will be wholly toward increased widening.

If Congress will not protect its own power and prestige, who will—or can?

### The Conglomerate

## HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the conglomerate corporate organization is something of a new breed in the business world; it represents a trend which needs to be better understood and evaluated.

Whether one happens to agree with his views or not, an address delivered recently by Mr. Walter Jeffrey before the American Marketing Association represents an interesting addition to the dialog on this subject.

Mr. Jeffrey is vice chairman of the E. F. MacDonald Co., and is recognized as a leading marketing authority. With the thought that Mr. Jeffrey's address will provide very useful information and background, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the extensions of remarks.

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

#### MARKETING IN A CHANGING SOCIETY (By Walter Jeffrey)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, last week, Friday to be exact, our Board of Directors met in Dayton, Ohio. On the table, before each of us, was an agenda and a rather thick folder holding the material to be covered at the meeting. Six years ago, the agenda—had it even been necessary to have one—would have been very short, and the folder wafer thin.

Six years ago the Directors would have been discussing a company with 50 million dollars in annual revenue, all from a sales incentive business which had been formed 40 years before. Each director at that meeting would have had a long record of service with the company and would have been familiar with almost every detail of its operation.

In the past six years the company has grown to a sales volume of almost 300 million dollars, and I would like to mention some of the subjects covered so you can see why the meeting folder has become such a thick one.

(1) The Incentive Division—A projection for 1968—a proposed new advertising campaign.

(2) The Trading Stamp Division—a new distribution program—requested approval for an expansion program, and a research report regarding trading stamp usage.

(3) The Travel Division—and a request

for chartering an airplane for anticipated trips.

(4) The Specialty Mail Order Division—a discussion of increased postal rates, the outlook for Holland's bulb season.

(5) The International Incentive Division—further review of the effects of the British pound devaluation.

(6) The Italian Supermarket Division—a special report on two supermarkets just opened.

(7) The Personal Loan Division—a forecast of interest rate levels.

(8) The Belgian Hotel Division—a request for building two new cafeterias.

(9) The California Supermarket Division—a report on competitive supermarket activity, a report on the effect of the meat cutter's strike, a program for opening additional stores.

And (10) Just preceding the Director's Meeting, a special stockholders meeting had approved the authorization of one million shares of preferred stock to assist in future acquisitions. We are a conglomerate!

Just a few short years ago the phrase "Conglomerate Corporation" did not appear in business circles with the frequency it does today. My topic centers around new marketing responsibilities—related to conglomerate management. Considering their size and scope, this topic represents a formidable task. By order of development I will first present a working definition of what, to my way of thinking, constitutes the essential characteristics of a conglomerate. Second, a few remarks will be directed to the basic rationale behind its development. My third, and major area of presentation, will relate to changing marketing responsibilities inherent in such a structure.

In my opening remarks I used our company as a reference point and from that example, two features are of major significance in understanding what constitutes a conglomerate. First, it is basic that I am referring to a multi-market corporation. Multi-market in the sense that each individual business enterprise is actively engaged in strategy formation and tactical performance in a separate and unique market. Thus, the conglomerate in total is engaged in a multitude of different markets, perhaps in a number of different countries. To my way of thinking, multi-market engagement is substantially different from the alternative strategies of market segmentation or product differentiation. The multi-market concept treats each company and its market in totality, with related strategies as separate and distinct performance areas. Thus, at the heart of a conglomerate structure is the basic notion that overall corporate strength and stability is magnified by the mutual exclusiveness of each individual market involvement. Returning to my example, a setback in the marketing of a travel service program will have very little if any direct infringement upon successful execution of a direct mail, supermarket, or trading stamp program.

The second major feature centers around its "plus" capability. The combined strength of the conglomerate should bring to the overall corporate enterprise a "plus" capability to aid any individual subsidiary faced with a legal, financial, or competitive adversity. Once again, the parent organization, as the coordinating force, should be ideally situated to promptly and effectively come to the aid of an ailing subsidiary.

Thus, the essential features may be summarized as multimarket operational autonomy and combined "plus" capability. These two features are, to my way of thinking, the fundamental difference between the large financial amalgamations of the late 1940's and 1950's in comparison to the corporate conglomerates of the 1960's.

Turning to the basic rationale of conglomerate development, perhaps the features

of multi-market autonomy and "plus" capability offer sufficient explanation. However, I think not. The important question is, why did they wait until the 1960's to emerge?

The current rash of conglomerate formation is most commonly attributed to a series of legislative and judicial decisions. In other words, such structures are viewed as a reaction to actual or potential legal restraints. There can be little doubt that traditional patterns of growth, once viewed as attractive alternatives, have been severely tarnished by restrictions on vertical and horizontal integration. However, in my opinion, at least three other factors must be afforded significant weighting.

First, inherent in each step toward continuous and profitable sales growth is a risk contingency. The conglomerate, unlike other forms of growth, renders the total corporation in a relatively secure situation. Unlike some vertically or horizontally expanded firms, this multi-market structure is not equally in danger of a domino-like reaction to adversity. Faced with a radical economic, social, political, or technological change, the conglomerate can spread risk. At the very least, by the very nature of its structure, the conglomerate has the advantage of leverage and time. Specific reverses can most often be restricted to a single business entity.

Second, perhaps the greatest force behind their growth rests in their capability to engage in planned innovation. In the future, more than at any other time in American economic development, a well-planned and steady implementation of innovation will be paramount to continued corporate growth. It may not always be feasible to obtain profitable growth through merger and acquisitions. Attention will have to be paid to growth possibilities from within the corporate structure. The conglomerate, with its combined know-how and financial stability, is well equipped to provide the flow of innovation necessary to maintain corporate and national growth in the decades ahead. There can be provided the required financial stability in an atmosphere of marketing, physical distribution, and manufacturing competence.

Finally, the third factor acting as a stimulant to conglomerate growth is the shortage of management resources. The greatest deficiency in business today is the lack of experienced, broad-gauged top management talent. Perhaps this factor has been generally overlooked. The conglomerate, unlike any of its predecessors, provides the organizational mobility and resource structure capable of stimulating the best of managerial talent.

Thus, the rationale of its growth runs far deeper than simply a corporate reaction to a restrictive legislative environment. Foremost among the variety of factors leading to rapid conglomerate formation has been the ability to dilute risk within the corporate structure; its unique potential to develop and navigate innovation; and the capability of the structure to efficiently utilize scarce managerial resources in a challenging and productive manner.

Now let us turn to the Marketing responsibilities in a conglomerate setting.

The problem of the conglomerate is not unique to marketing. Certainly, other areas face new and challenging problems.

Marketing management in particular faces an interesting challenge. During the first few years of conglomerate existence, the major problems usually center around the financial area. In essence, management is forced to perform a wedding of individual subsidiary operating statements and balance sheets.

Initially each subsidiary is more or less self-sufficient since for the most part central management is dealing with new and unfamiliar market patterns. Thus, emphasis during the initial years is centered around questions of cash flow, capital budgeting and general financial control.



However, after financial integration is complete, it appears certain that managerial emphasis is destined to shift from the financial area to one of growth. Herein may rest marketing's greatest challenge. The very basis of this multi-market organization is the creative implementation of the marketing concept. In short, there appears little doubt that marketing as a basic and prevailing philosophy of business orientation stands on the threshold of its most challenging era. Likewise, the role of the marketing executive will be one of viable responsibilities within the conglomerate structure.

At least five aspects of the responsibilities of marketing executives appear destined to shift in both scope and character of performance. The major areas of change we can label for purposes of discussion as: (1) corporate posture of the conglomerate marketing manager; (2) a philosophy of subsidiary market planning and control; (3) market innovation; (4) the marketing man's role in acquisition decisions; and (5) marketing's social responsibility. For the final few minutes I will develop some comments concerning each of these changing responsibilities.

First, and foremost, is the question of corporate posture of the conglomerate marketing executive. In my judgment, there exists today in such organizations a serious need for the emergence of a new, a completely new, type of marketing executive. This type of structure demands a corporate marketing executive who is capable of being both a jack-of-all-trades and a master-of-all-trades. While individual subsidiaries will in all probability remain autonomous with respect to operating performance, it appears equally probable that overall corporate direction and planning will become more centralized. The thrust of conglomerate corporation growth will have to flow from parent company headquarters. In order to maximize the benefits of conglomerate organization, headquarters management will be forced to pursue an integrative policy with respect to staff-oriented functions.

Thus, the new breed of marketing executive will place greater credence upon basic and universal principles of market planning and performance measurement. Experience and seniority will no longer constitute sufficient credentials for such a marketing job. It is highly doubtful that a single executive could ever hope to acquire sufficient exposure in each basic corporate entity to speak with authority on the details of each subsidiary. Rather, the marketing executive will place a high premium on basic marketing relationships. He will be an executive who understands basic similarities and differences between marketing systems. In general, more precise measures of performance and more exacting techniques of control will be required to efficiently guide multi-market growth.

Next, turning in greater depth to the question of market planning and control of subsidiaries, we see the second main area of required marketing application to conglomerate structure. There will be new questions raised concerning effectiveness of centralization. In essence the marketing concept calls for integrated performance of all aspects of the marketing mix. However, in a conglomerate setting it appears that maximum momentum, control, and planning performance may best be mobilized by centralization of some aspects of the traditional marketing mix while maintaining and encouraging highly decentralized or integrative operations concerning other aspects.

For example, consider the communications and distribution sub-mixes. A conglomerate marketing policy with respect to subsidiary control may well be one of *laissez-faire* (lay-say-fayr) regarding the basic communications mix. But with respect to the distribution mix, management may very well seek maximum physical distribution

economies by developing a policy of subsidiary integration with centralized control.

It is not my purpose to specify alternative patterns of control. The proper pattern depends upon the merits of each individual situation. What is of paramount importance is that marketing in a conglomerate structure will be faced with an increasing demand to effectively manage a coordinated program encompassing a variety of different operating sub-systems. The degree of centralization between these sub-systems will not only vary between the traditional sub-mixes of overall marketing, but also between the degree of autonomy of individual subsidiaries. Control in such a conglomerate setting as is demanding and complex as any challenge marketing has faced to date.

The third area of changing marketing responsibility centers around the need for planned innovation. As noted earlier, the future of conglomerate growth will rest directly upon the overall corporate capability to generate a steady stream of innovations. The mobilization of innovative talents and the delineation of market opportunities is an important part of marketing responsibility. Historically, it is in the American tradition to view the process of innovation as being individually oriented—Edison working alone to develop the light bulb—Kettering working late at night in his garage—(our Chairman, Mr. Elton F. MacDonald, visualizing the use of a salesman's briefcase as a means to incentivize the salesman's performance). It is my opinion, that a new dimension of innovation was born when a team of over forty scientists split and harnessed the atom twenty-five years ago.

In today's demanding business environment the cost of failure is great. A single product introduction can run into the millions to guide development through the growth stage of the product life cycle. It is a marketing responsibility to reduce the chance of error and to guarantee the rate of progress by fostering the right environment for innovative development.

Now, as a basic notion, the idea of marketing being associated with innovation is not new. Even the idea of team research is well established. What is new centers around the premium that conglomerate structure will be forced to place upon innovative performance.

The conglomerate marketing executive will have to develop the mechanism to gain a penetrating knowledge of the marketing determinants of subsidiary companies. In addition, the conglomerate executive will need the capability of extracting the necessary know-how from individual subsidiaries in order to translate market opportunity into tangible product reality.

This process of planned innovation is not one grounded on serendipity alone. Planned innovation must be based upon the scientific process. It will fall largely with the marketing executive to develop and implement the planned innovative process within the complex and often conflicting structure of a multimarket corporation.

Finally and foremost, the conglomerate marketing executive will need the capacity for evaluation of potential growth opportunities in terms of related risks and corresponding return-on-investment probabilities in a wide variety of often unrelated businesses.

Fourth, the marketing man becomes an integral part of the management team that evaluates future acquisitions. Pure financial data is not enough for decisions of this caliber. The marketing man, in his evaluation of the potential acquisition and its market, can contribute significantly to the soundness of merger decisions.

Marketing's changing responsibility will have social implications. I have long believed that increased marketing knowledge is one of the most vital forces in the growth of a highly developed and fully abundant

society. While marketing can make substantial contributions to under-developed societies, the greatest potential contribution rests in a highly affluent society. Here, marketing can work as a persuasive force in guiding the development of natural resources and human capability into the most socially desired and accepted channels of growth.

Over the past several decades we have come a long way from the theory of a self-regulating market system in which government simply existed to specify the rules and boundaries of the competitive game. Government has become a much greater force in all areas of business operation as legislative and judicial action has moved from a policy of passive to active interaction in the competitive environment. However, even assuming that governmental philosophies are correct reflections of the public interest, it is extremely doubtful that anything greater than temporary relocation, restraint, and reduction will ever result from legislative and judicial action in a free market economy.

The conglomerate, with the aid of powerful resources, technical competence, and the broad vision of multi-market operations must recognize this basic need to meet a social responsibility. Aided by computers, conglomerate management is on the verge of tremendous advancements regarding its capability to influence our basic market system. Management in general must become fully cognizant of its need to protect and enhance the development of a sound public policy. This responsibility can no longer be passive. Further, because of marketing's basic introspection into the nature and structure of consumer markets, it seems logical to expect that leadership must emanate from the marketing sector of the conglomerate firm.

In the past few minutes we have progressed from a basic definition of a corporate conglomerate to a series of challenges with respect to basic marketing responsibilities. I have suggested that the basic virtues of a conglomerate are multi-market autonomy and a combined "plus" capability. To my way of rationalization, governmental restraints on vertical and horizontal integration have constituted but one force in the emergence of the conglomerate structure. Other factors of significance are the advantages of risk reduction, the need for a structure capable of supporting a planned innovative endeavor, and finally the creation of an environment that will attract and stimulate scarce managerial resources.

The advent of the conglomerate signals substantial challenge to the marketing sector of the corporation. A new strain of broad-gauged marketing executive will be demanded by the complex operating structure of the conglomerate. This executive will have to translate the traditional concepts of marketing orientation into a control and planning mechanism for organizations engaged in various degrees of centralization. Foremost, among the emerging responsibilities will be a demand to develop our knowledge of marketing with respect to innovative development and evaluation. Finally, the marketing executive of the conglomerate must assume a new posture regarding the role of business responsibility in matters of public policy.

In conclusion it appears rather apparent that the American economy is rapidly moving to the point where it will make increased demands upon the discipline of marketing. The marketing concept has played a vital role in motivating our economic growth to this important juncture.

However, in the decades ahead the marketing challenge will be far greater than conception of a philosophy of growth. The challenge will rest solely upon the development of executive techniques to manage the continued growth of the most abundant economy ever known to mankind.

## Casualties in Our War Against Crime

**HON. RICHARD FULTON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, casualties are being suffered in a continuing war in our Nation—our war against crime.

In my home district of Nashville-Davidson County, one dedicated lawman was called upon to make the supreme sacrifice, and another officer suffered grievous wounds at the hands of three suspected forgers.

Officer Thomas E. Johnson was killed by a gunshot in the chest.

Officer Charles Wayne Thomasson was critically injured with multiple gunshot wounds. He is slowly recovering.

My community, and our Nation, too often takes the protection provided by our law officers for granted. Too often we fail to recognize the sacrifices these lawmen willingly take to protect our lives and our property. We are indeed fortunate that these men are willing to work under the most adverse conditions, working extra hours without compensation, at a less than deserving wage scale.

Officers Johnson and Thomasson deserve our highest honors. An editorial in the Nashville Tennessean paid tribute to these men and told of their ordeal. At this time, I include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TOP HONOR DUE OFFICERS JOHNSON AND THOMASSON

The community is shocked and saddened by the slaying of a Metro policeman and the critical wounding of another in the attempt to apprehend three suspected forgers Tuesday night.

The officer who was killed by a gunshot in the chest was Mr. Thomas E. Johnson, 38, of 1104 Kirkwood Ave. The second patrolman, Mr. Charles Wayne Thomasson, 28, of 224 Dodson Chapel Road, is in critical condition in General Hospital with multiple gunshot wounds.

The officers were among several policemen trying to hem in the suspected forgers in the North Nashville area. Sgt. G. L. Lilley, a veteran police officer, was in charge of the search. Others participating included Patrolman Jesse Patterson and Officer Raymond Black.

Sergeant Lilley had received a tip on the forgers from Mr. Harold E. Thomas, operator of a liquor store at 1218 Jefferson St., who became suspicious of a money order presented to him for cashing. The two men who tried to cash the order fled in a car bearing a Michigan license plate. Mr. Thomas got the number and gave it to the police.

A little later, Patrolman Patterson spotted the Michigan car parked in front of an apartment building at Hermosa St. The other officers converged on the area and as they did a car bearing an Ohio license plate sped away from the apartment building. Patrolman Johnson immediately gave chase in his patrol car and was joined a little distance away by Patrolman Thomasson.

The two officers apparently cornered the desperate men at a dead end and attempted to apprehend them before reinforcements could arrive.

Patrolman Thomasson, already critically wounded, directed Sergeant Lilley to the scene by radio and then fell silent. When the sergeant arrived, Patrolman Johnson was

dead in the street. The suspects had fled on foot but their car containing valuable clues to their identity—and some evidence of Black Power ties, according to some sources—had been effectively blocked by the patrolmen. Four shots had been fired from Mr. Johnson's gun, but it was not determined if any of them had found their mark.

Patrolmen Johnson and Thomasson represent the highest ideals of the dedicated law enforcement officer. Their devotion to duty and bravery are a credit to the many fine rank and file members of the Metro police force, who daily go about the business of facing death without seeking personal recognition or advancement.

A grateful community extends sympathy to the family and friends of Patrolman Johnson. It is hoped the principles of diligent and impartial enforcement which characterized his career will be strengthened by his tragic death.

The community earnestly wishes for Patrolman Thomasson a speedy recovery from his serious wounds. The sacrifice of both men will be long an inspiration to many devoted, hard working members of the police force and a community reminder that good law enforcement comes not from the over-ambitious, political-minded high police superiors in city hall but from the good officers who patrol the beats and risk their lives to keep the city safe.

**Control of Nuclear Powerplants****HON. LEE METCALF**

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. METCALF, Mr. President, as nuclear powerplants for generating electricity continually grow larger, many of us have become concerned as to who will control them. Will such plants be for the public benefit, or will they increase the monopolistic control of the private utilities?

The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who introduced proposed legislation late in 1967 to protect the public, has been a leader in this field. I have been pleased to cosponsor his bill, S. 2564.

On January 15, Senator AIKEN delivered the keynote address before a legislative conference of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Washington. There he clearly outlined the need for a Nuclear Power Act. His remarks were extremely well received by this audience of rural electric cooperative leaders from throughout the United States.

Because Senator AIKEN's comments are such an excellent summary of the nuclear power situation, I am pleased to call them to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR GEORGE D. AIKEN BEFORE THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 15, 1968

As of January 1, 1968, there were 15 nuclear power plants in operation in the United States.

Twenty-one others were under construction, while firm orders had been placed for 40 more.

Add to these 76 the 12 that are planned, but for which no firm orders had been placed, and we have a total of 88 nuclear electric plants which are expected to be in operation within the next few years.

The comparison of the plants in operation with those that are planned, however, does not tell the real story.

Whereas, only six of the fifteen plants now in use have a capacity for over 100 megawatts, only five applications since 1965 call for less than 500 megawatts, while ten of them contemplate a capacity of 1000 megawatts and over.

Of the 41 applications since 1965, 26 are between 500 and 1000 megawatts.

It is estimated that between now and 1980, some 150,000 megawatts of nuclear power capacity will have been built.

This will represent over one-third of the nation's total generating capacity.

Nuclear power has without doubt become competitive with other generating systems over much of the country, if present cost estimates are realized.

Even in my own State of Vermont, utility companies estimate that the cost of nuclear generation will be quite competitive with and probably cheaper than hydro power from St. Lawrence or other sources.

Even though it is expected that research will still further reduce the production cost, we may well say that nuclear power has arrived and will play an increasingly important part in our general economy.

The increasing feasibility of nuclear power production has, however, created new problems and the necessity for new legislation to deal with these problems before it is too late.

It is for this reason that in conjunction with several of my Senatorial Colleagues I have introduced Senate Bill S. 2564, early action on which is necessary if the natural resources of the nation, the health of our people and the competitive system which has made our nation great are to be protected.

And, in connection with the achievement of these objectives, we must insure an adequate supply of electric energy for all parts of the nation—not just the creamy areas.

S. 2564, together with S. 1934, the Electric Power Reliability Act introduced by Senator Muskie of Maine and others, including myself, would go far toward insuring us against power shortages or blackouts in the future.

Before going into the provisions of our proposed legislation in more detail, I will briefly comment on the progress, or perhaps the lack of progress, in atomic energy legislation since the passage of the McMahon Act or the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

This basic legislation was directed primarily at the development and production of atomic weapons and it was not until some years later that the potential of the atom for the production of electric power really dawned upon the industry.

The McMahon Act was amended from time to time but it was not until 1954 that major changes were recommended to the Congress.

While the possibility of producing electric power from the atom was clearly apparent by that time, it was also apparent that the cost of production would be excessive.

Much more research was needed before it would be feasible for private or public utilities to consider construction of nuclear generating plants.

Public expenditures were imperative and the legislation of 1954 provided such assistance.

In a minority report to the Congress, Representatives Hollifield and Price severely criticized the proposed bill.

In their report, they stated: (Page 120) "The very magnitude of economically feasible nuclear power plants persuades us



to believe that the balance will be thrown heavily in favor of private monopoly unless provision is made for Federal development of atomic power, particularly where supply is desired by public or cooperative systems."

And again they stated (page 121), "the bill includes no provision to encourage public or cooperative distribution of nuclear power. Furthermore, it includes no provisions assuring that privately owned electric utilities producing nuclear electric energy under license from the Commission shall sell the power at the lowest possible rates consonant with sound business practices."

The legislation of 1954 has justified both the hopes of its supporters and the fears of its critics.

The first central station nuclear plant built with government assistance—the Shippingport Atomic Power Station—began production on December 18, 1957.

From that time on production costs dropped from about 50 mills per kwh to less than 4 mills at the present time.

The Federal Government has expended something over \$2 billion in bringing about this competitive cost.

Under the law, the A.E.C. was vested with authority to license atomic power plants although, as the Hollifield-Price report states, the A.E.C. "has never been a 'power-minded' agency" and "it has steadily backed away from any concept of government responsibility for the production of atomic power."

Subsequent events seem to have vindicated that the judgment of those two Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for the Atomic Energy Commission appears far more concerned with improving the means for developing that power than it is with the distribution and use of such power once it is generated.

I am not sure but what we expect too much from the Atomic Energy Commission since its primary interest should lie in the technological use of nuclear science rather than serving as a licensing agency for power plants and as policemen for the public interest.

It may well be that having laid down the rules for control of radiation hazards, this Agency should not be expected to act as fish and game warden, recreation director, and enforcement officer for the anti-trust laws as well.

However, in the absence of clear-cut A.E.C. authority to regulate these matters, I think it is high time that Congress made a decision as to whether and to what extent, and by whom these matters should be regulated.

The law as it now exists is highly satisfactory to the corporate utility interests, but is becoming more and more inadequate and unsatisfactory as protector of the public domain and the democratic rights of the individual.

That is why, with some of my Colleagues in the Senate, I have introduced S. 2564 hoping that Congress will take action to protect the rights of the public and the resources of the nation before it is too late.

The Gold Rush is on.

The private electric utility interests hope to establish monopolistic control over the electric power supply of the nation before the public becomes aware of what is going on.

They are applying for licenses under the provision of Section 104 of the law—Section 104 is the section relating to "medical therapy and research development."

No license has yet been issued under Section 103 which authorizes the issuance of "commercial licenses."

The reason for seeking a license for research development rather than a commercial license is a lesson in transparency.

Under a "research license" a corporation in effect avoids possible embarrassment under the anti-trust laws.

As a practical matter, with the law as it is now, municipal and cooperative systems can only obtain protection under the anti-

trust statutes after the monopoly or restraint of trade has been established and then only after costly, time-consuming litigation in the courts.

The reasoning of the Atomic Energy Commission in issuing only "research" licenses for power plants is set forth in a speech by Commissioner Ramey before the Federal Bar Association on October 16, 1967.

After pointing out that before issuing a commercial license the Commission must "find in writing that a type of reactor has been sufficiently developed to be of practical value for industrial or commercial purposes," Commissioner Ramey points out that the Commission has not yet made a "practical value" finding.

This attitude on the part of the Commission seems rather incongruous when we learn that the cost of producing nuclear power is said to be well under 4 mills per kwh and the large power companies are falling over themselves to get licenses.

They are planning to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in new plant construction which they would not do unless they were satisfied that such action were of "practical value."

The transparency of this approach is further illustrated in another way. While a utility is applying to the A.E.C. for a license as a research project, the utility officials go down the street to the S.E.C. and ask permission to issue stock as a profitmaking corporation.

No other interpretation can be put upon the present situation except that the corporate utility interests are seeking a monopoly over much of the nation to the exclusion of public and cooperative systems before adequate guidelines for issuing licenses can be legislated.

As I said before, The Gold Rush is on.

That is the reason for the introduction of S. 2564, a bill "To insure a reasonable opportunity for all electrical utilities to participate in the benefits of nuclear power."

I would now like to give you a brief insight into the purposes and provisions of this bill.

The purposes of the bill are—

First. To protect the public health and safety.

Second. To protect and conserve natural resources.

Third. To prevent monopoly in the field of electric generation and distribution.

Fourth. To insure an adequate supply of electricity in areas threatened by shortages.

As far as the first purpose—to protect the public health and safety—is concerned, existing legislation is adequate but needs to be coordinated with the other purposes I enumerated earlier.

The A.E.C. has so meticulously administered the rules pertaining to radiation hazards that there has been no need for payment of Price-Anderson Act indemnity funds connected with any nuclear power plant in operation up to this time.

In fact, judging from the record to date, there is more danger to the public health from the breaking of a hydro-electric dam or from air pollution caused from the burning of fossil fuels.

To dismiss radiation dangers as non-existent would be foolhardy since a margin of human error always exists, but the record of nuclear power plants and our nuclear naval vessels to date indicates that there is probably more risk from established and orthodox uses of radiation than from these newer, larger developments.

It is most unfortunate that scare stories have been broadcast for the purpose of arousing public sentiment against nuclear power development.

The second purpose of the bill—"to protect and conserve natural resources"—warrants close attention.

Since most atomic power plants are planned for location with access to fresh water,

the protection of such waters against a substantial rise in temperature becomes of increasing concern.

The people interested in recreation, particularly sports fishing, have risen up in protest.

The result has been that water cooling equipment will undoubtedly be required for plants constructed from now on.

Of course, I recognize that the problem of "thermal enrichment" is not peculiar to nuclear plants but is common to all thermal power plants.

This will add to the cost of generating the power, but it is believed that such cost will still be well within the range of competition with fossil fuels over most of the country.

To guard against the possible loss to our fresh water assets, the bill would require the A.E.C. to consult with the Water Resources Council before issuing a license.

Even with this precaution, it is conceivable that the large plants of the future may be located offshore where sea water may be used as a coolant, and safe waste disposal areas may be constructed or provided.

The power from such plants might then be piped inland to great distances, possibly by direct transmission.

Purpose number three—"To prevent monopoly in the field of electric generation and transmission."

This purpose is quite patently intended to prevent the corporate utilities from shutting off the municipal and cooperative systems from the benefits of low cost power which has been made possible by public expenditures.

As I have pointed out, the private utilities are virtually exempt from the anti-trust provisions of the Atomic Energy Act as the Act is interpreted and applied by the A.E.C.

Therefore, the Bill, S. 2564, provides that Section 111 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 shall read in part as follows:

"No person shall be issued a license under this chapter to construct and operate a utilization or production facility to produce electric energy for ultimate sale to the public unless the Commission finds that—

"the applicant has granted to all other interested persons, including Government agencies and public, private and cooperative bodies, engaged in the distribution, transmission, or production of electric energy an opportunity to participate to a fair and reasonable extent, as determined by the Commission, in the ownership of the facility for which the license is requested;"

And also: "the applicant agrees to make the output of electric energy from the facility available, during the life of such facility, for sale on fair and nondiscriminatory terms to all persons, including Government agencies and public, private and cooperative bodies, engaged in the distribution, transmission, or sale of electric energy."

It may be assumed that the private utilities as a whole will fight vigorously against sharing ownership of a plant with any public or cooperative system.

In the case of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, however, the President of the Corporation, Mr. Albert Cree, whom I consider the most enlightened utility operator in New England, has offered the co-ops and municipalities of Vermont an opportunity to purchase stock in the proposed plant.

He did not make a similar offer to Massachusetts municipalities located within easy transmission distance of the proposed facility and thirty-nine of them have taken the matter to the courts.

Incidentally, I feel that Mr. Cree did not endeavor himself to the more conservative New England operators by going as far as he did.

Whether many municipalities and cooperatives would actually invest much in large atomic plants is a matter for conjecture.

What the consumer-owned systems want to be sure of is that the price they pay for power will be on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Yet, in addressing a meeting in Chicago last November, the Chairman of Commonwealth Edison said that allowing consumer-owned systems to own a portion of a new nuclear plant would discriminate against company customers who pay system costs in their rates.

If the private power industry actually intends to deal with consumer-owned systems on a nondiscriminatory basis, it should not object to having that proviso written into the law.

But, I fear they do object.

The fourth purpose of the bill is—"to insure an adequate supply of electricity in areas threatened by shortages."

The use of electric energy in the nation is increasing at an accelerated rate.

Probably all estimates of future requirements are too modest.

To meet the requirements of production and distribution we will need all types of systems—private—municipal—other public systems and cooperatives.

Nuclear generation will show by far the greatest rate of increase provided adequate guidelines are laid down and enforced so that construction of plants will not be delayed.

Speed is of the essence.

We cannot afford to have generation delayed by lengthy court action.

Much peaking power will be required if nuclear power is to be provided at lowest cost.

This is one reason why the use of fossil fuels should increase rather than decrease as nuclear power widens the utilization area.

As evidence of this trend, we find that while TVA is planning a 1,065 megawatt unit with a predicted production cost of 2.39 mills per kilowatt hour, it is also planning for two 1,300 megawatt coal-fired power units which are expected to produce at about the same cost.

Further delay in revamping the law is inexcusable.

What form such revision may take is immaterial to me so long as it does the job.

If the Congress sees fit to merge my bill, which amends the Atomic Energy Act, with Senator Muskie's Electric Power Reliability Act which I am also sponsoring, I have no objection.

If it is decided to delegate the authority to license nuclear power plants to another agency, I will agree so long as the purposes I have outlined are attained.

If certain Members of Congress see fit to abet the utility companies in trying to kill our proposal or block a hearing, I won't like it although I will concede their right to do so.

I hope it will be possible to get early hearings on the proposals.

All interests concerned should have the opportunity to be heard.

The purpose of my bill is not to hamstring the corporations, but to make sure that the law is equally fair to all.

If I have one hope paramount to all others, it is that the President will put the power of his office behind these proposals, thus putting public needs above private desires.

Lastly, let me thank the personnel of the NRECA for their wholehearted support of measures which are consistent with national requirements and our democratic traditions.

### Young Americans—Make This Country Safe

**HON. E. C. GATHINGS**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, despite the seeming numberless articles in the newspapers concerning juvenile delin-

quency, hippies, beatniks, and draft-card burners, the plain truth is that these articles have to do only with an infinitesimal percentage of our young people. The vast majority of young Americans are concerned, positive people with their eyes on the stars but with their feet on the ground. Sometimes, but not often enough, news articles are written about these fine young people.

One such article was written recently by Miss Corinne Hodges and carried as a feature story in the January 30 edition of the Memphis Commercial Appeal. It relates the story of young 15-year-old Jay Oakes, of Augusta, Ark., and his work to restore the 1902 clock in the bell tower of the Woodruff County Courthouse.

The future of this country is safe with such fine young men growing to manhood throughout the Nation; concerned, capable, and dedicated young people such as young Jay Oakes.

The story follows:

#### YOUTH WITH TIME ON HANDS SETS THINGS STRAIGHT

(By Corinne Hodges)

AUGUSTA, ARK., January 29.—The time is correct on the four faces of the clock in the Woodruff County Courthouse tower at Augusta because a 15-year-old youth is a dedicated clock lover.

The 1902 timepiece had stood still until Jay Oakes, a high school student, took over its renovation. Long interested in clocks, he had had some experience with a jeweler and some study on his own.

Dust and debris of years had collected all over the clock works. Moreover, Jay had a battle on hand with bats and birds.

"Bats swarmed in the tower here. You had to have a flashlight to see. The place was in horrible shape. And there was an epidemic of wasps; they were an inch thick on the floor."

Weeks of mopping and cleaning in spare time followed. Then Jay started on the more meticulous task of the clock works. Piece by piece, he went over the clock, which bears the name, E. Howard Clock Co. of Boston.

Removing the faces, which are six feet in diameter, he carefully cleaned and replaced each one.

"But the hand on the south face still is broken. On the east face, some of the minutes have fallen off. Oh, there's still lots to be done. For instance, a bird flies right through the middle of the South face. That hole has to be fixed. I wish we could get some new faces."

Jay can hardly wait to get up to the clock tower after school, sometimes at night, and often on Sunday afternoons. "It's such a change from school.

"I like to call the clock mine; and when I start towards the courthouse, it seems like I'm going to my courthouse."

Sometimes Jay brings a friend, Robin Coleman, with him, and on special occasions, he may even show the clock to adults. He explains how the four shafts from the center works operate the faces.

He tells how to "set this old deal," and picks up the ancient pendulum and the crank to wind it. The clock was electrified some time ago, but it has to be reset when the power goes off.

For those who can climb the narrow flight of steps to the belfry above the clock, Jay will show the giant bronze bell, almost six feet in diameter.

"When I finally got the bell and the clock fixed, the bell rang 24 times before it stopped. But I finally got that fixed."

The timepiece was installed when the

Woodruff County Courthouse was remodeled in 1902.

Jay, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack Oakes, has developed a different outlook on the world of politics from his clock-tower viewpoint. Political rallies on the courthouse yard are much more interesting when he's in the clock tower looking down.

### Letter From Vietnam

**HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON**

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest in letters from servicemen in Vietnam and I have been asked by one of my constituents to insert in the RECORD a letter which she received from a relative, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1968.

DEAR ROBYN: Today was briefing day, (show and tell day), so we had to make up the usual amount of stuff. The Col. now calls me Tommy so at least he knows who I am. As you have probably heard the American has killed over 1,000 NVA in the last week. It has been a busy and a hard week up north.

Today I went up to the 2nd Surgical Hospital to see one of my classmates from OCS. His platoon got caught in a minefield last week and he was in critical condition. He has broken his jaw and both cheeks, has three chest wounds, and his right leg is broken. This as well as small fragmentation wounds too. He was in the intensive care ward and it was a hard thing to see. In the beds there were other troopers who had lost both arms below the elbow, and other serious wounds. Peacock can not talk as he has a tracture in his neck. He is very weak and in a great deal of pain. He writes notes on a pad and seems to be making good headway as they didn't think that he would live when he first came in. He wanted some apple juice so I went down to the P.X. and got him some.

I have told you this because when you see something like it it makes you sit back and wonder if this war is worth the price that it costs us in American lives. To see these young guys with arms and legs blown off and to think of the difference in their lives now is a hard thing. It leaves a great deal for thought. I wish that there was a way to show the people in the states who protest for peace the debt that they owe these people. I am glad that they want peace, but is it for peace that they protest or because that they are looking for the typical way out; or as in many cases is it that it is the "in" thing to do, so let's join the mob and do it? I hate to be this way but after I see the sacrifice that some give to be Americans I have little patience for the people at home who protest the way that they do.

I know that there are certain bad things to the war and reasons to get out, but we are a self determining government and we have a democratic method of expressing our desires and that is the way that we should do it. Those who have not earned the right, but yet have it and abuse it in the manner that some do don't deserve the rights that they have. I don't say that everyone should have to go to war to be a good American, but I am saying that every American owes it to his country to uphold its principles and if they desire a change to do it by the manner of voting which makes our country. I am beginning to lose a great deal of respect for the so-called "in" group. I don't mean to burden you with my thoughts, but there are certain things that I think that you should know and understand.



### Help the Mental Health Clinic

## HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there is a wider recognition of the problem of mental health throughout the United States today than ever before. All levels of government and many voluntary associations have developed programs to help those who are mentally disturbed. One of the most outstanding examples of voluntary groups doing much good work in this field is the Riverdale Mental Health Association, soon to begin its eighth year of service to the community of the Bronx, N.Y.

I enclose herewith an article on the work done by the Riverdale Mental Health Association for the benefit of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

#### HELP THE MENTAL HEALTH CLINIC

The Riverdale Mental Health Association will soon begin its eighth year of service to the community. Founded and supported by a dedicated group of volunteers, this organization has established a remarkable record.

Hundreds of families in Riverdale now contribute their time and money toward the development of a mental health clinic to help those who cannot afford private psychiatric care. To meet constantly increasing needs, a staff of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and other therapists provides a variety of services. Marriage counseling, family guidance, an after-care program for patients discharged from mental institutions, occupational therapy, a child care program and community education are some of the programs that have been developed effectively here.

In 1965 New York City recognized the value of the important work done by the Riverdale Mental Health Association. The Clinic is eligible for a grant from the City's Community Health Board. This grant is contingent, however, on funds raised locally in Riverdale.

If the Clinic were not functioning here, many who need its services in Kingsbridge, Marble Hill, Spuyten Duyvil and Riverdale would be deprived of important health care. Those who could not otherwise afford private psychiatric care are eligible for consultation and treatment at low-cost fees, based on ability to pay. An application fee of \$10, for example, also includes the first interview.

The Clinic maintains bright and cheerful quarters at the Professional Building on Johnson Avenue at 235 St. In addition, such programs as the School Consultation Service reach out into the community. Teachers have welcomed the series of lectures given by Clinic psychiatrists to help them increase their understanding of children's emotional problems.

Last year 248 residents of the community were helped by the Riverdale Mental Health Clinic. A waiting list averaging 20 persons a month is awaiting expansion of its services. There is only one way for the clinic to grow, and that is through contributions from an appreciative community.

A Mental Health Telethon will begin on January 26 and will continue through January 28. When one of your neighbors calls for funds we hope you'll respond generously. Your contribution will help someone in your neighborhood to find a solution to emotional problems.

Better still, may we suggest that you send your gift now to the Riverdale Mental Health Clinic, 3265 Johnson Ave., Bronx, N.Y., 10463.

The cost of a Family Membership is \$10, you can become a Contributing Member for \$25, a Sustaining Member for \$50, or a Sponsoring Member for \$500. Your help is vitally important, and it's needed now.

### Flight Safety—The Need for Good Training

## HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recent editorials in the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star contained serious errors regarding the DC-8 training accident in New Orleans last March which killed 19 people, 13 of them on the ground. The pilot in training was practicing two-engine-out emergency procedures when the accident occurred. The Post editorial questioned the value of this type of training, claiming that "no jetliner has ever experienced such an emergency."

Actually, there have been 18 such emergencies in turbine-powered airplanes. All 18 landed without mishap because the pilots had undergone such training and knew exactly what to do.

In its editorial entitled "FAA Error" the Star put the blame squarely on the FAA, claiming "the pilots and the FAA inspector allowed the airspeed to fall below safe limits." The FAA inspector actually had nothing to do with the accident. He was aboard as an observer to familiarize himself with this type aircraft. He was not in any fashion in charge of the flight or even giving directions to the pilots.

Some Members of Congress and the press have seized upon the accident to demand that the maneuver be stopped on the basis that it is valueless.

The FAA has made some changes in the two-engine-out maneuver rule but has not abolished it. It is still required in training but not on flight checks. All airline operators have been advised that when performing the two-engine-out training maneuver it must be accomplished over approach lanes isolated from residential areas.

I think it should be remembered that the passengers in the plane should be protected—and any maneuver should be designed toward this end—as well as protecting pilots and people on the ground.

Federal Aviation Administrator Gen. William F. McKee has written the Post responding to some of the points raised. At this point, I am enclosing a copy of his letter:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., January 26, 1968.

Mr. J. R. WIGGINS,  
Editor, the Washington Post,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIGGINS: In your editorial Friday, January 26, "Airplane Safety," the following statement is made:

"The FAA requirement that pilots master two-engine-out landings, even though no jetliner has ever experienced such an emer-

gency with passengers aboard, may well be justified."

For your information there have been 18 two-engine-out landings (with passengers) involving jet aircraft since 1962. All of these landings were made successfully and due, we think to proper crew training.

We have taken action to see to it that two-engine-out landings in training are not made over heavily populated areas.

The last sentence in your editorial reads? "It is up to the FAA to take steps that will make the training procedures for airline pilots safer, both for them and for those of us on the ground."

I agree with this sentence with one addition—you should add to the sentence: "and for the passengers on the aircraft." This we are doing.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKEE,  
Administrator.

### Freedom of Travel

## HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's rather recent request that all Americans join him in an effort to improve the Nation's balance-of-payments position by imposing a voluntary ban on nonessential foreign travel for a period of 2 years reaffirms his faith that the American public will do whatever it can to work for the welfare of the Nation.

In testimony before the Ways and Means Committee yesterday, administration officials indicated an effort will be made to go beyond this voluntary restriction on foreign travel. I will not support efforts to tax traveling Americans as long as there are so many other areas where affirmative action could improve our balance-of-payments position as dramatically and with much less inconvenience and expense to the traveling American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the Comptroller General recently published his report to the Congress on the U.S. balance-of-payments position. In reading this report, I was made acutely aware that efforts have been made in some areas to improve our balance-of-payments position; while in other areas, there has been a noticeable lack of activity.

This report documents a number of steps which have been taken by the administration to minimize the effect of tourism on our balance-of-payments position. Some of these measures:

First. The Department of Commerce has embarked upon a campaign to stimulate travel in the United States on the part of both Americans and those from other countries.

Second. The duty-free exemption on goods bought abroad by tourists has been reduced from \$500 wholesale to \$100 retail value.

I could go through the Comptroller General's report in great detail and document how it has been repeatedly suggested that the United States include in its agreements with foreign countries

provisions for maintaining the value of U.S. foreign currency balances and foreign currency loans. Failure to do this has resulted in enormous losses being incurred as readjustments were made in the relative values of foreign currencies and the dollar. The cumulative effect of these detrimental readjustments was a value loss to the United States of \$2.2 billion through June of 1966 with additional losses to be sustained in future years. I could also point out that over a 10-year period, the United States was overcharged by \$50 million for telephone service in Japan. I would suggest that more attention be paid the Comptroller General's recommendations before we tax our traveling public.

I believe that in addition to those basic rights which are specifically stated in the U.S. Constitution, there are certain other traditionally held rights which Americans everywhere have come to prize just as highly. One of these rights is the prerogative of each and every American citizen to travel abroad whenever and wherever he chooses.

In the past, and even now, it has been necessary for the Department of State to place certain countries on a restricted list for American tourists because of reasons affecting our national security. I have supported these determinations on the whole because I believed them to be in the public interest. However, I cannot and will not support any type of arbitrary travel ban or travel tax on foreign travel by U.S. citizens.

It has been said by some that this so-called travel tax may be necessary as one means of correcting the current deficit that the United States is encountering in its balance-of-payments posture. Those who support this view seem to forget that in 1966, the United States was one of the foremost tourist host nations in the entire world. Certainly any action taken by our Nation to impose a travel tax on its citizens would be met with prompt retaliatory action by other member nations of the world community and I doubt seriously that, if this eventuality were to occur, our balance-of-payments position would be significantly strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post published a very good and extremely pungent editorial on the administration's proposed restrictions on American tourism. I insert this editorial in the RECORD at this time and urge that my colleagues read it and note the many and varied weaknesses and inequities which are in the administration's proposals:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1968]  
A REGRESSIVE TAX

Having imposed severe restrictions on business investment in Western Europe, the Administration now proposes to apply the principle of "equality of sacrifice" to those who would travel. Its "travel tax" proposal, unveiled yesterday by Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, is a thoroughly objectionable measure. It is a regressive tax that would fall principally upon those in the middle income brackets who cannot write off their trip to Europe as a "business expense." The mandatory declarations of how much money is being taken out of the country and the need to account for it on return would subject travellers to an intimidating volume of

paper work as well as to penalties and fines. Finally, there is no guarantee that other countries would not retaliate against this proposed "devaluation" of the tourists dollar with measures that would reduce further our trade or current account surplus.

Secretary Fowler made much of the fact that the tax on travel expenditures will not fall heavily upon those with small incomes. The first \$7 of daily expenditures in Europe is exempted from the tax; the next \$8 of expenditures is taxed 15 per cent; and all expenditures in excess of \$15 a day are taxed at a 30 per cent rate.

People in very modest circumstances who visit Europe and reside with relatives may indeed pay little or no travel tax. But what of the middle income traveller without relatives in Europe, the tourist who demands not luxury, but a modicum of comfort. The single person who spends \$750 to travel in Europe for 20 days would, in addition to a proposed 5 per cent tax on a plane or steamship ticket, have to pay a travel tax of \$159 or 21.2 per cent. Adding 21.2 per cent more to the cost of trip might not be a great burden for the very wealthy, but it surely would be for those in the middle income group. A family of four planning to spend \$1500 for a 20-day tour of Europe, would be taxed \$186 or at the rate of 12.4 per cent.

In addition to the regressivity of the travel tax—the same rates for all, irrespective of income or ability to pay—those who can deduct the trip as a business expense get reduction in the travel tax rate. A single traveller in the 50 per cent income tax bracket cuts his travel tax rate in half. Moreover, those with cash personal balances in Europe, or access to corporate cash balances in branches or affiliates, may escape paying the tax altogether.

There is no doubt that this measure would discourage some travel to Europe. But it does not follow that the balance-of-payments deficit would be significantly diminished. Increased travel by Americans in the Western hemisphere will result in a substantial migration of dollars to Europe unless this country adopts outright, rather than disguised exchange controls. And why does the Treasury assume that Europe—which has a bilateral deficit on trade account with the United States—will permit us to place a high tax on tourism, one of the most important "services" which they provide for Americans?

It is argued that other countries, notably the United Kingdom, impose far more stringent restraints on foreign travel. But one set of clumsy controls does not justify another. Before Ways and Means endorses the travel tax, it ought first consider alternatives to piecemeal dollar devaluation through the proliferation of controls.

### President Johnson Urges Greater Powers for EEOC To End Job Discrimination

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

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

PRESIDENT JOHNSON URGES GREATER POWERS FOR EEOC TO END JOB DISCRIMINATION

The President of the United States has once again asked us to advance the fight against discrimination in employment by enacting a bill which would strengthen the enforcement powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The President has rightly requested cease and desist

powers for EEOC. I urge the Congress to enact this necessary piece of legislation.

Discrimination in employment is one of the most serious forms of discrimination existing in America today. For one of the most fundamental rights guaranteed to every American is the right to hold a job.

The unemployment rate of Negroes today is double the rate for white persons; and Negroes are often the last to be hired and the first to be fired. Correspondingly, the wage level for Negroes is considerably lower than the level for white persons. The result is that the Negro has less chance to buy a home outside the ghetto, he has less chance to send his children to college, and he has less opportunity to enjoy other advantages of American life. At a time when our prosperity is at its highest level, this is unconscionable.

We have been asked by the President to take a step which will help assure that discrimination in employment will be dealt with effectively. I urge the Congress to pass this measure without delay.

### President's Consumer Message Turns Attention to Faulty Repairs and Worthless Warranties

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in his consumer message to Congress, President Johnson issued a timely call for action on the growing problems of improper repairs and worthless warranties on consumer products.

Abuse in this area has built up a crescendo of discontent. Consumers are asked to put absolute faith in manufacturers' guarantees but sometimes that faith is unjustified.

Products sometimes break down before the buyer has had a chance to finish paying for them.

Guarantees are worded in vague terms which provide little protection against repair.

Housewives are at the mercy of repairmen who are sometimes unscrupulous or incompetent.

We are—all of us—consumers, whether rich or poor, young or old, whether we live in great cities, small farms, or sprawling suburbs. Our spending for consumer products makes up two-thirds of America's gross national product. The consumer deserves protection against deception and dishonesty in the sale and repair of consumer goods by unqualified or unconcerned parties.

President Johnson has launched a cooperative venture with private industry to raise the standard of service and repairs and to give real meaning to guarantees of product quality and consumer safety.

President Johnson's proposals will help insure that American buyers receive a fair and honest exchange for their hard-earned dollar. In turn, this will give added public confidence in those manufacturers and repairmen who do a good job. By far the majority of these people perform dependable service and they should be protected from misjudgment



by seeing that the unscrupulous and careless are held accountable for their work.

## Wake Up, America

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Hartsville Vidette of Hartsville, Tenn., recently published a speech by Mr. Howard W. Kacey, president of Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C., made at the Lions and Rotary Clubs of College Park, Md., in which he issued the challenge: Wake Up, America.

This is a most provocative and challenging speech—a timely discussion of national problems—and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I include excerpts from this speech.

The excerpts follow:

### WAKE UP, AMERICA

Things are happening throughout our land which greatly disturb me—things which I feel must also be of real concern to every citizen. On every hand there are signs that the moral strength of our nation is decreasing alarmingly. The principles upon which our country was founded are being eroded slowly but surely. We are substituting materialistic values for spiritual ones—the old moral standards of what is right and what's wrong are being discarded and, in their stead, we are establishing codes of ethics that, if followed, can only render us impotent as a people and as a nation.

When I selected "Wake Up, America," as the title of my talk, there were fresh in my mind the riots that took place in Ohio, in New York, in Missouri, in Iowa, in Wyoming. However, these riots, unlike the ones which took place in Los Angeles, in Chicago, in Springfield, Massachusetts, did not have racial overtones. What they all had in common, however, was a disregard—yes, even a hate—for law and order. All of them were grim, unhappy examples of the present moral climate of our nation.

The situation is getting worse, and yet, too many Americans are still emulating Rip Van Winkle. Unless we can find a way to wake them up, there might be no stopping the downward course of America.

Clubs, like yours, are a force for good in our business and community life, and today more than ever before, there is a crying need for this force.

Even though some of us recognize that our nation is headed in the wrong direction, we are living in a dream world waiting for someone else to do what is necessary to get America back on the right road again. Seemingly, we don't want to become involved or else we justify our lack of action by saying:

"It can't happen here," or

"That's just teenagers letting off steam," or

"Times are changing, you've got to expect things like that," or

"It's the Government's problem—I'm not going to worry about it."

Yes, those statements, and many more like them, can be heard every day from the man next door, from the fellow who works with you in the office, from county, state and national politicians, from pulpits, from reporters, from editors, from college professors, from friends and relatives—from just about every level of society.

Somehow, someday, an epidemic of sleeping sickness has struck our nation. Upon those who have been fortunate enough to

thus far escape the disease rests the responsibility of finding a solution before it is too late. If we are to turn the tide, each one of us must shout over and over again to all who will listen—"It can happen here!"—"It is happening here!" In fact, in Los Angeles it happened right before our eyes, thanks to television.

Like Sodom and Gomorrah—like Rome—America is rotting from within. Immorality is flourishing and pre-marital sex is being condoned even from the pulpits; juvenile delinquency is on the rise and disregard for law and order has been given a cloak of respectability; pornography is accepted and even preferred in our literature, in our movies and in our stage shows; our courts continue to find technicalities whereby vicious criminals, known to be guilty, are turned loose to prey again and again on society—why just recently the Washington police arrested a man caught in the act of raping a 24 year old waitress. This man had, on two other occasions within the previous six months been charged with the same type of crime. In the first instance the case was dismissed because the victim committed suicide rather than go through the ordeal of the trial. The second case was dismissed by the trial court on the technical grounds that the police made an illegal search because of their failure to first obtain a search warrant.

Listen, Gentlemen, we are going to have to wake up before it is too late—we are going to have to effect some drastic changes in our present way of life—changes in our behavior patterns, changes in our thought processes, changes in our moral values.

But, "What can I do?" is the question that people invariably ask me and therefore, one of the very first things we all can do is to make the most of every opportunity that presents itself to help bring self-discipline and decency back into style. If you have youngsters of your own—or are in a position to influence other peoples' youngsters—take the time to try to develop in them a sense of personal responsibility, an understanding of the importance of their maintaining high moral standards, of the need for constant devotion to religious principles and of the necessity for fostering a deep and abiding pride in and love of country.

Next, you can bring all the pressure at your command to plug up the loopholes in our laws that enable punks to go scot-free not just once but time after time. Let's demand that criminals be treated as criminals—that the hands of our police in bringing criminals to justice not be tied down by unworkable and unreasonable requirements such as the Mallory Rule.

Just as important, let's support our law enforcement officers.

Too often the everyday acts of courtesy, help and cooperation which our dedicated law enforcement officers perform for the benefit of the health, safety, welfare and protection of all our citizens are accepted matter-of-factly. I believe that for the good of every community and for the good of our citizens who desire to see law and order prevail throughout our land it is up to all law-abiding people to help improve the policeman's public image by giving to him full and complete support and cooperation.

Likewise, I believe that we must counteract the generally unfounded charges of police brutality which are being leveled with increasing frequency at arresting officers all across the land. The policeman's job is tough enough without having to face brutality charges every time he makes an arrest. It is a fine line between brutality and self-defense. I do not mean to imply that there have not been misuses of police power, for the record shows otherwise. However, these are the exceptions. Let's demand of our law enforcement officers the highest quality and efficiency of performance, while demanding for them the public respect which they so rightly deserve.

Our schools have been instructed to refrain from teaching our children the power and glory of PRAYER. We have successfully defended in court our children's right to ignore the salute to the flag. Groups are hard at work trying to abolish Christmas and Easter programs in schools—to do away with baccalaureate sermons—to eliminate Thanksgiving Day and Presidential proclamations of prayer—even working to remove Chaplains from our Armed Forces. This may all sound fantastic, but unfortunately, it's true. Certainly you cannot deny that there is a move afoot to remove religion from every phase of our national life—a move that is getting support even from ministerial groups.

The blows are being well-timed—the poison is being administered in small doses—we are weakening before the relentless determination of the ever-present minority of evil people whose goal in life is to drag others down to their level.

If you have children in college, write a letter to the head of that institution urging him not to tolerate "student uprisings." In this connection I wish to commend Dr. Wilson Elkins, the President of the University of Maryland, for the firm stand he has taken concerning this matter. Dr. Elkins warned the parents of the members of the Freshman Class that students who want to take matters in their own inexperienced hands will not be welcome at Maryland. He made it clear that the University will not tolerate disorder and demonstrations similar to those which occurred at Berkeley, California. According to a campus survey conducted by The Washington Post, most of the students interviewed supported Dr. Elkins' position.

Let's insist that our churches and our ministers devote their time to our spiritual problems and not just to those problems connected with civil rights. Tell your minister that it is just as sinful to advocate civil strife as it is to deny right.

I am confident that all of you can think of many more things you can personally do to turn the tide in favor of self-discipline and decency. I am hopeful that each one of you will do something. The time for lip service is past—the time for action is now!

Remember this—as the old hymn says, "God moves in a mysterious way. His wonders to perform." Perhaps through you He will point the way whereby we can . . . Wake Up, America!

## Veterans Association Resolution Concerning U.S.S. "Pueblo"

**HON. SILVIO O. CONTE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the 104th United States Regiment Veterans Association to introduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD its recent resolution concerning the Pueblo incident.

Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions been requested by organizations to introduce resolutions setting forth their views on various matters and have been happy to do so.

I am similarly pleased to insert the 104th United States Regiment Veterans Association's statement at this point in the RECORD:

Be it known that the 104th U.S. Infantry Regiment Veterans Association Inc. is an organization whose members are overseas wartime veterans who are duly and permanently concerned with the vital security of the United States of America.

In regular session held 28 January 1968 the National Executive Council of the 104th U.S. Infantry Regiment Veterans Association Inc. did vote unanimously to recommend that the President and the Congress of the United States of America take the following actions:

1. Immediately break off negotiations in the United Nations Assembly to retrieve the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew.
2. Immediately start negotiations directly with North Korea to retrieve the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew.
3. Failing to retrieve the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew within one week take whichever positive action necessary, including use of an armed force, to retrieve the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and the Naval Officers and Men, and the civilians who comprise her crew.

### Inner-City Rural Program

#### HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago the National Council of Boy Scouts and 16 selected local councils initiated a cooperative program to learn how best to use the Boy Scout program in disadvantaged urban and rural areas. I commend the Boy Scouts of America for undertaking this pilot effort and believe all Members will enjoy and appreciate their report on the program.

The report follows:

#### INNER-CITY RURAL PROGRAM

In 1965 a cooperative program between the National Council and sixteen selected local councils was initiated, to learn how best to use the Scouting program with boys and families living in disadvantaged urban and rural areas.

The Inner-City Rural Program is beginning to produce a number of important findings. We are beginning to discover the nature and depth of some of the obstacles that seem to be preventing Scouting from achieving greater effectiveness in disadvantaged areas.

Among adults who are disadvantaged, the image of Scouting is not clear and because of the complexity of the pressing problems they face, it tends to get a rather low priority. Professional and volunteer Scouters need more training, understanding and guidance to enable them to serve disadvantaged youth and communities. Some of our supporting materials such as visuals, must be revised in order to make them more relevant to the needs of disadvantaged people.

The overall Inner-City Rural Program has made some important contributions. It has brought about a recognition on the part of some local Health and Welfare Councils and United Funds, that Scouting is a valuable tool in serving disadvantaged areas. It has opened doors to new cooperative relationships with some governmental agencies.

Each project has established purposes and a research design. Some highlights of progress to date would include the following:

Some literature has been developed which relates to disadvantaged children and their parents. This includes a Cub Scout Application and the Bobcat Requirements in English and Spanish. In addition, a new Boy Scout Application with an illustrated explanation of the Tenderfoot Requirements has been developed, as well as a booklet for new Scoutmasters containing six months of program helps. All of these items have been worded at a low grade level.

An attempt is being made to relate materials and program content to the cultural characteristics of disadvantaged people in

the Ozarks, Appalachia and to those of Mexican-American background.

Efforts are being made to develop unit programs that are relevant to inner-city boys. A referral system has been set up at a state training school for boys, in which 50% of the boys are enrolled in Scouting. The program is designed to encourage local Scout councils to help these boys to continue in Scouting upon their return to their home communities.

Cooperative programs have been tried with various anti-poverty agencies. These include the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Summer VISTA Associates, College Work-Study Students and personnel from local Community Actions Programs.

The program with the Cuban refugees continues to grow and is received with enthusiasm by these boys and their parents.

Some new ideas seem to be emerging:

The use of neighborhood and area committees in both rural and inner-city areas to bring Scouting closer to the community level.

The use of teenagers as leaders in some instances.

The use of store-front meeting places, where facilities are scarce and sponsorship is weak.

The specialized training of professional leaders for work in disadvantaged areas.

The giving of direct service to some children and families with problems and the referral of them to other agencies.

The development of relationships with other agencies whose primary responsibility is to disadvantaged people.

We have now entered the "phase out period" for four of the projects, although we expect a number of them to continue through 1970. As findings are refined, plans will be laid to implement them by providing necessary supporting programs and personnel for local councils.

The following councils have been authorized to carry out these controlled experimental projects in disadvantaged areas:

Appalachian Council, Bluefield, W. Va.  
Baltimore Area Council, Baltimore, Md.  
Chicago Area Council, Chicago, Ill.  
Dan Beard Council, Cincinnati, Ohio  
Detroit Area Council, Detroit, Mich.  
Egyptian Council, Herrin, Ill.  
Greater Cleveland Council, Cleveland, Ohio  
Greater New York Council, New York, N.Y.  
Los Angeles Area Council, Los Angeles, Calif.  
Middlesex Council, Edison, N.J.  
National Capital Area Council, Washington, D.C.  
Ozarks Council, Springfield, Mo.  
Philadelphia Council, Philadelphia, Pa.  
Robert Treat Council, Newark, N.J.  
St. Louis Area Council, St. Louis, Mo.  
South Florida Council, Miami, Fla.

### Lithuanians Still Seek Freedom

#### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1968, the Santa Monica Evening Outlook published an editorial of great importance not only to the million Americans of Lithuanian descent, but to all Americans who cherish the right of free self-determination. In recognition of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Lithuanian Republic, I wish to commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

#### LITHUANIANS STILL SEEK FREEDOM

Americans of Lithuanian descent and Lithuanians in all other parts of the free

world are observing two important anniversaries this month. One is founding of the Lithuanian state in February 1251, under King Mindaugas the Great. This month is also the 50th anniversary of the Lithuanian Republic's establishment. Due to the aggressions and treacheries of the Nazis and Reds during World War II, Lithuania became a satellite of the Soviet Union.

Since the day of occupation by the Russians, the Lithuanians have never lost their desire for freedom. Remembering the sacrifices made over the years by Lithuanian patriots, nearly a million Americans of Lithuanian descent are acting through their U.S. organizations to designate 1968 as Lithuanian Fight for Freedom Year. The Lithuanian-American Council of Southern California points out in a news release that the American people remained sympathetic to the aspirations of Lithuania's patriots.

Recalling that the 89th U.S. Congress passed House Concurrent Resolution 416, calling for freedom not only for Lithuania, but for Latvia and Estonia, the Southern California council is asking that the United States carry out the intent of the resolution by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding that the U.S.S.R. withdraw from those states. Russian aggressions cannot be exposed too often and this month is a particularly appropriate time to renew the Baltic issue in the United Nations.

### The J. P. Stevens Co.

#### HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, my good friend and colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] under a special order of the House brought to the attention of the Members the extremely unjust manner in which the NLRB and the Supreme Court have acted in relation to the J. P. Stevens Co. and its officers.

I was unavoidably detained and unable to participate in the discussion. However, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to associate myself with the statements of my colleague made at that time. I, too, have the good fortune to have a plant of the J. P. Stevens Co. situated in the congressional district which I represent, and as a matter of fact in my hometown.

This company has been an outstanding corporate citizen of our community since it came there and we consider ourselves extremely fortunate in having it. Its officers and employees who have moved to Wallace, N.C., from other places to form the nucleus of the administrative staff have, without exception, been the kind of people any community would welcome. I have had the extreme pleasure to meet and become personally acquainted with Mr. Robert Stevens, the president of the parent Stevens Co. and am convinced of his sincerity, integrity, and ability.

An effort has been made by the labor unions to organize a number of Stevens plants. In many instances, the unions charged unfair labor practices by the management in coercing or otherwise intimidating employees. In each instance,



management officials refuted the charges. Essentially, the disputes boiled down to questions of fact and in the final analysis, the issue became one of the credibility of the witnesses and the NLRB without exception chose to accept the testimony of the union organizers rejecting out of hand the testimony of management officials.

Now, I do not challenge the propriety of the union in attempting to organize any plant it can. I do not challenge the propriety of the union's taking its case to the NLRB when it feels that unfair labor practices have been committed; or of offering testimony tending to show that such practices have been committed.

What I cannot understand is the action of the NLRB going so far as to require officials of the company to appear before employee groups and admit that they had violated the law when, in fact, the management officials do not honestly feel and believe that they have violated the law.

The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the decision by the NLRB without even listening to argument and without affording the management officials the "day in court" which our system of justice has always provided for any and all persons accused of violating the law. I cannot think of words appropriate to describe the highhanded attitude of the NLRB officials who issued such an order or the lack of concern by our Supreme Court Justices who refused even to consider the case. I would hope that responsible labor union leadership would recognize the gross unfairness of the situation and would join management in insisting that the Supreme Court reconsider its decision in this case and take jurisdiction in order to spell out and clearly define the limits to which the NLRB can constitutionally go. After all, attitudes and personnel could change so that some day the shoe might be on the other foot and the NLRB might be making union officials place themselves in the same unjust and humiliating position now being required of management officials.

#### French Resolution

### HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the resolution to express the sense of the House that France be forced to pay her World War I debt to the United States.

We all know that France is dedicated to undermining the interests of the United States; in Paris, the French collect dollars with which to bleed U.S. gold supplies, and in Vietnam, French rubber planters and companies regularly give money to the Communists and Vietcong. Therefore, it makes no sense to allow France to ignore her World War I debt to this country. I urge the Members of this House to join in support of this resolution. We will never get loyalty from France; we cannot expect integrity

from France; we cannot expect support from France; then let us be sensible and get our money back. If we can collect our World War I debt from France—and I mean by any means necessary—then we will eliminate much of the threat to our gold supply and we will put General de Gaulle out of business. It is high time that we tell France to behave.

I do not believe that this resolution is enough; even firmer steps must be taken. First, I believe we should embargo all gold shipments to France. I am drawing up a bill to prohibit the export of gold to any country which has owed the United States more than a certain number of billions of dollars for over 40 years. This will only apply to France. I also think that we should consider imposing special, sky-high tariffs on French goods. I do not think we should help support the French economy by spending dollars on French goods that could be spent on American goods.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we can get tough enough with France. De Gaulle has practically declared economic war on this country. Are we just going to sit still and see our gold stolen bit by bit, or are we going to counterattack and teach the ungrateful French a much-needed lesson?

#### Project Hope

### HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our efforts to be understood and our efforts to help the people of other nations seem so frustrated and ineffective, it is heartening to look at one American project, the SS Hope, which is successfully bringing medical assistance to people around the world. This ship's missions of mercy, made possible by the generosity of private individuals and industry, have brought great credit to our country. I include here an editorial from the Bakersfield Californian, which is an excellent account of Project Hope's accomplishments, as follows:

[From the Bakersfield (Calif.) Californian, Dec. 30, 1967]

#### SS "HOPE" HEAPS GLORIES UPON HERSELF

One of America's finest achievements in the realm of world understanding and good will has been the SS Hope project.

It is a ship staffed with medical supplies, people and a genuine desire to be helpful, wherever it might drop anchor. To those peoples of the world who have availed themselves of its services, SS Hope is America.

We have built an untold reservoir of human understanding with the ship whose missions of mercy around the world are made possible by the support of private individuals and industry.

Since she first weighed anchor seven years ago, the ship has visited Indonesia, Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, Guinea and Nicaragua.

For 10 months in 1967, some 280 volunteer American doctors, nurses and technicians from 39 states conducted medical treatment-teaching programs in Colombia.

Next March, the ship will sail to Ceylon to begin another 10-month mission.

As Project Hope entered its final month in Colombia, 24,227 patients had been treated aboard the ship or in shore clinics, 1,642 operations had been performed and 162,157 immunizations administered.

A total of 676 Colombian physicians, dentists, nurses and other medical personnel had taken part in formal medical educational exchange programs.

The Hope leaves behind in Cartagena a shore-based clinic to continue this work.

Student demonstrators who don't like anything about America were notably absent from the pier in Philadelphia.

#### Priority One

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, H. G. Wells once wrote that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." What we have seen unfolding in our streets during the last few years is a testimony to Mr. Wells' wisdom. The underprivileged, undernourished, and undereducated children of our ghettos are striking back at a society which has not been able to find room for them. Their rocks do not mean that they reject us as much as that we have failed them.

If we are to avoid tragedy, we must be willing to commit our resources and energy to our schools. I recently received a manuscript from Mrs. Eileen K. Davis, a constituent of mine, that suggests a way in which these resources and energy could be effectively spent. It is not necessarily the "right" answer to the crisis in ghetto education, but it does demonstrate a well-conceived design to help the slum school better shoulder its obligations. I commend it to my colleagues, to educators, and to all Americans of good will.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following manuscript, "Priority One," in the RECORD:

#### PRIORITY ONE

(By Eileen K. Davis)

The proposal which I am about to do my blunt best to sell you assumes as its basic premise that it's the squeaky wheel which should get the grease, and that no wheel in our society squeaks so piteously as the slum child.

A slum is a place of sullen apathy and sour cynicism, where every promise that America has ever made to her children is a dirty joke at which no one laughs. From it, bearing on his small mind and body all the old scars and fresh wounds it has inflicted, the slum child goes every day to be educated—after a fitful night shared with two or three bed-fellows and rent with the savage sounds of degradation: the ugly fights and shrewish screams and foul oaths, punctuated by occasional police sirens, that make up the sound track against which the sordid drama of the slum is played out.

He goes to be educated—with his stomach not-quite-full of a presweetened dry cereal or a stale doughnut, listless and dull. And there he is herded about all day, reproached for not having done his homework, and exhorted to more vigorous participation in volley ball or folk dancing.

His academic diet is a fragmented affair, consisting of a smidgen of this and a smattering of that, so that in a single morning he may be expected to remember that "occasion" is spelled with two c's but only one s, that meat is full of protein and lettuce full of iron, that  $6 \times 6 = 36$ , that coffee is the chief export of Brazil, and that latitude means sideways and longitude means lengthwise. Very likely, following the established speech pattern of these places, he communicates in a slurred, barely comprehensible patois—and is solemnly taught to diagram sentences and shun the split infinitive.

From time to time he is given a report card to take home to his parents; yet another flake of paper from the snow factory of the powers that be, this one complaining that he knows too little of Pueblo Indian customs or repeatedly fails to distinguish between Eastern and Western hemispheres; that his spelling is poor, and he doesn't seem to be "trying." Very probably, no one reads it, or would care if they did.

In this, at least, his elders are more intelligent than we, for it's all incredibly irrelevant. It has nothing to do with this child, with who he is or what he needs, or what prospect awaits him tonight or tomorrow or when he is twenty. It is a package delivered to the wrong address, a gift intended for somebody else.

In this situation, then, I submit the concept of the Priority One school, to be established in areas defined as slums by any of several social or economic criteria, which simply acknowledges the realities of slum life and attempts to out-flank them. It is predicated on four fundamental articles of faith:

1. That the tap root of the poverty jungle is ignorance; ignorance of a kind, and to a degree, which amounts to a cultural illness, and is passed from generation to generation through the social genes of the slum environment.

2. That the children of the slums, in the grip of this illness, drop out of school not at 16, when they actually trade the boredom of the classroom for the boredom of the street-corner, but at 11 or even younger, when the bushy-tailed eagerness to learn, with which they started school at five, withers and dies; so that they enter high school so poorly prepared for its challenges and so oblivious of its rewards, that failure and withdrawal are virtual inevitabilities, and the poverty cycle is all but complete.

3. That therefore, any meaningful assault on poverty must begin with the very young, and in this struggle for the cultural health of these children, civilized society gets its only innings in the public schools.

4. That if we are to score in these innings, every resource of lay intelligence and professional know-how must be imaginatively brought to bear on the special problems peculiar to educating these seriously handicapped children, taking into account every known characteristic of their life and countering each with an effective antidote.

To implement these convictions, Priority One differs from conventional schools less in kind than in degree, though to meet its specialized objectives it airily disregards curricular conventions which are all but sacrosanct and rudely brushes aside any and all legal requirements which get in the way of its resolute purpose. It is *not* however, an experimental school, full of electronic hardware and avant garde notions. On the contrary, it may be regarded by some as downright old-fashioned: a three-R-and-no-nonsense curriculum, presented in a framework of practical response to practical needs.

This is because we cannot afford to gamble with these children. Middle class kids may be well able to withstand the intellectual punishment of academic experiments which do not pan out, for they have built into their lives innumerable compensations, from Sunday School to literate

parents. The slum child has few, if any, of these. He is climbing a very steep and slippery ladder, with little by way of a literate tradition to sustain him, and we dare not try to coax him upward with fancy footwork and tricky shortcuts. No aid or technique would be shunned simply because it is not traditional, but each and any employed would have first to be proven, and the test of its acceptability for Priority One would be the degree of certainty with which we could acclaim its usefulness. This is a scheme in which every component is meticulously chosen for a carefully calculated effect. It fully exploits, without apology, the fact that during the hours they spend in school, we can create and control the environment in which these children live—and frankly extends those hours to give us a bigger edge.

Because the child's life is one of brutality and clamor, the school would be designed as an oasis of serenity; carpeted, and divided into many very small classrooms, for classes would be limited to 15, and landscaped with many trees and broad lawn areas. Small schools, and more of them, would be planned instead of a few larger ones; they reduce the need for petty strictures and regimentation, of which we want as little as possible.

Nothing must be allowed to lengthen the odds on success, and so it will be necessary to swallow hard and face a terrible fact; that the older child, already steeped in the squalid mores of the slum, is therefore a potentially corruptive influence. Accordingly, at the outset we would provide only for kindergarten and grades one through four, adding a grade each year for a total of eight.

Because the slum home so often lacks an effectual father, a condition which gives the children a nebulous sense of their sexual identity, boys would be taught by men, girls by women, from first grade through sixth. Women would teach kindergarten coeducationally, and seventh and eighth grades would be mixed in preparation for the sexual awareness of adolescence.

Our first order of business is to make the children educable, and a physically under-par child is not educable. So, because meals in the slum home are typically concocted with scant regard for nutritional values, the school day would begin with a solid breakfast. Lunch would also be given, of course, and here again the accent would be on nutrition, with a grand disdain for the filling macaroni so dear to the heart of the school cafeteria. These kids get enough carbohydrates at home; what they need from us are meat and milk and green vegetables and fruit. Dining would be a civilized business, with small tables and music piped in. Teachers would be required to share breakfast and lunch with the children, each shepherding an octagonal table of eight—encouraging the children in conversation, gently chiding sloppy table manners, and spreading themselves around so that no child sat at a teacherless table for more than two consecutive meals.

Similarly, because the usual, 'school-welfare-agency-health department' scheme is haphazard and inefficient, mobile eye, dental, and general health units would make routine swings through the slum territory, hitting each Priority One school on a computer-scheduled round, so that each child's eyes, teeth, and body were examined at regular intervals. Within the limits of medical practicality, these units would be fully equipped and appropriately staffed to give treatment on the spot; so that if Teddy was found to have a cavity in a molar it would be filled then and there, and if Becky was discovered to need eyeglasses, the prescription would be written, facial measurements taken, and in a day or two her glasses delivered to the school nurse to be put on her. No little slips of paper, to be sent home and ignored. Parents would give written consent to this limited treatment-as-required when the child

was enrolled, so that we wouldn't have to track them down with quintuplicate forms in our fist every time we needed to fill a tooth.

Both to beef them up academically and to keep them out of the street and in an environment we can control, Priority One would operate around the calendar, with a week off at Christmas, Easter, July Fourth, and in early October. Except for kindergarten and first grade, which would be scheduled for half-day sessions, the school day would begin at eight o'clock and dismiss at 3:30, after which the teachers would be available to the children for individual tutoring until 4:30.

Because the noise and congestion of the slum afford no semblance of privacy or tranquility, no smallest corner in which a child might sneak a quiet hour in which to pull himself together, every school day would allow every youngster, as a substitute for recess and gym, an hour in which to be his own man—or at least child; to do just as he pleased, indoors or out, alone or with friends. Instead of an auditorium, in which to lecture the kids on the necessity for forming orderly lines and show slides of the Canadian Rockies, Priority One would have a large lounge, abrim with books and games and art materials, and furnished with several tables and big, warm chairs; a cushioned window seat would stretch along one wall. Here a kid could thumb through magazines or crayon pictures, or simply sit and watch the rain. If he chose to go outdoors instead, he could find there a variety of activities, from discharging his aggressions at the expense of a tetherball to gliding dreamily in a swing. He could lie under a tree and think about things, or get up a softball game with others so disposed. Whatever he chose to do with this hour of Liberty, the point is that he would be given an opportunity to refresh his spirit and collect his wits by whatever means he found most effective on any given day.

Well now that we have fed him, doctored him, even given him time to call his soul his own—now that we have made him educable—how about educating him, which presumably is what he is here for? What do we teach him? We teach him only two things, but those two we teach like crazy: mathematics and communications. No hygiene, no art. No social studies. No English, history, geography, science. No papier mache models, class plays, music, domestic arts, or other specialized subjects and activities for which he has no time. He has only 25 hours of actual study per week, and very strenuous catching-up to do; every minute has therefore to be jealously guarded. (There would be, of course, no homework. The whole idea of homework for these children is absurd; they have neither the place nor the peace to study at home.)

For two hours after breakfast, they would study mathematics. Whether the New Math is taught, or the old, is for professionals to decide, so long as it is understood that our objective is to make the children able, as entering high school freshmen, to check a payroll stub for withdrawals, to balance a checkbook, to estimate the amount of paint required to paint a room of given dimensions, to compute bank and credit interest, to add up their purchases and count their change, and perform with reliable accuracy all the other ordinary mathematics of modern living. Along the way, of course, they must be given sufficient grasp of mathematical principles to cope effectively with the mystical rigors of algebra and trigonometry which await them in high school. To these ends, they would drill, they would play games; they would solve problems on paper, on the blackboard, and in their heads; so that by graduation no problem within the realm of simple arithmetic would have them baffled.

After lunch, with their hour of Liberty sandwiched in somewhere, they would spend three hours learning how man communicates with man and what, to date, he has had to



say. From kindergarten onward, they would constantly read, write, and be read to; constantly speak and be spoken to. While the segregation of the sexes would naturally influence the choice of material (girls would enjoy *Little Women* and the struggles of Clara Barton, while boys would prefer *Treasure Island* and the adventures of Lewis and Clark) in general, their reading would be selected—and where necessary, written to order—for its effectiveness in (1) broadening their frame of reference and (2) engendering an easy familiarity with the printed page and a respect for its pleasure and usefulness.

They would read (or listen to, in the lower grades) every gripping tale of derring-do which children have ever loved, from *The Wizard of Oz* to *Robinson Crusoe*, together with the story of their country presented as what it really was: a great adventure. They would read about Lindbergh and Lincoln and Buffalo Bill; about the Boston Tea Party and Valley Forge and the man who invented the telephone; about the American frontier as it really was, and what it took to carve a canal from one sea to the other. They would read about Tom Edison, man boy, and about the great tide of immigration that created a nation unique in the history of the world.

They would read, in short, for both fun and profit, and everything they read they would talk about and write about. Grammar, spelling, penmanship and vocabulary would thus be taught as integral parts of these verbal and writing exercises, not as isolated disciplines walled off in a separate compartment of their education. It would be all of a piece, as it really is.

After 99 months of this, the eighth grader's literacy skill should be such as to enable him to read a newspaper with ease and comprehension, to follow printed instructions, to express simple ideas in short paragraphs of coherent sentences. In sum, they should be the literate equals of their middle class contemporaries, with freshman high school texts well within their capability.

Each child's progress would be constantly watched and evaluated. Testing would accelerate in the sixth grade and by the eighth have become a major concern, until every eighth grader was known inside-out and upside-down to his teachers and their principal: what came easy, what came hard; how he responded to challenges, to new ideas, to guidance, to success and to failure. *No child would be passed on to high school until and unless his teachers were confident that he stood a better-than-fair chance of meeting its demands.* Doubtful cases would not simply be "left back" to repeat the eighth grade with younger children, but instead moved into 9-A, where a remedial curriculum, fresh and provocative, would be at the ready.

It is in school that a child makes his first contact with official authority, and we want it to inspire confidence and respect, not fear and contempt. A cardinal rule of Priority One would therefore require that every child be treated with unfailing consideration and civility by every adult he encountered in or about the building. By this is meant no phony-baloney or saccharine condescension, but an honest, decent courtesy and a scrupulous adherence to the principle that the suspect is presumed innocent until proven guilty. If these children are to achieve they must be given massive doses of dignity and self respect; each one must be made to regard school as one place in this unpleasant world where he is a real person, where he really counts.

But respect, it would be pointedly amplified, is a two-way street, and the lippy little wisecracker would find enlightenment swift, cool, and emphatic. Children would stand to address their teachers, this as a means of instilling respect for both learning and authority.

Priority One is so designated because the eradication of ignorance is central to the

eradication of dependency, lawlessness, and all the other ugly stations on the perpetual cycle in which the poor are caught up, and so must be our first concern. Such innovations as the Job Corps are excellent remedial devices for those whom the schools have failed, but our long range objective is not a greater and grander Job Corps, but the elimination of the need for it. The very fact that a Job Corps is necessary is an indictment of the job that our slum schools have been doing.

Moreover, if our objective is really to provide equal opportunity, as loudly and repeatedly asserted, then we deceive ourselves if we think that a Job Corps can attain it. In plain language, the Job Corps offers, not equal opportunity, but a consolation prize. If for no other reason than this, therefore, it must be regarded as strictly an emergency expedient, no more a permanent part of our plan than was the WPA in its day.

But if we are to so regard it, we must recognize the most significant factor in dealing with the problems of the ignorant poor: that it is at the grade school level that all the really important business is transacted, and so it is at the grade school level that our major thrust must be made; that if we wait, as we have waited, turning out class after class of candidates for the Job Corps, the best that we can hope to offer is a relatively secure position at the bottom of the social and economic totem pole. And this is a long, long way from the equal opportunity which we insist is our goal.

It's a terrible thing to write off a 15 year old child as beyond redemption. But so powerful is the slimy suction of the slum that if the values of this society haven't taken root in him by then, they aren't going to. His direction thereafter is not going to be from organized society; it's going to be from the street. And then, as he grows older, he can find all sorts of rationales for his failure: it's the White Power Structure, or it's the capitalist system, or it's something else. But it isn't him; it isn't because he's an ignorant misfit who doesn't know anything and can't do anything. It's because some "establishment" is holding him down. And if and when he gets to this point, then of course there's no reasoning with him at all; he's completely beyond our reach. He's out throwing bottles through windows and shooting at firemen. So then you can throw him in jail, and what kind of answer is that?

The real answer is that so long as people are ignorant, they are vulnerable; they can be pushed around, manipulated, and exploited. So long as they are ignorant, they are easy marks for any Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael who finds them useful to his destructive purposes.

The rallying cry of present-day demagoguery takes the form of an hysterical harangue against the "establishment," as if it were some sinister conspiracy, dedicated to greed and oppression. While, to be sure, there are several sub-establishments—government, business, labor and so forth, each with its own axe to grind and many conflicts of interest, there is only one real "establishment" in this country, and that is decent, responsible society, with all the complex apparatus through which it functions. The Hippies have decided to resign from it, and the rioters have decided to attack it. But the Hippie's resignation comes literally to a screaming halt when he is carried helpless into the establishment's hospital for treatment of a "bad trip," and the rioters, after they have wantonly destroyed that which they need to live, come brazenly back to the establishment, demanding that all be rebuilt. This is because, whether they like it or not, the "establishment" is the only game in town. So long as we live in an organized society, every one of us is dependent upon the skills and services of people who spend their time providing everything from the fresh water we drink to the freeways we drive.

Those skills, and the services they make possible, begin with education. Choose any man of achievement you like—the judge in his courtroom, the chemist in his laboratory, the surgeon in the operating theatre—and we have to force ourselves to remember that not too many years ago he was a grubby little boy, throwing spitballs in somebody's classroom; and that he could not do what he does today, could not make the contribution that he makes, had not that somebody taught him to read. Who of us can say for certain that right now, in some foul, wretched slum, dally absorbing into his soul the vicious code of the switchblade, there is not a dirty, ill-fed little boy who has it in him to be another Jonas Salk, another John Glenn, another Earl Warren?

This youth of 16 or 17, who today is burning and looting in a mindless mob, only six years ago was a child of 10 or 11, in our charge and under our influence several hours a day. What use were we making of those hours? What were we doing then to give him a sense of what this country is all about? What were we doing then to make him understand that this "establishment," of which he talks so glibly and bitterly, with so much contempt and so little understanding, exists to serve him; to expand his opportunities, protect his rights, and enrich his life, and that there is a place in it for him whenever he is ready to assume it? What were we doing then, when we had the opportunity? Whatever it was, it wasn't enough, that much is clear, for we have the charred ruins of a dozen cities to prove it. Six years from now, will we be agonizing over the same failure with his younger brother?

So I put it to you this way: I would rather build schools than build jails. And if that is not to become the choice, we have got to find a way to re-establish the standards of this society and make them stick. There appears to be general agreement that education is the key, and Priority One is designed to put the key in the lock and turn it. What assurance do we have that it would work?

None. We have the same assurance that Wilbur and Orville had, when they took off in their funny-looking contraption from Kitty Hawk. Two hundred years ago, our ancestors had no assurance that America would work, and if I remember my history correctly, it looked for a while back there as if it wasn't going to. But you don't build an airplane or a nation or anything else on iron-clad guarantees. You build it on intelligent judgment and resourcefulness and a willingness to take risks.

Some years ago a perceptive gentleman named J. P. Edwards observed that, "We weren't always the richest, the most numerous, or the best educated"; that there was a time when we were a small, poor, struggling country, and that our supremacy had been attained because, "... We cared the most, and we tried the hardest."

The challenge of the slums is essentially another test of how much we really care, and how hard we are willing to try. The concept of Priority One is offered as a vigorously affirmative response to that challenge.

### Immediate Action Required on New York City Garbage Disposal Emergency

**HON. EMANUEL CELLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that the refuse piling up at the rate of 10,000 tons daily in the city of New York because of the sanitation strike is as clear cut an emergency

situation as are power breakdowns, riots, and floods.

The immediate hazards to life are obvious. We cannot leave out of account the possibility of an epidemic arising from the rats, cockroaches, and vermin now feeding on the exposed garbage on the streets of New York City. There can be no longer any delay. The board of health must declare at once a state of emergency and use its legal powers thereunder to take every step possible to remove the obvious health hazard of piled-up garbage.

The situation is so serious, and becomes more so with each passing hour, that there should be no hesitancy in calling up the National Guard. For those who bear the administrative responsibility, both State and city, for protecting the health and safety of the people of New York, there can be no excuse for not taking direct and immediate action.

This is a matter for New York State as well as New York City. Epidemics are no respecters of geographical lines.

### Trouble in Korea

#### HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, because it relates so significantly to recent events I would like to share with Members of this House the general context of a detailed briefing I was privy to in South Korea on January 19, 1968.

At 1600 on Friday, January 19, 1968, I arrived at the new facility housing the Republic of Korea's Central Intelligence Agency. I was there at the invitation of Director Hyung Wook Kim and was briefed personally by Assistant Director Lee. The major concern I had expressed to officials of the Republic of Korea was over the increased reports of incidents of confrontations with agent cadres from North Korea throughout the South Korean countryside. The briefing dramatically highlighted this precise problem. Whereas in 1965 there were 107 North Korean agents apprehended by all forces in the Republic and 106 in 1966—a total of 345 agents were apprehended by December 1, 1967, in this last year. Without question all information pointed that a massive effort of infiltration, espionage, sabotage, and disruption had been mounted by the North Koreans. Actually the great increase started in June of 1967 so the acceleration was most dramatic in the latter part of the year.

This development as I suspected and was so informed was a result of a calculated effort well planned and prepared. In early 1966 training had been activated in four separate special camps in the North with the idea of applying this pressure commencing with the timing of the Republic's elections and following thereafter. I surmise that Kim, Il Sing, the Communist leader of the North, desired to serve notice to all that the North was not giving up its basic aim to communize the entire peninsula of

Korea. There has been growing concern that the successful execution of the Japan-Korea Normalization Treaty; the successful and relative peaceful elections of early 1967; the success of the first 5-year plan and the enthusiastic assault on the second 5-year plan for the Republic's economic improvement were all exceedingly disturbing signs to the North of political stability, economic betterment and, in short, bad news for Communist aims and purposes. There was, in addition, lines of communication flowing from Hanoi and Peking which added fuel and encouragement for reactivating new trouble in Korea along this very timetable.

I was informed in response to my questions about 1968. Yes, we expect a continuation and acceleration of these North Korean efforts. It is clear that with several thousand miles of remote and sometimes sparsely settled coast line, fast moving boats coming in just about or just after sundown are awfully hard to control. Penetration is possible.

What efforts is the Republic making to confront this threat? I was shown and I appreciate the thoughtful consideration given to a new three dimensional protective screen being applied. However, with the small Navy capability in patrol and the limited radar network it is not likely that this screen will be totally effective.

This leads to the final question, what then is the real defense. Reports on the successful confrontations and ultimate capture of agents tell that story. In a dual effort to bring real service to the countryside and provide a quick response to the infiltrated agents threats, local police have been given special training by the government and are plugged into the integrated communication system which now effectively ties the country together. Back of these local police, and used only in cases where their limited capabilities are overtaxed, stands a regional network of quick-alert, special-trained troops. By minimizing outside help to extreme cases the local cooperation and local confidence has been maximized. This is particularly vital and intelligent in nation building.

The success of the Republic's program, however, rests not so much with its police and military forces as with the people of the country themselves. Over 85 percent of all the apprehensions have been the result of local natives of South Korea personally alerting their local police to the presence of the agents. Agents have been prepared in the north to believe that their southern neighbors are eagerly awaiting their intrusion and will join them in assaulting the so called "tyranny" of the present government in the Republic. Most of these intruders have had a bitter and disillusioning experience. The South Korean appreciates and supports his present government and underscores that support by prompt cooperation with the local authorities. South Korean's now have a stake in their country. Increasingly they have more and more to lose and less and less to gain by involvement with the violence and disruption imported from the north.

In spite of the few instances of spectacular show recently put on by the

desperation of North Korea, the truth and the strength of that nation is written in the many unpublished stories of personal sacrifice and courage of the individual citizen from widely separated places who have been key figures in the high ratio of apprehension of North Korean agents.

The officials of the Republic in the CIA and other critical departments knew this was to be a time of testing both for themselves and for their American friends and allies. They take pride, and justly so, in the readiness of both their people and their police and military forces. One big grandstand play or even several are not going to alarm or confuse the leaders or the people of the Republic of Korea. They have the will and the capability of meeting this new bag of tricks within their grasp and will use it. They will not respond by either calling back their troops from Vietnam nor be panicked to reduce their vigorous pursuits for improving the country's wealth and their people's welfare.

I ask you as Members of this House in the face of this performance by our small and valiant ally, can we do less? It is for us as it is for them a time of trial. They knew it was coming and we should have been equally prepared. They are not being either bluffed or buffaloed by these bullying and bellicose tactics and neither should we be.

Appropriate but measured force should be applied in response, but careful and sensible preparation should be before the fact. More important the full measure of positive action to improve the situations in each of the Pacific countries and to solve the basic problems of the peoples of these lands should continue unabated. This is the only pattern which will prevail. We must pursue it with patience and with perseverance even as our gallant friends of Korea are now doing.

### Milwaukee Company Brings New Product to World Market

#### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Kearney & Trecker Corp., a company located in my congressional district, has proven once again the ability of our American industries to sell in international markets because of superior know-how and technology.

Kearney & Trecker Corp. of Milwaukee took part in the Fourth International Engineering Show at Melbourne, Australia, last summer. U.S. participation in the trade show was arranged by the Department of Commerce as part of the administration's program to expand American exports in world markets.

For Kearney & Trecker the Australian show provided an opportunity to demonstrate one of their new products, a numerically-controlled machining center. It is a highly sophisticated, advanced type of machinery.

This Kearney & Trecker product was able to compete with distinguished suc-



cess in this international market. On the spot sales amounted to \$150,000. Further, the company has estimated that in the 12 months following the Melbourne trade show, sales of more than a third of a million dollars will be recorded as a direct result of the Australian trip.

I am pleased to report that Mr. W. Woods, sales director for the company, has stated that the U.S. pavilion in Melbourne was a credit to our Nation.

This is another happy example of the ability of American industry to sell in international markets, because of advanced technology and because of a chance to be seen in an international showplace.

### Equitable Labor Relations in the Federal Service

#### HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech of my distinguished colleague, Congressman DOMINICK V. DANIELS, who has long been in the forefront of activities to benefit postal employees and improve postal service:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS BEFORE UNITED FEDERATION OF POSTAL CLERKS, HOTEL WILLARD, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1968

President Hallbeck, Legislative Director Nilan, Officers and members of the United Federation of Postal Clerks.

It is a great pleasure to be with you today to discuss what we on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee are doing to make life a little better for the Postal employee by improving the conditions of work.

Your very able Legislative Director, Pat Nilan, who surely is one of the most effective advocates you or any other group would have representing you on Capitol Hill, has asked me to discuss with you my bill, H.R. 460, a bill which is felt to be of particular importance to all members of this organization.

Very simply, my bill is designed to put teeth into Executive Order 10988 which was promulgated on January 14, 1962, by the late President John F. Kennedy, a little more than six years ago.

This Executive Order was a good order. It was timely. It was needed. As a direct result we have seen Unionism grow and prosper. More than half a million new members have been signed up by Postal and other Federal employee unions.

In the Post Office Department seven AFL-CIO and independent Postal Unions have consummated important national bargaining agreements and some 12,000 local agreements have been written under the national contract. In fact, some 600 other agreements have been negotiated by Unions representing non-postal agencies.

You may ask, what is the need or justification for this legislation if things are working out so well? The answer is—There is nothing basically wrong with this Executive Order—However, this Executive Order 10988, like other Executive Orders, contains no teeth. There is no way to compel compliance by management.

In many instances, both at the National and the local levels, it has not been complied with.

Some months ago when I first heard some rumblings of discontent about this Execu-

tive Order, I turned to a man on whom I could count for a straight answer. I turned to your National Legislative Director, Patrick J. Nilan, who is sitting right here this morning. "Pat," I said, "give me the facts. What's wrong?"

Pat replies, "What is wrong is that under this Order, a postal clerk can be suspended, separated, admonished, reprimanded or kicked out on his mail sack for the slightest violation of contract work rules and postal regulations."

"But there isn't a damn thing anybody can do about postmasters or supervisors when they refuse to admit that a contract exists."

In other words, it is a one sided proposition. It is tilted like the Leaning Tower of Pisa and this leaning tower leans entirely in the direction of management.

In his inimitable way, Pat has hit the nail on the head. A system which presupposes mutuality of right but provides for only a unilateral remedy needs adjustment. This is a situation, as I see it, which begs for reform.

Equity requires that obligations and remedies should be mutually enforceable. This is simple justice and that is why I introduced H.R. 460 at the beginning of this Congress.

I might recommend that you read very carefully, if you have not already done so, Pat Nilan's excellent summary of the bill in the current issue of "The Union Postal Clerk and Postal Transport Journal."

One of the most important things my bill will do is to take the responsibility of handling grievances out of the hands of the Civil Service Commission and place it where it belongs, in the hands of the Department of Labor. The Civil Service Commission, worthy as it is, still is an arm of management, and cannot be considered impartial in its dealings with the problems of labor.

My bill sets up an orderly program of administrative procedure and appeals, which will be conducted under the experienced leadership of the Labor Department.

But most of all, my bill will have punitive teeth which will make it just as necessary for management to live up to its obligations as it is for labor.

We also want the meaning of "consultation" defined, and by that we do not mean that this implies that management will tell you something which it has already done.

There are a number of important sections, but time will not permit me to go into the bill in any great detail. However, I do hope you will take the time to read Mr. Nilan's summary of the bill which is excellent. And while I am on the subject, I think I ought to give a plug for S. 341, a similar bill introduced by my good friend, and a very good friend of Postal employees, Senator Daniel B. Brewster of Maryland. I am not so vain that I really care whose bill is passed. I don't care about pride of authorship. I just want to see this much needed reform enacted into law. And if my bill is a more convenient vehicle, that's all right with me. If the Senate gets the ball rolling, I shall be the first to battle for the Senator's bill. The only thing I care about is establishing a system of labor relations in the Federal Service which is based upon the principles of equity. I know Senator Brewster shares my view.

Enacting this bill now is important. Let me point out that at some future time (let's hope it never happens) we may not have a man in the White House as we do today, who is motivated by a sense of concern for the working man and woman. In that case the Executive Order may be wiped out by a stroke of the pen. Let's prevent that from happening. Let's put this principle which is so basic to all members of the labor force into the law books. By so doing, we are ensuring that anyone who wants us to go back

to the bad old days is going to have a fight on his hands.

There have been many accomplishments in the years I have served on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Better pay and fringe benefits have been enacted. I would be less than candid if I did not say that much still remains to be done. These accomplishments would not have been possible without the vigorous support of your organization. Therefore, I think you ought to insure that your voice will be an effective one in the years to come. This goal can best be accomplished by getting H.R. 460 out of the Committee of Post Office and Civil Service and onto the Floor of the House and Senate and then down to the White House. You can count upon my support every inch of the way.

In conclusion I would like to thank each of you present for this invitation to join with you this morning. I hope that you will invite me again because this kind of speaking assignment is truly a labor of love. Of all the things I do in the Congress nothing gives me more pleasure than my association with the Postal Unions. I hope that I can always earn your respect and that I will always be able to come to you as a friend.

### Arthur Ross and Foreign Aid at Home

#### HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Ross, my constituent, has been in attendance at all of the NATO parliamentarians meetings and was a member of the U.S. delegation to the 38th and 39th Assembly of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Because of his distinguished interest in world and foreign affairs, Mr. Ross is listed in the International Yearbook and Statesmen's Who's Who.

At a meeting of the 13th annual session of the Parliamentary Conference in Brussels, Belgium, in November 1967, Mr. Ross presented a memorandum entitled "Foreign Aid at Home."

In light of the recent debate regarding the U.S. relationship with Western European nations, it seems appropriate to consider another aspect of this relationship—that of the NATO alliance and U.S. foreign aid to these allied countries. It is with this purpose in mind I commend Mr. Ross' memorandum to the attention of my colleagues, and include it at this point in the RECORD:

FOREIGN AID AT HOME  
(Memorandum submitted by Mr. Arthur Ross, United States)

In the past twenty years the underdeveloped countries have been one of the central preoccupations in international affairs. While in no way wishing to underestimate the importance of this subject, I think now is the time when we should look in the opposite direction—towards the problems of the more developed world. I propose we take stock of the strengths and weaknesses of the Western nations; partly from motives of self-interest, and also because ultimately the peace and prosperity of much of the world depends on the vitality of the West, and depends on its capacity for strong and intelligent responses to a multitude of global issues.

So the question may be posed: How strong is the West, and how strong are the members of NATO? This is a complex and difficult question. It does not admit easy answers. But some of the available evidence suggests

that there are alarming cracks and fissures here and there, which could have grave consequences in the future. Moreover, these weaknesses appear at a time when it is obvious that the challenges in the years ahead will be more frequent and of a larger magnitude than at any time in the past.

A catalog of the present difficulties of most Western nations would be long; certainly longer than five years ago, perhaps longer than ten years ago. Some of the old political solidarity has vanished between Western nations, particularly in the field of foreign policy. Economically, it seems as if we have reached an apogee in the West. The exuberance of postwar economic rebuilding has gone.

There are signs of serious malfunctions in the productive apparatus of several Western nations which, only a few years ago seemed capable of an endless series of economic triumphs. On top of this we have recurring worries over such issues as the technological gap, and financial squabbles over who should bear certain costs for our mutual defense. Furthermore, there are conspicuous inequities in the standard of living of NATO members—a question which has not so far received the attention it deserves. Heretofore we have not sought to tackle these and other mutual problems on a systematic basis. The general assumption appears to have been that these headaches would be adequately solved in good time. This muddling through approach is no longer adequate. We cannot afford to be so casual.

Other regional, ethnic and cultural groupings amongst the nations of the globe are emerging and becoming stronger. What is more, population in many of these areas is growing at a far quicker rate than in the West. Over-population in these nations inevitably creates domestic pressures which require them to pursue aggressive and expansionist policies.

In spite of the previously mentioned difficulties within the NATO countries, there is much in which we can take pride. It is worth noting that over the past hundred years most of the nations that today comprise NATO warred with one another intermittently. Yet currently there exists a sympathy between them that would have been unthinkable a century ago, or even twenty years ago.

This is no small achievement. Slowly but surely, sometimes willingly, sometimes driven, these nations have come to share more and more common ground. There is naturally a wide diversity between these countries. What is remarkable, however, is the extent to which they share humanistic values, political institutions, aptitudes and beliefs about the nature of man and society.

It must be admitted that the unity of the Western alliance is not entirely of its own making. The external pressures of the Cold War played a decisive role. But we must not let the thaw in the Cold War create an atmosphere in which there is less unity and cooperation. The solidarity of the West—if it is not to decline—must be nurtured and fostered from within; must be reinvigorated by conscious choices on our part to secure our interests and maintain our vitality.

In 1918, Oswald Spengler, the German historian, published the famous book, "The Decline of the West", which prophesied an imminent decline for most of the current members of NATO. Thus far the prophecy remains unfulfilled. However, greater threats to the West can be expected in the future which will affect its standing.

According to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, world population in 1960 stood at 3 billion. Their forecasts for the year 2,000 have put this figure at 6 billion. Thus in forty years the world population will more than double.

It is significant that out of an estimated net increase of 3 billion, the countries of the

North American Continent and Europe as far as and including European U.S.S.R., will have a net gain of merely half a billion.<sup>1</sup> By the year 2,000 the technologically advanced nations of the Northern half of the globe will have around 22% of the total world population, compared to more than 28% in 1960.

The West therefore faces a sharp reduction in its population representation. National population groups are in themselves a factor in power politics—as we repeatedly admit when thinking about China. It should be remembered that power is not entirely relative. It is, for example, not difficult to conceive of several large presently underdeveloped countries becoming major powers with only a very small increment in their economic output and technological abilities.

For the past fifteen years the nations of the West have spent much of their patrimony on aid to the underdeveloped world. This was necessary, appropriate, and should not be discontinued. But at the same time, except for military defense, the nations of the West have neglected to pursue some of their long range interests closer to home. For instance, they have neglected to strengthen and assist the weaker members within the Western Alliance. The following data sheds some light on this issue.

United States foreign aid to Western Europe declined from \$4.3 billion in 1949 to \$58 million in 1965. Meanwhile, between 1956 and 1965, net official grants to the underdeveloped world by NATO countries increased from \$3.1 billion to \$5.9 billion. It goes without saying that these figures largely reflect the Marshall Plan spending, the subsequent European postwar economic growth, and the succeeding ability of the European nations to undertake this form of assistance to the less fortunate countries.

I have presented these facts here principally to give us pause and to reflect whether we should not spend some energy and attention within the shores and borders of the Western Alliance. The West could be and must be stronger. Even in the area of economic development there are regional areas within countries, and in some cases entire nations that need all the skills and resources we can muster.

In other words, I suggest we examine our priorities very carefully and seriously question the whole intellectual system on which we conceive our self interest. If it appears that the case for increased mutual aid between Western nations is a good one, then NATO could become increasingly useful to us all. NATO, as we all know, was created as a specific historical response to a foreboding set of circumstances. The historical conditions have changed, yet NATO remains a well-tuned instrument that can be put to more ambitious non-military purposes. The organization has actually already taken a few tentative steps in this direction.

Aid has been offered to some of the less fortunate NATO members. But the potential for this kind of activity has only barely been tapped. Furthermore, when the NATO treaty comes to be rewritten in 1969, we should place at its heart a statement of objectives that will stimulate cooperation and mutual assistance between members at all levels and in all relevant areas.

We all share an obligation to maintain and increase the strength of the West and each of us finally has a grave responsibility for the others' welfare. The nations of the West created the modern world. It would be lamentable if the verdict of history was that we failed to do everything in our power to protect and preserve it.

<sup>1</sup> Willard L. Thorp, "Development Assistance Efforts and Policies of the Members of the Development Assistance Committee, 1966 Review" (Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, September 1966) Page 148.

## Civic-Minded Management of First Federal Savings of Michigan City, Ind., Lauded in Magazine Article

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Business and Politics Can Mix," which appeared in the January 1968 issue of Savings and Loan News magazine.

The article details the extent to which the management of First Federal Savings of Michigan City, Ind., in my congressional district—led by First Federal President Fred Pilliard; his assistant, James Fleming; and Vice President Wayne Magnuson—have become involved in urban renewal, fair housing, a community development corporation, housing for the elderly, human relations education, the war on poverty, an opposition weekly newspaper, and last year's local mayoral election campaign.

The First Federal management have taken the lead in getting the Michigan City business community to meet vital local needs and have not been reluctant to do so even when the problems were controversial.

The article follows:

### BUSINESS AND POLITICS CAN MIX

As local businessmen, you participate vigorously in all types of civic, community and charity projects which everyone favors, and stays as far away as possible from anything which smacks of controversy—especially political controversy?

Right?

Wrong, says First Federal Savings of La Porte County, Ind.

The \$38 million Michigan City association, through the vigorous participation of its management team, has staked its reputation on the proposition that no mutual financial institution can be happy in its prosperity if the people and community which it serves are not prospering also.

If the best interests of the community require that the institution's executive tangle publicly with those opposed to progress, so be it.

Led by First Federal President Fred Pilliard, his assistant, James Fleming, and Vice President Wayne Magnuson, the association has practiced this philosophy to the extent of being involved in urban renewal, fair housing, a community development corporation, housing for the elderly, human relations education, the war on poverty, an opposition weekly newspaper and November's mayoral election campaign.

Breaking all these businessmen's taboos does not appear to have damaged the association in its primary activity, accumulating savings and making mortgage loans. In the 23 years Pilliard has headed First Federal, it has enjoyed the same spectacular growth shared by most of the business, including a savings gain of 9% during 1966 and 6% for just the first six months of 1967—the period of greatest, most controversial association activity.

### BEING TOP DOG HELPS

It must be noted that First Federal is by far the dominant thrift institution in its area, which is a happy land where a 3.75% passbook rate (compounded quarterly) and a 4.5% six-month certificate rate pull in all the funds needed. The association is the



largest mortgage lender in La Porte County, doing 50% more mortgage business than its closest competitor, a Michigan City commercial bank.

Were the institutional consequences of political and community involvement in controversy as severe as is generally thought, however, this dominance might well have passed away.

What First Federal has done is to identify publicly some of the most acute commercial and residential needs in Michigan City and then take the lead in efforts by the business community and others to meet these needs.

First, Michigan City, located at the eastern base of Lake Michigan, has a severe shortage of moderate cost home and apartment units suitable for the blue collar workers being hired by nearby steel plants. Bethlehem Steel Corporation, for example, is investing \$1 billion in facilities just west of the city. These will bring some 5,000 new employees into the area, but Michigan City has no housing to offer them and, therefore, little hope of attracting the business their earnings will support.

Second, the city also lacks housing suitable for relocating those displaced by urban redevelopment, for low income families and for the elderly whose incomes have been curtailed.

Third, Michigan City's downtown shopping district is in need of rejuvenation if it is to prosper. Access to the city's most attractive resource, a waterfront park development, lies through the drab downtown section. Recently, the location of a multimillion-dollar shopping center (housing, among others, such potential downtown anchors as Sears, Roebuck and J. C. Penney) three miles to the south jolted the downtown merchants into a new awareness of what First Federal had been preaching for years.

#### VALUE RESULTS, NOT HARMONY

To combat the lethargy which has so long enveloped the city with regard to these and other needs, First Federal has lent either its own or its executives' efforts to a broad scale program—one which eschews the theoretical and wishful, and zeroes in on practical answers.

These answers are not always popular with the entire community, nor are they necessarily the only or the best solutions. They are, however, sincere, concrete proposals for dealing with real, immediate community problems.

What began with some relatively typical savings and loan efforts at civic improvement—tree planting and feed-the-birds projects—gradually grew into a full-scale attack upon economic problems and the entrenched interests which ignored them.

Did this drag the association into public controversy? It certainly did. Did it make enemies for the association? Yes; in fact, by election time 1967, First Federal was pretty well cut off from the incumbent political power structure—for the simple reason that the association's top executives were actively supporting the challenger for the office of mayor.

It was, perhaps, inevitable. As the association pitched harder and harder for action on controversial programs, and the city administration, locked in a tough reelection fight, sought to avoid any decisive steps without a nearly unanimous consensus, the gap widened. From the skeptical cordiality with which First Federal greeted Mayor Randall Miller following his election in 1963, the relationship gradually deteriorated into chilly propriety, increasing criticism and, finally, outright opposition.

"It isn't a matter of political party," says Pilliard. "We'll support anyone who will work to improve the community, but we can't sit around forever and wait for 100% agreement while the housing situation goes from bad to worse and people suffer."

In the 1967 election, Pilliard actively sup-

ported Democrat Conrad S. Kominlarek, a former city judge who was president of the city's Fair Housing Committee until he announced his candidacy for mayor.

On November 7, Kominlarek was elected and Pilliard has good reason to hope that the city's efforts to solve the festering problems of residential redevelopment, downtown rehabilitation and low cost housing will begin to move in earnest.

During the past campaign, housing became a political issue and all progress was halted. It became necessary for First Federal to sit tight and restrict itself to an occasional "defensive" statement in order to correct misstatements made in public debate.

Once Kominlarek takes over the reins of local government—and that shouldn't be hard, since, as a thrice-elected city judge, he had an excellent observation point to see all that was being done, for good or bad—there should be an entirely different climate.

Not only has Kominlarek previously been on record as favoring many of the things Pilliard feels must be done, but as close business associates, and in view of Pilliard's early public support of his candidacy, the two men could expect to see eye-to-eye more than did Pilliard and Miller.

If there are risks in speaking one's convictions, there are also significant rewards.

#### FIRST FEDERAL WAS NEVER ALONE

It is easy, though, to overemphasize the opposition which First Federal's outspoken stand in favor of more and better housing has uncovered. The institution also has won a great many friends. President Pilliard has a file of letters from business executives and public officials praising his courage and approving his position.

The association's own savers and borrowers, moreover, constitute a pretty substantial sample of the Michigan City community, and they have yet to complain about First Federal's policies or activities.

Nor has the association really "gone it alone." While it has been the leader in Michigan City's uplift efforts, it is far from the only participant. Both the First Merchants National Bank and the Citizens Bank have given their names, funds and personnel to various housing efforts, including support of the Fair Housing Committee and financing of the Fair Haven relocation project.

First Federal has succeeded in galvanizing the business community to the extent that the merchants organized a Downtown Council of merchants to promote the commercial center of the city. While this group has not been active in the housing-oriented projects, it does participate with the association in the business redevelopment activities.

Among other things, this means that these business leaders know that Fred Pilliard does not really have horns and a tail, no matter what those who write letters to the *News-Dispatch* may say.

Observes Fleming, "You're making progress when you get one community leader—First Federal—to inspire other community leaders to take action."

There is, in fact, every reason to believe that when the smoke clears, the bureaucratic processing is completed and some of today's embryo projects have grown to maturity, Fred Pilliard will be hailed by his fellow businessmen as the man of courage and vision who showed them the way.

Until that euphoric moment arrives, Pilliard is quite content to believe simply that his efforts have helped to improve his community. What's more, he really enjoys the political scrapping and, as for business, it's fine, thank you.

Housing subcommittee. In one sense, everything that has brought First Federal into politics began when Pilliard was appointed chairman of the housing subcommittee of the Mayor's Human Relations Commission. Whatever others may have intended, this was not, for Pilliard, a window-dressing commission.

Beginning in 1963, the housing subcommittee sponsored Operation Good Neighbor (see March 1966 SLN, p. 52), a largely educational program aimed at making open housing—Indiana has a state law—workable in Michigan City. With cooperation from the local media, Operation Good Neighbor succeeded in distributing thousands of informational pieces aimed at explaining the state law and easing neighborhood fears and tensions associated with increasing residential integration.

While the program failed to achieve as much block-by-block participation in white neighborhoods as desired, it did succeed in exposing many people to facts, as opposed to rumors and myths; and it opened the way for a considerable amount of counseling of potential Negro home owners.

In September 1966, the housing subcommittee sponsored Operation SLAM (Stop Living as a Minority), again an educational effort, aimed at overcoming Negro apathy about housing standards. SLAM sought to awaken community pride among Negroes and was highlighted by a rally featuring Chicago civil rights leader Al Raby. Raby told his listeners, "Michigan City already is where Chicago would like to be" in terms of community concern and cooperation on racial problems, and he urged them to continue to build on the foundation that existed.

While these programs were noncontroversial, the bite came when the housing subcommittee began to take stands in favor of specific projects—the city's North End urban renewal project, for example, stalled for years by administrative delay and, more recently, by taxpayer litigation—and against others, such as the creation of a segregated public housing project.

As housing and urban renewal became more of a public issue in 1966 and 1967, the subcommittee became entangled first in the Democratic mayoral primary and subsequently in the general election campaigns. Pilliard, as chairman of the housing subcommittee, took every means available, including full-page newspaper ads, to make clear the subcommittee's position in favor of immediate positive action.

Since three members of First Federal's staff serve on the housing subcommittee, there has tended to be a close identification between the subcommittee's public pronouncements and the association itself. (One of Pilliard's ads even listed the Fair Housing Committee and First Federal synonymously.) For this involvement, no one at First Federal has apologized, since the people involved feel that what they are doing is clearly for the improvement of the community.

Fair housing committee. The Michigan City Fair Housing Committee is a spinoff from the housing subcommittee. Formed in December 1965 and separately incorporated in August 1966, it is supported by individual dues from nearly 200 members and by the city's three leading financial institutions: First Merchants and Citizens banks, and First Federal. The committee is able to act as project sponsor, independent critic and private counsel.

FHC operates four neighborhood centers, serves as a clearinghouse for housing problems and seeks to provide legal aid or counseling for individuals encountering difficulties in obtaining residential equality.

In addition to sponsorship of Fair Haven and Fair Acres, both discussed below, the committee is the leading civic spokesman in public debate on low cost housing and urban redevelopment, taking on dissident individuals and the city administration alike. Much of this debating is done through either the letters columns or paid advertising in the *News-Dispatch*, and many of these ads are paid for personally by Pilliard.

Originally headed by Conrad Kominlarek, FHC has been led since March 1967 by First Federal's Jim Fleming. Under both men it has

been a gadfly to the city administration, especially with respect to urban renewal.

The city has been mulling various projects since 1960, but virtually nothing has been accomplished. Typical of the situation is the North End renewal project, involving the clearance and rebuilding of a mixed commercial and residential area. After the project was designated and partially vacated, it was hit in October 1965 by a taxpayer's suit, which in one way or another has tied it up ever since.

Not only has the Fair Housing Committee kept after renewal officials to press for a decision (the project was upheld at the trial court level in September 1966), but it has interceded with the state's two U.S. senators to get action underway.

Early in 1967 First Federal filed suit for damages against the obstructing plaintiff in an attempt to force him to cooperate in speeding hearings on the appeal.

He was the one who wanted his day in court, say Pilliard, "and yet he's done everything in his power to avoid getting it. We want to get this obstructionism out of the way and get on with the project."

On the public front, the Fair Housing Committee sponsored a "March for Progress, designed to show support in the business community for the renewal projects. The Downtown Council became interested in expediting things when Sears indicated it would have been interested in a site in the renewal project, if it had been made available, but would not wait indefinitely—and subsequently chose the shopping center location.

FHC is also the guiding hand in the Michigan City poverty program. In this role, the committee has attempted to organize VISTA, Youth Corps, visiting nurse and job retraining programs, and in June 1967 received a \$117,000 federal grant to fund its Head Start program.

The problems of relocation, however, have been the focus of the committees most positive action, and the most successful of its efforts is Fair Haven.

Fair Haven. Relocation of displaced families from the North End urban renewal project has been one of the major points of controversy among the political and real estate powers of Michigan City. Leaders of the Fair Housing Committee were determined that these people would not be shunted off into other substandard housing or herded into public housing ghettos.

When it became apparent that this was about all city officials were prepared to do, especially since litigation was preventing the urban renewal department from obtaining the funds needed to conduct a proper relocation program, the committee went into action.

Leasing a site for two years beginning in October 1966, the committee purchased 14 new 55- and 65-foot mobile homes at cost and added accommodations so up to 12 members of one family could live together. The committee bore the site preparation costs, and the city's two banks financed the mobile homes purchase. The committee also set up a neighborhood center at the site to provide recreation and educational programs, and it maintains supervision of the entire project.

The 14 relocated families pay only a rental geared to the rent subsidy formula, and the committee makes up the substantial difference to meet project costs. While it was hoped that rent subsidy or poverty funds might be obtained to help carry the load, this has not occurred yet.

As of April 1967, there were still 25 families from the North End project in need of relocation. At this point, First Federal stepped into the picture under its own name by initiating Project Challenge.

Project Challenge. Illustrative of the extreme dedication of the association's personnel to the cause of renewal, Project Challenge was announced to Michigan City in a full-page newspaper ad.

The ad first stated the problem and the number and types of houses needed to relocate the remaining 25 families. Then First Federal stated it would use four foreclosed properties for relocation housing and that four association officers would individually purchase one home each for additional relocation use.

As the families being relocated would only be charged rentals at the public housing rates, the four First Federal officers agreed to make up personally the differential between these rates and the fair market rentals, so that no claim could be made that First Federal savers were being penalized by acceptance of reduced income.

From this "money where our mouth is" stance, First Federal challenged the rest of the community to come up with relocation of the remaining 17 families.

The community never did rise successfully to the challenge, but there was enough response so that the Fair Housing Committee ultimately was able to take care of all the displaced families.

Fair Acres. As part of its campaign to push for creation of 500 additional rental units in Michigan City, the Fair Housing Committee sought to sponsor two moderate income projects under PHA 221d3 financing.

Fair Acres East was to provide 81 units on a five-acre site, while Fair Acres South projected 150 units on 15 acres. All went well, including cooperation from the city on obtaining location, until the sites were announced.

At that point controversy erupted on all sides; moderate income, open occupancy housing is fine, it seems, unless it is in your neighborhood. City cooperation, needed to obtain zoning changes, evaporated and the projects became caught up in the political race for mayor. As a result, the committee temporarily abandoned its efforts to push the projects through until after the election.

Backing out on the Fair Acres projects by the city probably did more to sharpen the hostility between the Fair Housing activists and Mayor Randall than any other one thing, according to Fleming. From that point, First Federal became more aggressive in its criticism and drew closer to Conrad Kominarek.

Spaulding House, Inc. Less controversial than Fair Acres is another project in which First Federal's officers are involved: Spaulding House, Inc.

In March 1967, a nonprofit corporation headed by Pilliard purchased a 40-year-old Michigan City landmark, the Spaulding Hotel, located on a prime downtown corner. Closed since early 1966, the hotel was blighting the business district by symbolizing the flight of commercial trade to outlying facilities.

Spaulding House, Inc., plans to convert the hotel into 91 units of housing for the elderly, retaining the first-floor space for commercial uses, such as a restaurant and a new community room for banquet and meeting use.

While final approval of a federal Community Facilities Administration loan to finance rehabilitation and conversion of the property is expected soon, no funds have yet been made available.

Meanwhile, the corporation does everything possible to keep the first-floor offices in the building actively used. Groups such as the Jaycees, United Fund and Girl Scouts are given free space. During the holidays, the 30-foot community Christmas tree was located on the hotel marquee.

In a related move, a group of private investors plans to build a motel and parking facility on the lot directly across the street from the Spaulding.

MCBIDCO. Supplementing all this ad hoc action, First Federal officers also have taken steps to provide long-term community support through the organization of a limited dividend, local development corporation—the

Michigan City Business and Industrial Development Company, Inc.

Organized in April 1967 as a vehicle for Small Business Administration 501 and 502 loans and as a general redevelopment sponsor, the corporation is intended to help alleviate Michigan City's shortage of development capital.

Since the city's financial institutions collectively hold only \$130 million in assets, additional funds from outside will be needed to carry through the redevelopment envisioned in the North End, West Side and other projects, and to aid the small businessmen displaced in these developments.

Local development corporations have broad scope for financing businesses, projects and equipment. Through federal guarantees they can develop great leverage from funds obtained from private lenders.

MCBIDCO was initiated with capitalization of \$50,000, of which no more than \$5,000 can be invested by one individual. At least 75% of the stock must be locally held.

What Pilliard and others are seeking first through the corporation is a vehicle for drawing a 10-15 year comprehensive plan for Michigan City, linking economic feasibility and development planning.

The corporation's first act was to hire Real Estate Research Corporation, Chicago, to conduct an economic feasibility study for Michigan City. The study is now complete, and the stage is set for planning action.

Michigan City Gazette. One of the frustrations Pilliard, Fleming and others have undergone in the past two years is the inability to get their positions presented to the public as they would like to—without editing, rebuttal or suppression.

This was one of the reasons for their extensive investment in full-page advertisements devoted to long, detailed explanations of Fair Haven, Fair Acres, Project Challenge and the endless debate over North End urban renewal litigation.

In June of 1967 they finally decided to take another route and back a local newspaperman who started his own newspaper, the Michigan City Gazette. The weekly tabloid is distributed to every household in Michigan City and, although not self-supporting from outside advertising revenue, has provided First Federal with a good advertising vehicle. (The association continues a regular, although somewhat reduced, schedule in the *News-Dispatch*.)

The former *News-Dispatch* reporter, who is editor-publisher, is thoroughly familiar with the entire renewal-housing story, and the *Gazette* now offers a "second voice" to Michigan City readers.

"We felt the *News-Dispatch* was too neutral on critical issues," says Fleming. "We wanted a vehicle to stimulate some good thinking in the community."

Whether or not it has achieved that, the *Gazette*, like First Federal's other involvements, has made both enemies and friends for the association.

Perhaps its real significance is that it shows in still another way how totally immersed in its community First Federal is.

### The 20th Century Fund

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a research foundation in New York City has offered a ray of hope to hard-pressed municipal governments faced with an ever-growing list of demands and severely limited financial resources.



The decision of the tax-exempt 20th Century Fund to contribute \$10,000 to the city in lieu of taxes was generous and constructive in itself. But its impact could be even more far reaching if it spurs other foundations located in urban centers to similar acts of generosity.

An estimated one-third of New York City's total real estate value of \$47 billion is presently tax exempt, and in some cities this figure is even higher. In Boston, I understand, it is 44 percent.

The 20th Century Fund's \$10,000 gift—representing roughly what the foundation would owe the city in taxes if it were not exempt—in no way weakens the position that exempt status is justified for nonprofit groups which are making valuable contributions to the city, the State, and the Nation.

As a matter of fact, the fund has directed an increasing portion of its resources into the search for solutions to pressing urban problems, and it has provided several grants directly to New York City for programs to bring students and professors into public agencies and for other urban projects.

But, in all fairness, while the benefits of its activities are widely shared throughout the country, New York City residents alone bear the burden of financing the foundation's purely local needs. This fact was recognized by M. J. Rossant, the new executive director, in announcing the \$10,000 payment to the city.

Mr. Rossant said:

We believe that we have a civic responsibility to make some payment for the municipal services—fire and police protection, water supply, etc.—furnished us.

In a letter thanking the fund for its "generous and constructive" action, Mayor Lindsay rightly called it "an extraordinary development in our town."

I am proud to be associated with the 20th Century Fund, as a member of its board of trustees, and I share Mayor Lindsay's hope that its example will be widely followed. I am sure that New York and other municipalities would welcome further examples of this kind of civic spirit.

### Speculation in the Stock Markets

#### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, John Cunniff, a financial writer for the Associated Press, has written a very interesting article dealing with speculation in the stock markets that recently appeared in the New Bedford Standard-Times.

Mr. Cunniff points out some of the major causes of speculation in the markets both by institutions and individuals. We often think of portfolio managers of institutional investors as masters of their own fate that they are the cause of changes in the market and the economy rather than men who react to outside influences. Yet, in fact they are often subject to the same influences as the individual investor.

A very good example of this is the influence of inflation. In discussing the effect of the threat of inflation on institutions, Mr. Cunniff states:

Although many of these institutions were once very conservative and inactive investors, they too have become worried about inflation. They have succumbed also to the lure of quick money through in-out trading.

Mr. Speaker, in our consideration of the threat of speculation in the stock markets, I think Mr. Cunniff's article, "Wild Stock Speculation Worries Amex Brokers," which follows, will be of much assistance.

#### WILD STOCK SPECULATION WORRIES AMEX BROKERS

(By John Cunniff)

NEW YORK.—"They're speculating wildly," a broker remarked as he watched trading on the American Stock Exchange soar to more than 10 million shares. "My customers are acting as if there were no tomorrow."

Few statements could have been further from the truth, for a very large percentage of stock speculation today results from traders knowing there will be a tomorrow—of inflation and shrinking dollars.

This inflation psychology now has a good grip on the thinking of millions of Americans. Taxes and rising living costs are devouring their bank account interest. "Fixed return" investments are shrinking in value.

To offset this shrinkage, investors have been urged to go into stocks, to hedge against inflation by owning securities that rise with the economy. Good advice or poor, it is being given abundantly.

#### A CUSHION

A variety of factors now intensify this inflation psychology and also present the opportunity for it to be exploited.

For one thing, much of the money saved in recent months by average Americans has given them a cushion of confidence. With their excess funds they have stepped into the stock market and hope to duplicate the experience of friends by doubling their money.

At the same time thousands of once cautious investors very likely have become bored, irritated and frustrated as their blue chips vegetate, while young sprouts on the American Exchange soar to the sun. And so they join the crowd.

Whereas some of the solid blue chip stocks on the New York Stock Exchange sell for \$100 or more, an American Exchange trader has his choice of about 60 stocks selling for less than \$5 and many more for less than \$10.

Lending encouragement as well as impact to this churning of stock, some Wall Street informants say, are registered representatives who speculate for their own accounts and encourage customers to do likewise.

#### CREDIT EASY

A few other factors also may be involved: No matter what is said for the record, credit for speculating is pretty easy to come by these days. And the suspicion exists among critics that some speculation may be manipulation.

Certainly the huge increase in the number of stockholders is having its impact as well, for the latest figure of 24 million is four times the figure of 20 years ago.

However, it is difficult to believe that amateur or small-investor speculation has suddenly caused the enormous burst of activity.

American Exchange average daily volume for all of 1966 was 2.7 million shares. For 1967 volume averaged 4.5 million. For the first two weeks of the new year volume has jumped to 8 million shares.

Some skilled observers of the Wall Street scene believe that much of this activity is, instead, the result of professional specula-

tion by pension and mutual funds, by trust accounts and by college endowments, among others.

Last May the American Exchange found that institutional activity of this sort was increasing and that it accounted for 16 per cent of all volume. A conservative estimate now would place the figure beyond 20 per cent.

#### WORRIED INSTITUTIONS

Although many of these institutions were once very conservative and inactive investors, they too have become worried about inflation. They have succumbed also to the lure of quick money through in-out trading.

In-out trading is the trademark of the so-called performance or go-go funds, some of which have demonstrated that quick turnover of holdings so as always to be invested in the hottest issues can bring big profit.

Amex officials are greatly concerned that the bubble will burst, and that when prices come down so also may the image of their institution in the minds of thousands of neatly trimmed amateur speculators.

No amount of warnings, however, are going to stem the rising tide of institutional trading. These institutions have grown enormously in recent years and also have become very active traders.

Some securities men question whether institutional buying and selling can be accommodated safely by the stock exchanges under present regulations.

### Vietnam Casualties

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the following six servicemen from Maryland, four soldiers and two marines, were recently killed in Vietnam: Major Maximilian H. Simmeth, 1st Lt. Wesley R. Moore, Jr., Pfc. Harry L. Ecton, Pfc. Russell E. Millberry, Marine Lance Cpl. Thomas J. Torrington, and Marine Pfc. Dubois R. Jones. I wish to commend the courage of these men and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FOUR SOLDIERS AND TWO MARINES FROM STATE DIE IN VIETNAM

Six Maryland servicemen—four soldiers and two marines—have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The latest casualties were identified as: Maj. Maximilian H. Simmeth, of 102 Woodland drive, Bel Air.

1st Lt. Wesley R. Moore, Jr., of 9201 Lanham-Severn road, Seabrook.

Pfc. Harry L. Ecton, of 203 South Potomac street, Boonsboro.

Pfc. Russell E. Millberry, of Route 1, Union Bridge.

Marine Lance Cpl. Thomas J. Torrington, of 106 North Smallwood street, Cumberland.

Marine Pfc. Dubois R. Jones, of 4034 Belle avenue, Baltimore.

Major Simmeth, 37, a ranger was killed Wednesday near Saigon in an ambush, his brother, Joseph Simmeth, said last night. The major was a career Army man on his second tour of duty in Vietnam.

During his first tour in 1966, he won the Silver Star. He had been in Vietnam on the second tour for four months.

Major Simmeth enlisted in the Army in

1954, four years after coming to the United States from his native Bavaria. His brother owns a meat firm in Bel Air.

#### WIFE SURVIVES

Besides his brother, he is survived by his wife, Mrs. Marylou Simmeth, of St. Metz, France; a son, Thomas Simmeth, who is with his mother; four sisters, Mrs. Terry Wood, of Bel Air; Mrs. Mary Feld, of New York; Mrs. Carla Landres, of Mainz, Germany, and Mrs. Catherine Coryell, of Norristown, Pa., and his mother, Mrs. Albine Simmeth, of Bel Air.

Lieutenant Moore, 27, was killed Thursday by American fire while returning with a patrol in the area of An Khe. He had been in Vietnam since mid-December.

Another career Army man, he had ten years to his credit, including several in the Army Reserve. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in November, 1963.

#### HIGHPOINT GRADUATE

Lieutenant Moore, who was born in Berwyn Heights, Md., was graduated in 1958 from Highpoint High School. He had completed three years at the University of Maryland.

He is survived by his wife of just over a year, Mrs. Barbara D. Moore; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wesley R. Moore, of Berwyn Heights, and a sister, Mrs. Beverly Caldwell, of Fort Monmouth, N.J.

Pfc. Ecton, 20, a personnel carrier driver with the 9th Infantry Division, was killed in Saigon Wednesday, exactly eight months after he was drafted. He had been in Vietnam since late October.

He was a 1965 graduate of Boonsboro High School, where he was a member of the baseball team. For the two years between his graduation and his draft call he was an employee of the State Farm Insurance Company in Frederick.

Surviving are his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leon G. Ecton, of Boonsboro.

Corporal Torrington, 19, was killed Wednesday while on patrol in the Quang Nam province, his father, Francis R. Torrington, said yesterday. Assigned to the 3d Battalion, 5th Marines, he had been in South Vietnam for five months.

Corporal Torrington was graduated in 1966 from LaSalle High School.

Besides his parents, he is survived by two sisters, Maryann and Helen Torrington, both of Cumberland; and three brothers, Francis R. Torrington, Jr., who is with the United States Army at Fort Gordon, Ga., and David L. and William J. Torrington, both of Cumberland.

Private Millberry, 19, was a graduate of Francis Scott Key Senior High School near Union Bridge, according to his cousin, Mrs. Amelia Millberry, of Westminster, Md. She said Private Millberry worked briefly for a shoe factory in Westminster before he was drafted.

He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Millberry, Sr., of Route 1, Union Bridge, and a number of brothers and sisters.

#### KILLED WEDNESDAY

Private Jones, 20, was killed Wednesday while on a mission in Quang Tri, South Vietnam, his sister, Mrs. Lorraine Bryant said yesterday.

Private Jones enlisted in the Marines in March, 1966, after leaving City College during his senior year, and had been in Vietnam since last April. He finished his high school education in the Marines and intended to study sociology in college after the service, she said.

Besides Mrs. Bryant, he is survived by his mother, Mrs. Alice Jones, of Belle avenue, his father, Theophilus Jones, of Baltimore, and another sister, Mrs. Janet Carey, also of Baltimore.

## An Address by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien at the Women's National Press Club

### HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address given by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien at the Women's National Press Club here in Washington on Tuesday, January 30, 1968:

GERRY VAN DER HEUVEL. Ladies and gentlemen, politics go with Postmaster Generals like Boston-baked beans and brown bread. Being good politicians, all Postmasters are great bargainers. Some have been horse traders. But our guest is the first Postmaster General who offered to swap the U.S. Post Office. He hasn't had any takers, but I understand that another fellow wants to start his own business.

Our guest doesn't have to worry, of course, if he programs himself out of the Post Office job. Have you ever seen an habitually bare-headed man who wore so many hats? He has been the field marshal for all the legislation passed in the last seven years. His successes need no recounting. If there were failures, they were neither ones of strategy nor personal diplomacy, for Larry O'Brien is master of the first and the latter comes naturally. What other dedicated partisan has masterminded a Democratic and a Republican Presidential campaign at the same time? His compendium on campaigning was used, of course, by President Kennedy and President Johnson. What must have surprised him was when Barry Goldwater came up to him and said in 1964, "Larry, I might as well admit it, I have your book."

Nor do his converts stop at the water's edge. Great Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson used it in his successful campaign to oust the Conservatives. And the Philippines President Marcos gives him much credit for his winning race.

Ladies and gentlemen, probably the most respected political strategist on the current scene—may I present the Postmaster General?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much, Gerry. I should mention rumor has it that General de Gaulle used that manual also.

Vera Glasser, Isabel McCaig, Carroll Kilpatrick, my good friend Mike Manatos. And I should, by way of explanation, state that Barefoot Sanders would be with us this noon, but he is on the Hill at a luncheon involving some of the key members of the House to discuss our program, and he is therefore unavoidably absent. And of course, my good wife, Elva.

I usually begin my remarks by stating how pleased I am to be wherever I am. And when you think of the alternatives, that's a safe statement.

But frankly this afternoon I am dubious. If I say I'm pleased to be with you, one of you is liable to stand up and say, Why? And what could I say? It's too early to tell, would be the truth. But it wouldn't be very responsive, I'm afraid.

Actually, before I dive into the treasure trove I brought with me, before I reveal all the inside information about where we are, where we are going and why we might get there, just a word from my sponsor.

The President asked me to send you his personal greetings, and that's for attribution.

You know, one of the many mysteries of life here in Washington is that newspaper-

women may not be deadlier than the male of the species. But they tend to ask far more lethal questions. It happens again and again. I have a press conference, and I hope—and I pray a bit, too—pray that it is going to go well; I will be asked no questions which I don't expect, and for which I do not have the proper array of confusing answers. Then a slender gloved hand goes up. "Mr. O'Brien," the sweet voice begins; and soon I feel as if I am involved in a physics experiment, in which I am being bombarded by a high velocity electron. Now, in those experiments, I am told, some of the electrons miss the target. But your questions never do. So someday perhaps you will reveal your secret to me.

Since there is a rumor currently circulating that I have some passing interest in politics, I thought I might mention what I feel are some points worth considering in the months to come.

Perhaps the most significant so far is that compared to the President and the President's program, all the Republican candidates and their mixed bag of positions and issues are coming more and more to resemble the new canned diet food. Now, you know the one I have in mind—the label is attractive; the advertising is great; the can itself is giant-size and made of stainless steel. Of course, when you open it, it's empty.

Now during recent weeks I have been hearing more and more about 1948 instead of 1968. There seems to be a new epidemic sweeping news desks. Everyone remembers that there were third and fourth party candidates in 1948. And it appears we will have at least a third party candidate in 1968.

Everyone remembers the Dixiecrats in 1948. And now there are cries that they or their close relatives will rise again.

As there was twenty years ago, there is an incumbent Democratic President who has a number of problems to face, and a rating in the polls that fluctuates with the weather.

Finally, there is a Congress which seems—at times, at least—to want to go its own way.

So we hear about the possibility of our President coming out against a do-nothing Congress; and about the President giving them hell on the whistle-stops. All we need is Tom Dewey and we would be back in the good old days.

As with some of the more wishful and unrealistic solutions to the Vietnam conflict, these political parallels have the advantage of simplicity. Actually since we remember how things turned out on election day 1948, I wish the parallels were more prophetic as well as simple. Fortunately or unfortunately many things have changed since 1948. There is a two-party system throughout much of the South. And George Wallace is not an unmixed blessing to the Republican Party. Rabble-rousing and race-baiting in the South are becoming less effective. Many Southerners of both races have a new self-confidence about their ability to work together.

Old-world divisions, religious and ethnic backgrounds which were so compelling in the past in national politics and which were central to many appeals for support have, to a great extent, dissolved in the last twenty years.

The tens of thousands of union members who once jammed Detroit's Cadillac Square on Labor Day to hear fiery speeches are now spending the holidays with their families around barbecue pits in the suburbs, or hauling the boat trailer out to the lake.

Racial problems, once confined to the Southland, are now acute in our cities North, East and West. Many of the problems of 1948 have been resolved. But new problems have taken their place. Old habits, old alliances have disappeared.

Back in 1948 a lucky few were watching Uncle Milite on a communications medium that was so new that the Encyclopedia Britannica Yearbook agonized for some para-



graphs about what it should be called—Tela, Telesee, or even TV. Telesee is now the national pastime. And this alone destroys the parallel of 1948. For a significant part of the campaign will be waged through TV.

As a matter of fact, even if there were no television, there aren't enough passenger trains around to make whistle-stopping worthwhile.

Now, I wonder how Abraham Lincoln would have fared and how the Union would have survived had there been television back in 1860. Maybe a 19th century Ronald Reagan would have defeated Abraham Lincoln on television. But I firmly believe, and I do, in the judgment of the American people—then and now—in voting for a President on the basis of what he says, what he does, and what he stands for. We don't want a carefully packaged TV candidate.

But President Johnson does claim his right to discuss the great issues of our time, to cite the record of this Administration and to offer solutions for the future.

So I can tell you in advance what the main Democratic strategy will be during the campaign, and it is really quite simple. We will tell the unvarnished truth, that President Johnson has given leadership, that he has proposed imaginative, compassionate and realistic solutions, and that he has the ability to get those solutions translated into law. The President will not castigate a do-nothing Congress. Why? Because this Congress has already done a lot, as have all the Democratic Congresses since 1961. And by the time this session is over, the Congress will have done a lot more.

The President will not attack business because American business has come a long way since 1948. President Johnson has proposed more consumer legislation than any President in history. Twenty years ago this would have been greeted by businessmen with a howl heard 'round the nation. Today most businessmen know that it is simply good business to give people what they are paying for. Today business understands that it has a responsibility in the area of urban problems, and it is moving in cooperation with government to solve those problems, in jobs and in housing.

In short, the President is not going to attack, condemn or assail. He is going to spell out the accomplishments of his administration.

Now, we have a lot to be proud of in that record. It is a brilliant and—in my view—unprecedented record. In just the last four years the Congress has passed more than 260 measures proposed by the President.

Now don't be alarmed—I am not going to recite the laws like a list of ancestors in the Book of Genesis. But it is the job of the Democratic Party to recall the genesis of such measures as Medicare, elementary and secondary education, higher education, the Teacher Corps, mental health, new G.I. Bill of Rights, model cities, rent supplement, mass transit, outer space treaty, Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, water pollution and air pollution control, auto and highway safety, minimum wage increases—and on and on.

Well, what of this record? And I emphasize "this." In my honest judgment it is outstanding. You and I know that people don't vote for yesterday. They vote for tomorrow. We will not expect any plaudits for the powerful array of social legislation that has been passed since 1961. It is almost like the sad story of the husband who decided to surprise his wife on Christmas Day. He bought her a lovely skunk coat and placed it under the Christmas tree. On Christmas morning she opened the package, held the coat up to the light and declared, "How is it possible: such a beautiful skin from such a smelly little animal?" Our hero replied, "Well, I didn't expect gratitude, but you don't have to insult me."

Anyone who tries to win elections by merely reciting the record is misjudging the voter. Yesterday is the past. Tomorrow is what counts.

While many applaud the significant gains of the last several years, most take them for granted, and some even assume they have always existed.

People look, and rightly so, toward the future. Not what did you do, not even what did you do for me lately? But what will you do tomorrow and next year?

This is the question that is asked. This is the question we must answer.

And the Democratic Party has its goals for the future. We do have an unfinished agenda. Our program is no less than a new Bill of Rights. The President feels that Americans have the right to be protected from misrepresentation and sharp practice. He feels that the slogan "Let the buyer beware" is as outmoded as "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." To protect the right of the consumer for a clear return on his dollar, the President already has consumer protection bills before the Congress. But he feels these are not enough to stop deceptive practices.

So we are now asking for additional consumer protection, including new teeth for the Federal Trade Commission, new safeguards to assure the quality of fish and poultry, and the safety of our community water supplies, a close examination of automobile insurance, which can take a bite out of paychecks almost as large as a state income tax, and protection against TV radiation hazards.

These are parts of the consumer bill of rights.

We will ask: "What are the Republican plans for the future in this area?"

Take child health. As another element of the new bill of rights, the President feels that every American child has the right to a healthful start in life.

In addition to the bold new programs already passed under his leadership, he will ask Congress for a major child health program. We expect to ask, "What are the Republicans' plans in this area?"

Take housing. The President feels an \$800-billion-plus-a-year nation should be able to afford good housing, that Americans should have a right to live in a decent place of their choice. Our cities are tinderboxes. The flint of resistance, the steel of decaying rat and roach-infested high-rent housing, when struck together, can produce disasters that would cost billions.

The answer is not pious platitudes or hand-wringing. The answer is to remove the combustibles by providing decent housing and rebuilding our cities. The President has given that answer. We will ask what the Republican answer is.

And Americans have a right to a job, to be gainfully employed. That's why the President has urged programs aimed at the hard-core unemployed.

Working together with business and labor, the President seeks to place the half-million hard-core urban unemployed in training programs that will lead to useful work. We will ask what the Republican plans are to solve this problem.

In education, we have made massive strides in education, historic breakthroughs from elementary and secondary through higher. Invariably against overwhelming Republican opposition. But we must achieve the goal of two Presidents, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, that every American child will be given the opportunity to absorb as much education as he or she is capable of. We will continue our struggle to achieve that goal. But we will demand to know whether the Republicans are prepared to drop their continuous opposition and join us in this quest.

There is also a right that Americans must enjoy. The right of safety on our streets. The initiative for federal action against crime is a democratic initiative. It is President Johnson who first proposed the Safe Streets Act. It is the Republican who opposed that initiative. As the President said in the State of the Union address, "there is no more urgent business before this Congress than to pass the Safe Streets Act this year that I proposed last year."

We will ask: What are the Republican plans concerning crime?

And finally, Americans must never relinquish their hope of living in a world of peace and security, to enjoy their right to live in peace and security. Americans because of our position of power cannot afford the luxury of most other people in the world. We cannot afford to sit on our hands and dream of the wonders of peace. If there is to be a better world, we must work for it, here and abroad. Freedom cannot be an island. It is indivisible. If we lose our nerve, if we accept easy and irresponsible positions, based either on too much force or too little backbone, we are weakening our own freedom and denying freedom to friendly nations, in South Vietnam and elsewhere.

I can tell you we will ask the Republican Party what it would do to strengthen the forces of freedom, while at the same time working for peace throughout the world.

And this time I don't think simple slogans are going to satisfy the American people.

So now you have our campaign plan. We have learned from the experience of the past, but we know that the strategy of 1948 is history, and the problems of 1968 must have new solutions.

And we have one more expectation: Our expectation about you, about the nation's news media. We Democrats expect one thing from you—no more and no less—we expect that you will report the facts objectively and fully. And let me emphasize. We have no fear about facts. We have no fear about the American people when they know all the facts. And knowing you as I do, I have no fear that factual—and it will be that—that factual, full, objective, professional reporting is precisely what you intend to provide.

We all know a free press is one of the basic tenets of our freedom, and in this room today I can tell you that I know freedom is secure, for I am certain the story of this critical year will be told fully, factually, and fairly.

Thank you very much.

## President Acts To Assure Consumers Protection on Household Purchases

**HON. JACK BROOKS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in his consumer message proposes an immediate study of the problem of repairs and guarantees on consumer products.

Every day new devices come on the market to save us time and energy. But they can also be a source of annoyance, for with every invention come new problems.

Consumers are not told how long products will last. The documents which supposedly guarantee free service and repairs are vaguely worded and often provide no real protection. And repair work is often poor—and always a gamble.

The consumer deserves better treatment—and the administration has moved to provide it. President Johnson has instructed his Special Assistant on Consumer Affairs, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and the Secretary of Commerce to immediately begin working with the industry to improve the quality of service and repairs; to assure that warranties say what they mean and mean what they say; and to inform consumers of how long a product can be expected to last.

The time has long since past when we could ignore the problems faced by the consumer in the marketplace. The President's proposals will go a long way toward assuring the American consumer that his hard-earned money will be profitably spent on quality products.

I commend his proposals to the attention of Congress.

### Poultry Inspection

#### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill on poultry inspection sent to me by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in response to a request I made to him last fall following passage of the Wholesome Meat Act. I had asked for language to bring the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 into conformance with the improvements we had just voted in the Meat Inspection Act.

As the Members will recall, I was the original sponsor of the poultry inspection law which we passed in 1957. I think I was the first Member of Congress to call attention to the need for Federal inspection of poultry.

The 1957 act contained a section permitting the designation of "major consuming areas" in which all poultry offered for sale would have to be federally inspected for wholesomeness. This section was intended to authorize compulsory Federal inspection of poultry sold only in intrastate commerce within such a "major consuming area." As numerous speeches and statements of mine appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over the past 9 or 10 years will clearly show, the "major consuming area" machinery of the 1957 act has never been used and therefore can be presumed to be ineffective.

In his consumer message today, President Johnson, among other things, asked for passage of a poultry inspection law such as the one I am now introducing. I believe other Members are introducing or cosponsoring similar bills. It is my intention to fight for early passage of effective legislation to assure the wholesomeness of all poultry sold in this country, which means the inclusion of poultry now sold only in intrastate commerce.

For instance, of 11 intrastate poultry plants recently inspected in Missouri, only two could pass Federal inspection requirements. Think of that.

### "Untouchables" Unlimited Unelected

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, emotional and impressive sounding titles—positions of sacred trust and confidence over the lives and destiny of our people, but the documented roster of untouchables seems unlimited.

Day by day, it becomes clearer that any solution in Vietnam, Korea, or elsewhere cannot be solved until the problem of the "untouchable" menace within our own Government is handled.

The untouchables are a seeming elite corps of subversives, not elected by the people—they appoint each other, are mutually interdependent upon each other. They have no terms of office; and they manage to survive political partisanship—except through public opinion and the demand voice of Congress.

No stone must be left unturned to initiate more hearings and investigations to ferret out the disloyalist and dual citizenship employees of the Government, especially the State Department. Our role must be to overcome the ancient Greek adage:

If the gods want to destroy someone, first they strike him with blindness.

Was the *Pueblo* an accident? Until we replace the untouchables with pro-Americans—the mothers and dads of America can never be sure—nor can you and I.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Frank Capell, through his *Herald of Freedom*, has released part VI of the "The Untouchables" which I place in the RECORD at this point:

#### THE UNTOUCHABLES—PART VI

The Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee has issued its long-awaited report on State Department Security. This report, carefully documented by sworn testimony, is the result of two years of hearings the record of which was made public in twenty-five volumes. The views of Senator James O. Eastland, Chairman, and Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Vice Chairman of the Subcommittee, were stated at the beginning of the report, and read in part:

"The most outstanding negative aspect of the Otepka case has been its chilling effect upon all those Government employees, both in and out of the security field, who may quite reasonably see it as an object lesson teaching that honor and virtue are not their own reward if following the path of honor and virtue involves stepping on the toes of entrenched authority, or calls for disclosing matters embarrassing to officials in high places. . . .

"Until we can find a way to terminate the Otepka case with full justice to Mr. Otepka and every other witness who testifies, and with full and continuing recognition of the right of the Congress and its committees to obtain complete and accurate information with respect to wrong doing, subversive activity, or any other threat to our security which may exist or take place within the executive branch, we must not rest; for we must recognize that until this has been accomplished, the prerogatives of the legisla-

tive branch stand infringed, and its effectiveness stands curtailed."

Sen. Strom Thurmond presented his own individual views of what has been going on in the State Department. He said:

"The State Department's position has been . . . that no wrongdoing may be disclosed unless the disclosure is authorized presumably by the wrongdoers. . . . As amply set forth in this report and in the preceding volumes of testimony, the State Department was trying to hide a new policy of phasing out effective security procedures. The highest officers of the State Department no longer believed in the mandate to maintain critical standards of suitability and loyalty in employing personnel. . . .

"State Department personnel security policy is manifestly contrary to the intentions of Congress. State Department officers have attempted deliberately to hide this fact from an agency of Congress charged with overseeing security practices. The State Department has indulged in illegal acts, the destruction of the careers of honest men, misrepresentation, and perhaps perjury, in order to prevent Congress from carrying out its constitutional functions. This is an arrogant challenge, which must not be allowed to stand."

The facts that these hearings brought out have been known for years to our intelligence services . . . that there are many serious security risks employed in the federal government and particularly in the State Department. They remain in spite of their known subversive backgrounds and are protected and promoted. They are "The Untouchables." Sen. McCarthy (Joseph, that is) was destroyed when he began to seek them out. Scott McLeod, while he was head of the State Department Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, had his investigators and evaluators help him prepare a list of security risks employed at that time in the State Department. Under date of June 27, 1956, McLeod notified the Secretary of State that there were 858 such risks, 648 of whom were risks because of Communist activities and associations. The balance was made up of homosexuals, alcoholics, drug addicts, mentally ill and others who had violated security regulations.

McLeod was removed from his job as top security man by the maneuver of making him Ambassador to Ireland. Before he left for Dublin in July, 1957, however, he took the precaution of turning over the original list and two onion skin copies to trusted friends. The only action officially taken by the State Department after notification of the existence of this list was to seek out and remove those responsible for its preparation. Scott McLeod, a former college football player, died of a heart attack on November 7, 1961, in Concord, N.H., at the age of 47. Otto Otepka and the other McLeod security men are still alive but all far removed from security work. Isn't it time we went after the people on the list rather than those who prepared it?

David Henry Popper is one of the persons on McLeod's list. He is still with the U.S. State Department, now being Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the Bureau of International Organizations Affairs. He came into U.S. Government service through Alger Hiss in 1945 at which time he worked for and with Hiss. He was born in New York City on October 3, 1912, the son of Morris Popper and Lillian Greenbaum (Popper). He graduated from Harvard University in 1932 with an AB degree and received his MA in 1934. During part of the period from 1932 to 1933 he had a travelling fellowship in Europe and in 1941 had another one for travelling in Latin America. On March 8, 1936, Popper was married to Miss Florence Cecelia Maisel.

Soon after leaving Harvard in 1934 Popper was employed by the Foreign Policy Association where he worked for the next six years



until 1940. He was a research assistant under the direct supervision of the notorious Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean. Vera Micheles arrived in the United States from the Soviet Union in 1919. She became a U.S. citizen in 1928 after having obtained a Ph. D. from Radcliffe College. She was employed as Research Director by the Foreign Policy Association in 1928 and held this post until 1947 when she became Editor of Publications. As of June 30, 1960, Mrs. Dean's record of affiliations with Communist fronts took four pages to list when the House Committee on Un-American Activities prepared a report on her for Congressman James C. Davis.

Mrs. Dean was a member of the board of directors of the American Russian Institute, cited as Communist by a U.S. Attorney General and Communist-controlled by the Senate Judiciary Committee. This organization was intimately linked with the Institute of Pacific Relations and specialized in pro-Soviet propaganda. Mrs. Dean wrote articles for *Far Eastern Survey* and *Pacific Affairs*, both organs of the IPR. Page 4861 of the Senate Hearings on the IPR shows that David H. Popper was affiliated with the IPR also.

Mrs. Dean lectured at the Marxist-oriented New School for Social Research in New York City, the course being entitled "Asia in Ferment." Among those who lectured with her in this course were Owen Lattimore, Lawrence C. Rosinger, Derk Bodde, W. W. Lockwood and Harold R. Isaacs.

The Foreign Policy Association for which Popper worked under Mrs. Dean was cited in a Grand Jury Presentment by the March-April 1960 Grand Jury of Fulton County (Atlanta), Georgia and the Grand Jury of Bibb County, Georgia. Both examined the subversive type material sponsored by the F.P.A. and both recommended further investigations. The American Legion, Post 140, of Atlanta prepared a lengthy expose on the Foreign Policy Association which documented its subversive connections. The American Legion publication, *Firing Line*, of June 15, 1960, quoted from an article which appeared in *Plain Talk* of November 1946 as follows: "Under the present leadership of Vera Micheles Dean of the FPA's Research Department, its most influential section has been turned into a factory for propaganda to appease the Soviet Union and to apologize for its expansion in all directions." The American Legion publication also pointed out that the FPA received financial support from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace during Alger Hiss' presidency of that organization and stated that Hiss advocated "close collaboration between the Carnegie Endowment and the FPA." The FPA also received financial support from the Rockefeller Foundation while Dean Rusk was its president.

Through his employment in the FPA Research Department, David Popper came into close contact with key people in the IPR and also with identified Communists, Soviet espionage agents and Communist sympathizers. The IPR Hearings (P. 5193) show that David H. Popper was a member of the editorial board of the magazine *Amerasia* which was cited by the Senate Judiciary Committee as a "Communist controlled magazine which was so closely linked into the IPR system that the IPR family ordinarily treated it as simply another of its publications." Frederick Vanderbilt Field was owner of fifty per cent of the stock of *Amerasia* and was chairman of the editorial board for more than three years. "When it ceased publication after the arrest in what has been known as the *Amerasia* Case in 1945, the subscription list was taken over by the *Far Eastern Survey*, official publication of the IPR." (Senate Report 2050, IPR, 7-2-52, pp 71-95-145-146)

On the editorial board of *Amerasia* with David H. Popper were Frederick V. Field, identified as a Communist and member of a Soviet espionage ring; Philip J. Jaffee (alias

Y. W. Phillips), managing editor, Russian-born and identified as a Communist and convicted in connection with the theft of over 1500 secret Government documents found in *Amerasia* offices or the homes of persons connected with it; Lillian Peffer, assistant editor; T. A. Bisson, identified as a Communist; Ch'ao-Ting Chi, identified as a Communist and affiliated with IPR; Owen Lattimore who was identified as a Communist but denied it, and was cited by the Senate Judiciary Committee as "a conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet Conspiracy;" William W. Lockwood, closely associated with Communists and espionage agents, an executive of the IPR; Cyrus H. Peake; William T. Stone, connected with IPR; and Harriet Levine Chi, identified as a Communist. Those most closely associated with Popper were the identified Communists, Field, Jaffee and Bisson.

Another Communist enterprise with which Popper's name was connected was Commonwealth College set up at Mena, Arkansas. In 1935 a Special Committee of the Arkansas Legislature investigated the college and the testimony of Hon. J. L. Shaver, a member of that committee was presented in a Hearing before the Special Education Committee of the Arkansas Legislative Council, held December 16, 17, and 18, 1958. It reads as follows:

"In 1925, Commonwealth College settled west of Mena, Arkansas. This school had no particular academic requirements, tuition or qualifications for students of faculty. No attempt was made to belie the fact that it was communistic in nature, and to a large extent was supported by organizations with subversive backgrounds."

There was an official investigation made of the college as a result of its displaying of the Communist hammer and sickle. The records of the college were obtained and it was reported that the name of David H. Popper was found in the confidential files and on the regular mailing list of the college. The U.S. Attorney General cited Commonwealth College as Communist and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the college as "A Communist enterprise cited as subversive by an investigating committee of the Arkansas Legislature. It received money from the Garland Fund." The Garland Fund was also known as the American Fund for Public Service and was cited by the same House Committee—"It was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprises." William Z. Foster, who was Chairman of the Communist Party USA, served on its Board of Directors.

David H. Popper was reported as a dues paying member of the United Office and Professional Workers of America. In the Hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee entitled *Subversive Control of Distributive, Processing and Office Workers of America*, held in 1951-2, page 18, we find the testimony of W. A. Copeland, C.I.O. Regional Director:

"Mr. Arens. Do you have similar information with reference to the United Office and Professional Workers of America?"

"Mr. Copeland. They went through the similar process."

"Mr. Arens. And were they likewise expelled?"

"Mr. Copeland. They were expelled."

"Mr. Arens. And were they likewise expelled because the CIO found that the United Office and Professional Workers of America had followed the Communist Party program?"

"Mr. Copeland. That is the record of the CIO executive board. They were expelled for that reason."

Late in 1945, after Popper had served in the Army Chemical Warfare Service as a Captain, he came into the State Department as a specialist in International Organizations Affairs, where he worked with and under Alger Hiss. Other Hiss favorites were Harding Bancroft and Andrew Cordier, the

latter two having been recommended by Harlan Cleveland for a special advisory Committee to select staffing of personnel at the United Nations as mentioned in the Otepka Brief.

By 1948 Popper became Assistant Chief of the State Department's Division of International Affairs. His experience in promoting the United Nations idea and World Government while in the Foreign Policy Association had brought him into contact with a large number of pro-Soviets who had similar objectives and many of them had found their way into the State Department. The year before the formation of the U.N. at San Francisco, Andrew Cordier and Alger Hiss had toured the country promoting the U.N. idea. By 1949 Popper was the officer in charge of United Nations General Assembly Affairs for the State Department. He then became Deputy Director and then Director of the Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs of the Department of State.

During the years 1952-53, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee conducted investigations and hearings on "Activities of U.S. Citizens Employed by the United Nations." These hearings disclosed that U.S. Communists had been employed at the United Nations and that the State Department was negligent in allowing this situation to develop. The Committee's report, page 16, states:

"For a period of approximately 3 years—between the time of the formation of the United Nations in 1946 and some time in 1949—there was no safeguard whatsoever, from the standpoint of the United States, against employment by the United Nations of United States citizens who were disloyal to their country, or were actively engaged in espionage on behalf of some foreign power" Alger Hiss, who brought Popper into the State Department, also recommended a list of 200 people for U.N. employment. In the group were found Communists and Soviet espionage agents.

During the period from 1946 to 1953 Popper acted as an adviser to the United States Delegation to the United Nations Assembly. He was the Deputy U.S. Representative to the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests which conference took place at Geneva 1959-61 and out of which came the Test Ban Treaty which favors the U.S.S.R. Popper was Senior Adviser on Disarmament Affairs for the U.S. Mission to the United Nations 1961-2 which resulted in a program of disarmament of our country which has been carried out ever since.

In 1962 Popper was Director of the Office of Atlantic Political and Military Affairs of the Department of State, and was a member of the U.S. Delegation at NATO Ministers meetings. During 1962 in this capacity he worked with Harlan Cleveland, now U.S. Ambassador to NATO. Both Popper and Cleveland are long-time friends of Alger Hiss. It has recently been revealed that there is a large Soviet espionage ring operating in NATO.

As a result of the espionage cases of Harold Adrian Philby, Donald D. MacLean, Guy Burgess and George Blake, a team of forty British Secret Intelligence agents have been investigating some 120 Americans, according to the *Government Employee's Exchange* newspaper of Dec. 13, 1967. They are reportedly investigating employees of the State Department, the Foreign Service, the CIA, the Atomic Energy Commission, TVA, NASA, the Defense and Treasury Departments. Philby, the master spy, helped to set up the CIA and had contact with some of the same people with whom Popper was in contact. A confidential source reported Popper to a U.S. Intelligence service as having connections with members of the Soviet Intelligence apparatus. A former high ranking member of the Communist Party USA had advised a U.S. Intelligence agency that he had been in-

formed "Popper is one of us and should be treated accordingly."

That David H. Popper had subversive affiliations was publicly known in 1944, the year before he went into the State Department. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in their report, Appendix IX, page 1446, under the title (Communist) Party and Party Line Publications explained, "Throughout its existence in this country the Communist Party has made a specialty of propaganda through publications and periodicals." The first such publication listed was AMERASIA, "A review of America and the Far East published at 125 East 52nd St." Thereafter appear the names of the Editorial board with Frederick Vanderbilt Field as chairman, Philip Jaffe as managing editor and David H. Popper as Editorial board member.

Time and again information concerning the background and contacts of Popper came to the attention of the proper authorities but, as an "Untouchable," he was able to remain in the State Department, moving up higher and higher. As we have noted before, the Poppers stay, the Otepkas go. Among the files seized from Oteпка's office by his superior, John F. Reilly, one of the conspirators in the "Get Oteпка Project," were records of the investigation of the Amerasia Case which involved the theft or unlawful removal of hundreds of State Department documents in 1945. These files pertaining to U.S. relations with China implicated State Department employees. Also seized from Oteпка's files were the identities and backgrounds of the 858 persons in the Scott McLeod list. It is understood that orders may have been given to have these files destroyed and this may already have taken place. Unfortunately for the record-destroyers, there are two more copies of this information in safekeeping, and perhaps even copies of the copies.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Report, Part II, dated December 15, 1967 (for release January 9, 1968) states on Page 17:

"In attempting to trace the Oteпка files, the subcommittee found that some of the Oteпка files went to areas other than the central files. Mr. Crockett, after his testimony informing the subcommittee that the Oteпка material was still awaiting a final determination, later sent a letter indicating that destruction of this material was under consideration."

The Oteпка Hearings should make it crystal clear to every American that the State Department wants no part of "pro-Americans." While making noises like an American and being praised as a "loyal American," Secretary of State Dean Rusk has bypassed and undermined security procedures and instituted a policy "manifestly contrary to the intentions of Congress." Pro-Soviets are protected and pro-Americans are selected out or put in unimportant jobs where they can do nothing to interfere with the insiders—not even talk to a Congressional committee.

Just as Roy Rubottom and William Wield were able to conceal the warnings that Castro was a Communist so there are other serious security risks in positions where they can orient our foreign policy along a pro-Communist line. David Popper was well trained in pro-Soviet propaganda by an expert, Vera Micheles Dean, and we may be sure that, working quietly behind the scenes, his name never appearing in the newspapers, he is still unchanged. To the contrary Popper developed a close association with important figures in the Communist Conspiracy and with pro-Soviets both in the State Department and the United Nations. The take-over of one country after another by the Communist Conspiracy has been possible only because of the pro-Soviet policies of "Untouchables" within the Government of the United States.

## Secretary Weaver Underlines Importance of Achieving Rural-Urban Balance of Development

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Robert C. Weaver of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in a recent address to the Legislative Conference of the National Association of Counties underlined the importance of rural progress and development in the solution of urban problems.

Secretary Weaver emphasizes that as major as are the problems of our large cities this should not detract from the importance of assisting our smaller towns and cities in programs of growth and progress.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people generally in this matter of rural and urban development, I place excerpts from Secretary Weaver's speech in the RECORD, at this point:

### THE OPPORTUNITIES OF URBAN GROWTH

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Legislative Conference, National Association of Counties, Alexandria, Va., January 23, 1968)

Today public awareness and debate on domestic issues tend to polarize around two problem areas, the core city and rural America.

We hear a great deal about the urban ghetto and its difficult problems of bad housing and unemployment and discrimination. We have seen riots on television and we know the grim facts of crime in city streets.

The problems of rural America have been brought home to us. We know that one-fourth of rural Americans are poor, that one out of three of their homes are substandard, and that their health and educational facilities are seriously deficient.

This awareness and this debate are important and beneficial. As a result, government at all levels is committed to alleviate some of our thorniest problems. In the Federal sector alone, there are programs for poverty, unemployment, low-income housing, and to end discrimination.

The private sector is increasingly responsive to social problems. The business community is becoming involved in job training and industrial development in the ghettos. The insurance industry is putting a billion dollars into housing and industrial development in poor neighborhoods.

One reason for this awareness and activity lies in the emotional appeal of the problems. Poverty and its companions—bad housing, malnutrition, unemployment, despair—all these are urgent human problems which enlist the sympathy of most Americans.

There is also fear. We are on notice in our smoldering urban ghettos that we must act quickly and that our actions must go beyond a welfare check that barely sustains life or plugging a rat hole in a slum tenement. This matter is as urgent as it is immediate.

When there are humane matters of starvation and sick children at stake, and the fear of violence, the clock is moving along.

But there is a different timeclock at work in other urban matters.

There is a danger that in polarizing our concerns as we are, we may direct too little attention to the suburbs and the hinterland

of smaller towns and cities beyond. And yet these are the places where many Americans now live, where explosive growth is under way, and where many of the decisions affecting our urban future are being decided.

They are matters of interest and urgency to our people and of deep professional concern to HUD and NACO.

They are, in part, the following matters: Of planned metropolitan development; Of urban land use planning; Of new community development; Of viable intergovernmental arrangements among local governments;

Of educating and training the kinds of specialized and dedicated public servants needed in local government;

Of giving local government, particularly those too small to maintain a diverse staff, the technical assistance and information they need to take advantage of governmental programs.

As you know, these matters do not stand apart, but intertwine and interact. When we speak of planned land use and viable intergovernmental arrangements, we are also discussing metropolitan development and the creation of new communities.

Taken together, they spell growth—community growth, metropolitan growth, urban growth.

Also—unfortunately—taken together urban growth is a haphazard process in this country today.

I am not going to march a parade of horrible examples before you, because you know about them. If you are from urban counties, you live with the problems of urban sprawl, and bad highway planning; and the kinds of instant-blight commercial districts that clutter the crossroads.

If you are from rural counties, you can't help but mourn the loss of your young and ambitious people to the cities, and the slow death of towns which were once both attractive and functional.

Sometimes it is helpful to look at a situation through another's eyes. An English newspaperman, Ian Nairn, wrote last fall about driving around the eastern United States for the first time in seven years. He said: "What struck me most was the degree to which, in that short time, the American landscape had been wrecked."

The most deplorable thing about this is that there is no reason for our countryside to be wrecked.

We talk of population growth and the migration of rural people to the cities. But still our population density is only a small percentage of that in most of Western Europe, and although they have problems also, most European countries have done a far better job of planning their urban growth than we have here.

I think we can all agree on the single most important obstacle to better urban growth, and that is lack of a national land use policy. In this respect we are almost unique among industrialized nations.

As a consequence of this, urban land use is haphazard and usually unplanned . . .

An obvious alternative is statewide or areawide exercise of land use control powers . . .

County governments are in a key position to help discipline urban growth, for reasons with which you are very aware.

You have large geographic size, so you can singly or in compact with other counties play a key role in area-wide planning.

You have direct accountability to your residents, and so you can exercise political leadership.

You have an established legal and political status in Federal-State-local relations.

And counties are increasingly involved in matters which effect urban growth. You are increasingly involved in expressways, airports, parks, pollution control and in such clearly urban services as fire and police protection and water and sewer facilities. You



are involved in planning, both singly and in councils of government.

I believe there is also no alternative to quick and positive and concerted action in the problem of urban growth. This is not only a concern of today and ten years from now, but of our whole future. Unless we can change the pattern as it has existed in the past, we will not have a very livable countryside in that future. We at HUD will work together, and fight together with you to accomplish this mission, because we are true believers too.

### Vietcong Strategy: Fight During Negotiations

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been directed to an article which was written to coincide with the newest outbreak of Communist atrocities in Vietnam. Its objective comment on the motivation deserves our serious attention. The article, by the Very Reverend Monsignor John M. Kelly, editor of the New World, the Chicago Catholic archdiocese newspaper, follows:

#### VIETCONG STRATEGY: FIGHT DURING NEGOTIATIONS

(By J. M. Kelly)

There are those who feel sincerely that the U.S. should stop the bombing of North Vietnam with no reciprocal cessation of hostilities on the part of the communist forces. It is their feeling that the Viet Cong will think we're being pretty nice about it and will respond favorably. Captured secret documents of the Viet Cong reveal that their stated policy is to fight while negotiating.

According to one of the captured communist documents, peace negotiations will be started only from a position of strength in the military field and will "serve mainly to provide us the groundwork from which to launch our general offensive." A second reason for negotiating is presented: "to expose the enemy's political attack upon us and to show that ours is the just cause and his the unjust."

These thoughts are continued under the heading of definition of strategy: "To have negotiations we must fight more fiercely. Only in such a situation can we authorize negotiations to take place. Then, when we hear that negotiations are about to take place, we must attack the enemy all over the country."

These conditions are already being fulfilled. A great Red troop build-up has taken place at the De-militarized Zone. They are ready for this type of negotiation as soon as our nation weakens to their demands.

Meanwhile, we have their Red comrades in North Korea coming to their aid by their diversionary tactics in pirating an American vessel 25 miles off the North Korean coast in open water. Other North Koreans, guerrillas, have recently infiltrated the south and are perpetrating raids. Their admitted purpose is to kill the South Korean president.

Does any of this point to any sincerity on the part of Hanoi and the Viet Cong or any of their friends? If we want to get our boys shot down in a hurry, tell them to lay down their arms, stop the bombing unilaterally, and walk forward slowly with hands extended in friendship. Our enemies will not misfire. Remember, two-thirds of all our Korean war casualties were inflicted while we were at the conference table with the North Korean Reds.

### The Late Honorable Edward T. Miller

#### HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, it was my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of Hon. Edward T. Miller, of Easton, Md., who served as Representative from Maryland's First Congressional District from 1947 until 1959.

With the simple and impressive services of the Quaker religion, Ted Miller was laid to rest on January 23 in the churchyard of the Third Haven Friends Meetinghouse in Easton. Many Marylanders were there to pay their last respects to Ted, including myself and my colleague, Hon. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS; former Maryland Congressman, Gen. James P. S. Devereux; and the majority and minority leaders of the Maryland House of Delegates, Hon. Thomas Hunter Lowe, of Talbot County, and Hon. J. Glenn Beall, Jr., of Allegany County.

The loss of Ted Miller has been felt deeply by the citizens of the Eastern Shore and all Maryland.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a resolution of the Maryland House of Delegates, two editorials, and a statement by the former Vice President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, a close friend of Ted Miller since the days when they both first began their public service together in the 80th Congress:

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION

House resolution expressing the deep sympathies of the General Assembly of Maryland over the passing of the Honorable Edward T. Miller

The members of the General Assembly of Maryland learned with deepest regret of the passing of the Honorable Edward T. Miller of Talbot County.

Mr. Miller was a former member of the Congress of the United States from the First Congressional District of Maryland. He served in that capacity for 12 years and was an able and outstanding member of the Congress.

Edward T. Miller was born in Montgomery County. He was a graduate of Yale College, a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and an outstanding athlete.

He had military service in both the First World War and the Second World War. In World War I, he attained the rank of Captain and took part in a number of the major offenses in France. After that time, he retained his commission in the Army Reserve and re-entered the service after the outbreak of World War II as a Colonel of Infantry. His major service was in the China Command.

Mr. Miller's other public service included holding the post of Referee in Bankruptcy for a number of Eastern Shore counties and for a period of four years during the 1930's serving as Judge of the Juvenile Court in Talbot County.

In the passing of the Honorable Edward T. Miller, his county, the State of Maryland, and the entire nation have lost an outstanding public servant. He filled a variety of public offices with industry and integrity. In public life, the military service, and the practice of law, he gave of himself without reserve and lived a long and useful life in the highest tradition of American citizenship; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Mary-

land, That the deepest regrets of every member of this body are expressed over the passing of the Honorable Edward T. Miller of Talbot County; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of Maryland is requested to send copies of this Resolution to the surviving family of the late Mr. Miller, c/o Mrs. Edward T. Miller, Easton, Maryland.

JAMES P. MAUSE,  
Chief Clerk.

[From the Salisbury (Md.) Daily Times,  
Jan. 22, 1968]

EDWARD T. MILLER

Edward T. Miller, the man who broke a long Democratic hold on the Eastern Shore congressional seat and held it for 12 years, was a great deal more than a Republican who managed that feat.

He had served his country in both wars, engaging in front line campaigns in France in World War I and principally in the China-Burma-India Theater in World War II as a liaison between the Chinese and U.S. Gen. Joseph Stilwell.

In Congress he was a conservative, a trait which appealed to independent Eastern Shore voters who sent him to Congress six times even though the Democratic registration outnumbered that of his own party by two to one. His defeat in the election which turned him out of office was by only 718 votes.

He was not a native Eastern Shoreman, but he came to Easton to live as a young man and there's where his career of a service to his adopted area began. Illness had interrupted his services as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention.

His death on Saturday takes from the Maryland scene a wise, gentle and conservative voice.

[From the Chestertown (Md.) Kent County  
News, Jan. 24, 1968]

TED MILLER

Edward T. "Ted" Miller, the former Congressman who died last Saturday, was one of a breed all too rare—a non-native who became a typical Eastern Shoreman. Indeed, it was not until his death revealed his birthplace that most did not know he wasn't "bred and born" in the land he loved.

As the man who ended a 40-year drought for Republicans in the First District seat in Congress, he made Eastern Shoremen realize that it wasn't necessary to have "Democrat" after your name to do a serviceable job in representing the area.

And that is one thing he did do in the 12 years he was the Eastern Shore Representative—give service to his constituents. No problems were too large, none too small to gain his attention, as the hundreds he helped will attest.

He was proud to be a "Shoreman", even by adoption. May his tribe increase.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

Ted Miller was one of Maryland's and the nation's most able Congressmen. He was one of my closest personal friends and I valued his wise counsel during the years I was in Washington.

Mrs. Nixon joins me in sending our deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

### Equal Time for Supporters of Servicemen in Vietnam

#### HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a report about the activities of a group of Federal employees in

San Francisco who communicate with our servicemen in Vietnam for purposes of showing their support.

I bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues because usually the war protesters get primary coverage. My constituency represents both sides. In keeping with the spirit of the Federal Communications Commission's equal-time doctrine, I offer the following to provide a measure of equal time in behalf of the proponents.

The Employee's Association, an independently financed group at the Veterans' Administration regional office in San Francisco, initiated the project of writing to servicemen in certain units in Vietnam and last Christmas these servicemen received a flood of letters and Christmas cards. One employee sent over a hundred cards.

Through these letters they determined what items were lacking or difficult to come by, which, if obtained, would make things a little more comfortable for the soldiers. As a result they sent a variety of items to soldiers in Vietnam, including a quantity of recording tape to be used for recording individual messages to be sent home.

While we all recognize that the U.S. Army diet is the best in the world, it does not contain some of the nice-to-have luxuries to which most Americans have grown accustomed. The association determined from servicemen in one of the units in Vietnam what food items not in the Army diet, they would like. The association is now in the process of dispatching several cases of individual servings of canned food to meet this need.

A report I have received from Mr. Gordon R. Elliott, manager of the Veterans' Administration San Francisco regional office, indicates that association members have received many heartening responses which indicate that their efforts are appreciated and worthwhile. I would also like to commend both Gordon Elliott and the Employees Association for their thoughtfulness and humanitarian concern.

**T. Howard Duckett: Captain of Growth**

**HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a single man who shaped the destiny of what is now one of the fastest growing counties in the United States, that man was T. Howard Duckett.

If ever there was a single man who shaped a Democratic Party in what is now the largest county in Maryland and the only one without a single elected Republican, that man was T. Howard Duckett.

Mr. Speaker, it will be many years before the historians of Prince Georges County will be able to compile a comprehensive catalog of all that T. Howard Duckett did for his county in government, business, and politics. I am certain from knowing Mr. Duckett, from observing his work, that such a catalog of accomplishments will be unmatched

by any other individual in Prince Georges County.

I feel that one of the most objective tributes to Mr. Duckett was an editorial in the Washington Post on December 5, 1967, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 5, 1967]

T. HOWARD DUCKETT

Suburban Maryland had not yet emerged from its turn-of-the-century slumber when T. Howard Duckett began his long career as a lawyer, banker and wielder of hidden power. He sensed, however, that growth would come and transform the suburbs and that it offered great opportunities, both for public service and private gain. He led in the establishment of the regional park and planning agencies which made so much of that growth possible and bearable; his early championing of regionalism stands out now as a beacon of enlightenment in a sea of sprawl.

In Mr. Duckett's view, political calm was essential to economic growth and, in a behind-the-scenes style appropriate to him, he undertook to ensure that calm; never an elected official, he long helped steer the local Democratic organization. Later generations of Marylanders drew a sharper distinction between business and politics and rejected his attempt to spare economic life from public oversight. By then, Mr. Duckett, somewhat bemused, had retired from the corridors of political power to his various board rooms. His death, at 87, deprives the suburbs of one of the great captains of their growth.

**Guaranteed Insured Loan Program**

**HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Federal Government has increased all forms of institutional support. More and more young people who once could not have considered the possibility of higher education are now in residence on our campuses.

New buildings are rising on these same campuses supported by Federal dollars; new laboratories and laboratory equipment, new libraries, new books and all kinds of sophisticated educational hardware are enriching student lives all over the Nation. Withal, our student support programs have not kept up with the rising cost of post-secondary education. Qualified and motivated students are still barred from post-secondary education by mounting education costs. It is time to extend our student support upward, to provide educational opportunity for those students who are not from impoverished families, but from families whose annual income—under \$15,000—cannot encompass the burden of full tuition support without assistance.

I urge passage of the guaranteed insured loan program which President Johnson has proposed to Congress. Under this program, loans will be made available through private banks and institutions and guaranteed by the Federal Government.

Congress should pass the guaranteed insured loan program, as amended, to help maintain the steady march toward equality and educational opportunity.

Operations Research and the U.S. Congress—WORC—TIMS Meeting

**HON. ROBERT McCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, quite recently I had the opportunity to participate in a most significant meeting which took place in the chambers of the House Committee on the Judiciary. The occasion was a joint meeting of two prestigious professional organizations, the Washington Operations Research Council—WORC—and The Institute for Management Sciences—TIMS. The topic of discussion, never before considered by a gathering of legislative branch personnel and leading figures of the operations research systems analysis area of endeavor, was "Operations Research and the U.S. Congress."

The importance of this milestone session should not be overlooked by the Members of the Congress. Increasingly, there is a growing awareness that new tools and techniques must be discovered and applied in handling many of the decisionmaking functions of the individual Congressmen and the various committees of the two chambers. Systems technology, with its array of proven man-machine procedures, automatic data-processing devices, and mathematical models, offers the forward-looking legislators a capability which they can put to good use.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 21, and have been supported in this endeavor by 15 House Members on a bipartisan basis, which calls for the establishment of an automatic data-processing facility to support the Federal Congress. In my remarks before the joint WORC—TIMS membership, which were entered in the January 29 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 1322 to 1324—by my good friend and colleague, TOM RAILSBACK, I emphasized the many ways in which the systems approach could be utilized in our day-to-day operations. The burden remains upon us, as a moving force of leadership in American society, to harness systems technology whenever it will benefit us to do so.

Sharing the platform with me at the January 17 meeting was Robert L. Chartrand, who serves as the information sciences specialist for the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Commentary on his presentation and my speech was offered by Dr. Robert N. Grosse, Deputy Assistant Secretary—planning and evaluation—of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Dr. Alfred Blumstein, a longtime senior figure in the operations research community who is associated with the Institute for Defense Analyses. In addition to commending these gentlemen for their meaningful contributions on the subject of congressional use of systems technology, I should also like to thank Winston Riley III, president of WORC, and Dr. William Dorfman, president of TIMS, for their thoughtfulness and excellent planning of the evening seminar.



At this time, I include Mr. Chartrand's talk in order that all of my colleagues may have the opportunity to learn more about the progress being made in adapting modern technology to the needs of this governing body:

OPERATIONS RESEARCH AND THE U.S. CONGRESS—SPONSORED BY THE WASHINGTON OPERATIONS RESEARCH COUNCIL AND THE INSTITUTE FOR MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, JANUARY 17, 1968

(By Robert L. Chartrand)

#### INTRODUCTION

"Decisions will continue to come as they should from the political process in which social and economic change leads to conditions in which value judgments will always be as important as quantitative methods."

DAVID NOVICK.

The significance of this assemblage, comprised as it is of Congressional personnel and members of two prestigious professional organizations, the Washington Operations Research Council and the Institute for Management Sciences, merits more than cursory comment. In keeping with the tradition of the operations research community to "pioneer" new activities, it was determined that a closer rapport must be effected between the legislative decision-makers and those who create, test, and apply the new tools and techniques of our age.

As is so often the case—and this is equally true in government, industry, and the academic realm—the busy executive rarely feels that he can take time to examine closely those innovative methods and devices which might allow him to function more effectively. Our honored speaker, Representative Robert McClory of Illinois, has taken note of the evermounting burdens imposed on the Congressional staff, and has pointed out that: ". . . We must move to harness the technological forces that can provide us with the wherewithal to function more effectively as public servants."

The pressures upon the Federal Congress often are a magnification of the unprecedented pressures upon our civilization. We do not live in an age noted for simplicity nor a leisurely *modus vivendi*. The American society of the 1960 decade epitomizes change . . . change in working, playing, planning, interrelating. And what is the role of the member of Congress as institutions, legal codes, ethics and mores shift in unpredictable patterns?

The Congressman must fulfill at least three basic roles: as a legislator who must concern himself with issues of international and national importance; as the elected representative of a state or district with direct responsibility for its welfare; and as an untitled ombudsman, accessible to each constituent with a problem.

The plethora of public and private problems, reflected in part in the 20,387 bills and resolutions introduced in the two chambers of the Congress during 1967,<sup>2</sup> is a tangible manifestation of our complex society. Since dozens of major issues must be considered, the individual members must attempt to obtain basic information regarding the content of a bill, its sponsors, status, debate or hearings scheduled or held, and when possible any peripheral information concerning the urgency of the matter and which elements of society are to be affected by its passage.

As Congressional staffs labor to handle the mounting flood of correspondence—which may number a few thousand letters on a given day—and numerous visitors, as well as providing impromptu responses to countless telephone requests, the plea for better methods of operation seems reasonable.

Potential areas for utilizing operations re-

search, systems analysis and automatic data processing might be categorized as follows:

(1) *Support of legislative decision-making.* The need for highly selective information on discrete subjects is very critical. Information that is timely, accurate, complete, and relevant is a *must* if the member is to function competently. Included may be information on pending legislation, topical research, authorization and appropriations data, and information on past and current committee activity.

(2) *Preparation of legislation on public problems.* The legislator of today is being drawn into many local or regional problem determinations because of the role which various Federal agencies fulfill in providing funds or technical assistance to state and local governments. Adapting systems technology to a new problem area, and attempting to provide for this approach in proposed legislation, is a new experience for most Congressional offices. Also, provision must be made, in many cases, for information exchange between governmental units, and this too may be contained in suggested legislation.

#### SUPPORT OF LEGISLATIVE DECISIONMAKING

For several years, academicians, practical politicians, and industrial analysts have pondered the dilemma of the Federal decision-maker. Indeed, the Congress itself formed a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress—sometimes called the Monroney-Madden Committee—which explored ways and means of increasing the effectiveness of the Congress; the final report of the committee was incorporated into S. 355 which passed the Senate during the 1st Session of the 90th Congress and now awaits action by the House of Representatives.

Among the noteworthy written material treating the subject of Congressional performance and possible solutions are such volumes as Richard Bolling's *House Out of Order*, Joseph S. Clark's *Congress: The Sapsless Branch*, and *Congress, Its Contemporary Role* by Ernest S. Griffith. Specific consideration of utilizing systems techniques and automatic data processing is featured in monographs by James Robinson, Charles Dechert, and Kenneth Janda in *Congress: The First Branch of Government*. The Arthur D. Little Company management study of the Congress has appeared in book form as *Congress Needs Help* (by Philip Donham and Robert Fahey). Finally, the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing published a volume entitled *We Propose: A Modern Congress*.

Several years ago, Vice President (then Senator) Hubert H. Humphrey identified a requirement for the Congress to avail itself of modern equipment and information handling techniques.<sup>3</sup> It was not until late in the 89th Congress, however, that the first bill was introduced which called for the creation of an automatic data processing facility to support the Congress. Representative Robert McClory, the author of this bill which now appears as H.R. 21 (in the 90th Congress), has support for his proposal from House members of both parties. This bipartisan group believes that action must be taken at once to provide a computer-oriented capability which can aid the Congressman and his staff in numerous legislative and administrative action areas.

In order to add impetus to the McClory plan, Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania introduced an amendment (No. 63) to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 (S. 355) which was in essence the same plan for an ADP facility for Congress. The amendment was adopted and retained in the final Senate version of the bill.

While Representative McClory and his colleagues identified more than a dozen possible applications (see Figure 1) the computer and management science tech-

niques in statements in the *Congressional Record*, press releases, and elsewhere, an informal priority was given to the expedited handling of Federal budgetary data, synoptic information on bills and resolutions before the two chambers, and gaining access to machine-readable information which exists today in many Executive Branch agencies.<sup>4</sup>

#### CANDIDATE APPLICATIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL USE OF ADP AND THE SYSTEMS APPROACH

##### *Legislative functioning*

Status of pending legislation.

Current schedule of committee and subcommittee activity.

Authorization and appropriations data.

Topical research information and statistical data.

Computer-oriented index of Congressional documents.

Pre-vote information on major issues.

Post-vote analytical information.

Information on Federal contract awards.

##### *Administrative functioning*

Histories of committee and subcommittee activity.

Lobbyist activity information.

Constituent interest file.

Constituent correspondence file.

Congressional payroll accounts.

Current Congressional telephone book.

Within the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, implementation of the computerized handling of "Bill Digest" information has begun. Four Administrative Terminal System (ATS) units are in use, within the American Law Division, as bill synopses are entered and communicated via telephone lines to a remote computer. These devices allow placement of selected data in a computer, and the recall of this data for editing or printout purposes. In the near future, the magnetic tape produced will be delivered to the Government Printing Office where the new "Linotron" system utilizes magnetic tape in offset printing machines.

A concurrent activity within LRS which will aid Congressional staff members and LRS researchers alike is the placement of structured bibliographic citations, annotated, and organized by author and subject on paper tape (using Dura machines) for later transfer to magnetic tape form. In this system bibliographic cards can be prepared for dissemination to Congressional offices on the basis of expressed "profiles" of interest. Projected for the future will be the development of a capability for producing, according to several retrieval parameters, specially correlated information on either an *ad hoc* or regular (e.g., bi-weekly) schedule.

The Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives also has been working to develop improved means of acquiring, formatting, processing, and retrieving various types of data related both to housekeeping and legislative functions.

#### PREPARATION OF LEGISLATION ON PUBLIC PROBLEMS

The age-old problem of communication between disciplines often has arisen as technologists or Congressional members seeking to introduce measures calling for the use of the systems approach have attempted to convey the gist of the new methodology to other legislative personnel. Terminology has become a matter of soul searching, dispute, and prolonged debate. An example of this was an amendment (H.R. 12048) to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which included emphasis on "strengthened management practices;" among the Administrative Provisions may be found this wording:

"The Congress believes that United States foreign aid funds could be utilized more effectively by the application of advanced management decision-making, information and analysis techniques such as systems analysis, automatic data processing, benefit-cost studies, and information retrieval."<sup>5</sup>

Footnotes at end of speech.

Difficulty in perceiving the full impact of this phraseology by some Congressional conferees led to its deletion, after extended discussion. Nonetheless, an acute awareness of the need to orient and educate Congressional members and staff regarding the background, role, and essential elements of systems technology is growing "on the Hill."

For the past few years, the enormity of a new set of problems facing the nation has come into focus. Federal legislators have listened to expressions of alarm and calls for action by constituents who view such problems as air and water pollution, natural resources decimation, solid waste disposal and increasingly disrupted transportation with dismay.

Several Congressional committees charged with cognizance in these and other areas of public welfare have commenced seeking solutions and have found that in many instances new approaches to problem solving are needed. Technological advance has brought accompanying problems; the advent of faster, more powerful machines and techniques has not been an unmixed blessing. And the problem is not limited to the United States alone. The Lord Snow, in commentary upon the impact of computer technology, had this to say:

"We must get the idea of what is happening to us because of the computers, and of what is going to happen, right into the open world of the Congress and of Parliament; for it is their duty not to be supine, not to be just carried along dumbly by the technological tide."<sup>8</sup>

The leadership of the country has come to realize that our resources are not inexhaustible, that nature's corrective patterns no longer can restore the purity of streams or of air about the metropolitan areas, and that new solutions *must* be discovered and tested. Among the proposals developed by individual Congressmen is the concept for establishing a National Commission on Public Management. Introduced by Representative F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts as H.R. 20 in the 90th Congress, this plan has been endorsed by nearly 50 members of the House of Representatives. Similar legislation (S. 467) has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Hugh Scott and several colleagues. The mandate of the proposed National Commission would emphasize two major points:

(1) to collect and analyze information about the application of systems techniques to nondefense, nonspace, public problems and

(2) to develop programs which would use these techniques to solve specific problems.<sup>9</sup>

Expressing concern about the same range of problems, Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin introduced in the 90th Congress (as S. 430) his "Scientific Manpower Utilization Act" which places emphasis on the need to utilize systems analysis and systems engineering in conjunction with optimum allocation of scientific and engineering manpower in striving to overcome the diverse public problems. Senator Nelson's bill calls for the award of grants-in-aid to states or arrangements with universities or other private sector groups "for the purpose of causing the systems analysis and systems engineering approaches to be applied to national or local problems."<sup>10</sup> Senators Scott and Nelson at present are striving to effect a joint approach to the problem, since both agree that this is not a partisan issue.

Environmental pollution, a nemesis to many in positions of responsibility at the local, state, and Federal levels, is a candidate for the application of systems technology. The House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development (Representative Emilio Q. Daddario of Connecticut, chairman) issued this statement on the subject:

"To place pollution abatement on a comparable basis with other national technology programs, systems analysis and management capability should be established within the

Federal Government. This approach should be used along with the 'planning, programming, budgeting' technique to organize both near and long term Federal research and operational efforts in pollution abatement."<sup>11</sup>

Some Congressional criticism has been leveled at the lack of research and development monies made available for providing new tools and techniques in such areas as sewage treatment, pollution control, urban renewal and expansion, and transportation planning. The House Subcommittee on Research and Technical Programs (of the Committee on Government Operations) chaired by Representative Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin has been critical of the imbalance, which still is evident in that 84% of the projected Fiscal Year 1968 R & D funds will be absorbed by the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission.<sup>12</sup>

Senator Edward Kennedy has cited another problem area where a new approach is needed. In S.J. Res. 110 (in the 90th Congress) he signifies the need for "a study and investigation of information service systems for States and localities" and underscores the fact that:

"... scientific advances in computer and information retrieval technology represent a major new capability which may have important applications to the development of a modern intergovernmental information system."<sup>13</sup>

Finally, steps have been taken to urge the utilization of "objective, scientific, and empirical analysis"<sup>14</sup> in assessing all Federal programs. The selected mechanism for this, as contained in Representative Charles E. Goodell's bill (H.R. 12291) is the proposed establishment of an Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation and a Joint Committee of Congress on Program Analysis and Evaluation. Representative Goodell and several co-sponsors believe that strong controls are needed in order to ensure maximum results, as expressed in terms of costs and effectiveness, from the full spectrum of Federal programs.

#### SUMMARY

It may be seen that the Legislative Branch has begun to grasp the importance of knowing more about the systems approach: what it is, where it might be applied, its value vis-a-vis traditional modes of operation, and its possible impact on existing institutions and patterns of living. Gradually, the terms which describe various facets of the methodology are creeping into press releases, legislation, and private conversation: operations research and analysis, simulation and modeling, symbolic logic, queueing theory, econometrics, systems management and planning, and the many aspects of automatic data processing.

The problems of the nation must be met and overcome. Experience has shown that systems technology can provide valuable aid in selected areas of activity. Both public and private groups are moving to avail themselves of these devices and procedures which can comprise the capability needed to maintain our national viability. The combined efforts of skilled decision-makers, innovators, and systems specialists—possessing the acumen and proven performance of those in this audience—will preserve the heritage and enhance the future of these United States.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> McClory, Robert. An automatic data processing facility to support the Congress. Remarks in the House. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 20, p. 27825.

<sup>2</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. [Daily ed.] (Washington), v. 113, January 5, 1968, p. D1139.

<sup>3</sup> Humphrey, Hubert H. The computer revolution—address by Senator Humphrey before the Eastern Spring Computer Conference. Remarks in the Senate. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 7, pp. 9074-9076.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. Special Subcommittee

on Invasion of Privacy. The computer and invasion of privacy. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee. (89th Cong., 1st Sess., July 26-28, 1966). Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1966. Appendix 1, p. 209-253.

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Congress. H.R. 12048. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. (90th Cong., 1st Sess., August 2, 1967). p. 38.

<sup>6</sup> Snow, C. P. Government, science, and public policy. *In Science*, v. 151, February 11, 1966, p. 653.

<sup>7</sup> Morse, F. Bradford. Private responsibility for public management. *In Harvard business review*, v. 45, n. 2, March/April 1967, p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Special Subcommittee on the Utilization of Scientific Manpower. Scientific manpower utilization, 1967. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee (90th Cong., 1st Sess., January 24, 1967). p. 3.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science Research, and Development. Environmental pollution—a challenge to science and technology. (89th Cong., 2nd Sess., House Report, committee print, 1966). p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Preliminary statistics provided by the National Science Foundation, January 1968.

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Congress, S.J. Res. 110. A Joint resolution to authorize a study and investigation of information service systems for States and localities to participate more effectively in Federally assisted programs and to provide Congress and the President with a better measure of State and local needs and performance under these programs. (90th Cong., 1st Sess., August 30, 1967). p. 2.

<sup>12</sup> U.S. Congress. House. H.R. 12291. A Bill to establish an Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation and a Joint Committee of Congress on Program Analysis and Evaluation. (90th Cong., 1st Sess., August 10, 1967). p. 4.

### Letter From Michael D'Angelo

#### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes all of us in this House and in the other body too tend to become a little isolated from those whom we represent. The voice of the people is sometimes heard only faintly.

For this reason, I would like to ask unanimous consent that a very eloquent letter from a constituent of mine be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks. I think that all Members of this House and all who read this RECORD can learn much from a young sailor from Secaucus, N.J., named Michael P. D'Angelo.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this young man speaks for a whole generation of Americans whose lives are shaped by the decisions that are made here in the Congress. I think his words have special value to all of us.

The letter follows:

U.S. NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS,  
Box 67, FLEET POST OFFICE,  
Yokosuka, Japan, January 24, 1968.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIELS: Sir, I am an enlisted man serving in the Navy here in Yokosuka, Japan.

The reason for my writing this letter is because I am deeply hurt inside. The hurt, is in one way, in that I am an American and the American flag was stepped on yesterday by the North Koreans. I consider myself a part of that flag and accept it for whatever it stands for.



The other reasons for my being hurt is that I wear the uniform of the United States Navy. My shipmates and countrymen were taken prisoner and one of my ships boarded and captured.

Sir, I am proud of my uniform and proud of my country. I am prepared to die for either one at any time. It is because of this pride that I, as an American, cannot and will not sit back and let my country be treated like this. It is because of this pride that I ask you to institute immediate action to get the USS Pueblo and her men returned into United States hands, whether this action be forceful or otherwise.

Thank you for your time and your consideration of my letter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL P. D'ANGELO,  
RMSN 9154901 USN.

### The Syndrome of Disintegration

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced the fundamental long term danger to the United States is in the dangerous views which dominate the State Department and which hold that communism is legitimately mellowing, while the Soviet Union grows to an even greater effective state. A very thoughtful commentary on the significance of disintegration of the Soviet dictatorship was carried in the Hairenik Weekly on February 1. The editorial follows:

#### THE SYNDROME OF DISINTEGRATION

At least one contemporary historian, we know, has predicted that the utter dissolution of the Soviet regime in Russia will come from within and not as the result of aggression from without.

The truth of the second aspect of this prediction seems to be universally accepted by the present day diplomats who apparently are convinced that no power on earth can overthrow the Soviet regime from without, or if an attempt is made the error of the century will inevitably result, they say, in a nuclear clash which will devastate the whole world and destroy civilization.

However, interestingly enough, indications of the truth of the first aspect of the historian's prediction are already in the making. There are countless worries and apprehension smoldering in the internal life of the Soviet Union, especially among the upper party echelons, visible to a tangible degree by the people, which is beginning to worry the government.

There is, also, a common front in formation, directed against the regime which the Bolshevik leaders cannot as yet clearly define. A dark, clandestine force seems to hover over the masses and is gnawing at the roots of the social structure, inciting popular indignation.

The recent trial of the four writers and the subsequent noiseless demonstrations and the expressions of protest and violent indignation have begun to worry the government. Promising and brilliant young writers, the communist youth fearlessly have defied the government, and to imagine that one of the promoters of this commotion is none other than Pavel Litvinov, the grandson of the one time Soviet Foreign Minister and the representative of the third generation.

The concern of the Bolshevik leadership stems from the fact that the condemned young writers are among the most loyal and law-abiding citizens of the Soviet regime.

They base their right to dissent on the articles of the Soviet Constitution and they claim their demands are both necessary and in keeping with the spirit of progress and development of the country. They insist that their stand is designed not primarily to overthrow the government but to further consolidate it with the benefits of freedom and justice. One of the condemned youths openly declared that the former Russian revolutionaries who were persecuted, imprisoned or exiled to Siberia, endured their ordeals for the same reason. They are satisfied that they are sharing the same fate for the same cause.

The milling concourse around the court building were openly shouting their protest that, if the accused four youths were really guilty, why was it that their trial was being held behind closed doors. The public was denied this right of an open trial because, in truth, the government is no longer sure of its authority and because it is terrified by the specter of freedom and justice. It tries to apply the Stalinian methods of intimidation and terror, but without extremism or deviating from the socialist legality. But, unfortunately for the Bolshevik leaders, moderation and discretion toward the youth, instead of bringing them to sanity, further exacerbates their zeal, initiative and intransigence, whereas, the Stalinian methods is more likely to aggravate the present discontent into open rebellion. Under the circumstances the government as yet has no clear cut policy toward the rising youth.

The Soviet official organ, Pravda, deplors the moral decline of the young people and the prevailing lack of faith, and it ascribes this sad state of affairs to the ravages of "imperialistic propaganda." Pravda, of course, knows well that the charge is fictitious and is a mere effort of shifting the responsibility on to others.

The fifty year labor to create the "new Soviet man," to educate the youth in the Leninian ideology and communist morality has failed to such miserable extents that capitalism and imperialism are now being held accountable for the communist failure.

Instead of blaming capitalism for the major failures of communism in action, the Soviet will do well to seek the decaying worm in the very structure of its being.

The Soviet avoids this because it is afraid of the truth.

### Twenty-five Years With Aerosol

#### HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1968, the people of the United States will complete 25 years of free use of a public patent on the aerosol. It was developed by Lyle D. Goodhue and William N. Sullivan, U.S. Department of Agriculture scientists, at Beltsville, Md., and patented in 1943. Both industry and consumers have made the most of this gadget.

It was 1941 when the USDA scientists discovered an effective and convenient way to dispense pesticides to kill insects in buildings and other enclosed areas. The insecticide was dissolved in a liquefied gas held under pressure in a small metal container and released through a valve into the air as minute particles. This fine suspension of insecticide in the air was called an aerosol.

When the United States entered World War II, the scientists persuaded the Army to adopt these bug bombs—at first

filled with pyrethrum extract and sesame oil, and later with prethrum and DDT—to protect our Armed Forces from insects in barracks, tents, foxholes, and aircraft. Over 40 million of the aerosols were used, and their effectiveness in killing disease-carrying insects saved the lives of many of our troops.

After the war, insecticidal aerosols immediately came into civilian use. Low-pressure aerosols developed by industry and USDA made possible the use of cheap, light-weight cans for the bombs. They proved valuable for the application of insecticides to greenhouse plants and for insect control in the home. Continued work by the Department's Agricultural Research Service has resulted in more efficient valves and other improvements.

The success of insecticidal aerosols was so great that the idea was adopted by industry for the dispersal of a great variety of products. Aerosols soon found their way into the kitchen, the medicine chest, and the world of fashion and beauty.

Today, a quarter of a century since this product of agricultural research was patented, the dispensers are a \$2 billion industry annually. More than 300 different aerosol products are available, including hair sprays, dessert toppings, paint, a spray bandage for cuts and wounds, repellants for dogs, sharks, rabbits, and snakes, new-car odor for used cars, fish lure, and a preventive for bathtub slips.

### Captain Witherspoon Speaks to Unity

#### HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to submit for the RECORD a singular event that occurred in New York State on Sunday, February 4.

An outstanding leader in the Masonic order, Capt. Maurice M. Witherspoon, was the featured speaker at a well-attended assembly of the Knights of Columbus. This event has historic importance in that Captain Witherspoon was the first Masonic leader to address the Catholic order of the Knights of Columbus.

It has been my privilege to listen to Captain Witherspoon on several occasions. His addresses and invocations at such important events as Memorial Day and Loyalty Day parades are well known to veterans of the New York metropolitan area.

I am pleased to submit the account of this exercise in unity, followed by the text of Chaplain Witherspoon's address, for insertion in the RECORD at this point:

CAPTAIN WITHERSPOON SPEAKS AT ANNUAL CORPORATE COMMUNION BREAKFAST FOR THE NINTH NEW YORK DISTRICT, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, FEBRUARY 4

Captain M. M. Witherspoon well-known hero of World War II, was the featured speaker at the Annual Corporate Communion Breakfast of the 9th New York District, Knights of Columbus, held Sunday morning, February 4, at the New Hyde Park Inn,

215 Jericho Turnpike, at 8:45 a.m., following a Mass celebrated in the Holy Spirit Church, 500 Jericho Turnpike, New Hyde Park, at 7:45. This was the first time in the history of Long Island that a Masonic Protestant Chaplain has addressed the Knights.

Captain Witherspoon worked during World War II in the Navy with the Past Faithful Navigator, John R. Strachan, Levittown, of the Ninth District, Saint Isaac Joques, S.J. Province, of Knights of Columbus and made thousands of Catholic friends in the service.

During the past 22 years since World War II Captain Witherspoon has worked diligently to bring about better relations between the Knights of Columbus and the Masonic Fraternity. He has arranged for bowling and soft-ball competition, as well as other sports and general get-togethers in almost every part of the State. More especially the Knights worked with the Masons in a great demonstration at this summer's baseball at the Mets-Dodgers game where 20,000 Knights and Masons turned out en masse at Shea Stadium. He was also instrumental in having the Knights parade with the Knights Templar at their annual celebration and convocation at the Riverside Church.

#### KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS AND MASONS WORK ON THE FORCES THAT UNITE

##### LET'S FOCUS ON THE FUTURE

The fact of my being with you this morning points the way to the dawn of a new day—tomorrow. Strong winds of change, blowing from the battlefields of World War I, W.W. II and the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, have carried me, a Protestant Chaplain, to this platform. Chaplains and servicemen were the first to experience ecumenism. When the chips are down, when the moment of truth comes, it is "God" to whom we turn, regardless of the rituals of our churches.

##### GOD, A UNIFYING CONCEPT

Of all the forces that unite Knights and Masons, "God" is the keystone. All of the lofty cathedrals, the great paintings and sculpture created by the Roman Catholic Church, were all "for the glory of God." Memorable was the young Catholic guide's describing of the magnificent Cathedral of Toledo, Spain, to touring Americans: "On Easter morning," she said, "with the sun pouring through the stained glass windows, reflecting lovely color on the lofty pillars, the candles lighting the exquisite carvings, the robes of the clergy, the flowers, the incense, the music, the reverence of the devout, one feels the Glory of God."

In a simpler way, one senses the Glory of God and His Presence in the open Bible laid on the altar of every Masonic Lodge room—the Eye of God in every Masonic painting, the spirit of God in the heart of every Mason as he opens Lodge, attends Go-to-Church service, lays on the bier of a fallen brother a sprig of Acacia, symbol of the resurrection.

In whom do you put your trust? and the answer always comes back: "In God."

Since we agree on this—that God is our strongest unifying force, let us try to enlarge our concept of God. When I read the slogan, "God Is Dead," I always wonder just what God means to that sign carrier. Who among us can define what our personal idea of God is?

Suppose we drop for a moment our preconceived idea of God, and meditate on the Biblical promises, "I shall make all things new." Let's start with a fresh look—not down, but upward where the starry pavilions lie. Let us survey the vast universe that stretches to infinity—the sun, the moon, the stars, the planets, each in its own orbit—What divine order! Let us regard the seasons with the same imagination as the Chinese, who loved to paint the fruits and flowers and birds of winter, autumn, spring and summer. What delight as we view the kaleidoscope—the plum blossom to the poinsetta; the tangerine

to the winter pear—for our enjoyment and nourishment. The summer beaches, the winter snow—and always the glorious spring returns with its promise. What an orderly procession. Oh, God, how great Thou art! How worthy of our reverence, wonder and respect!

But God is not only awesome—what greater proof have we of His love—than the sacrifice of His only begotten Son? We who have lost sons or relatives in these cruel wars, can identify with the sorrow of God. Knowing His compassion for a world that needed to be cleansed by the blood of the Lamb, can we not feel the necessity for action against man's enemies: war, crime, poverty, disease and apathy?

The most exciting, revolutionary, inspiring story I have read in many years—a focus on the future—appeared in the New York Times on January 17, 1968—"Vatican Extends Protestant Ties"—The Vatican and World Council Set Up Economic and Peace Units. A Vatican official disclosed that the Vatican and the World Council of Churches have established three joint working committees in the areas of world economic development and peace, reported Edward B. Fiske in the Times.

Previous cooperative efforts have been limited to the study of relations between the Vatican and the Council and to an examination of the problems involved in intermarriage.

But now the three working groups, each of which will have 20 members, will establish joint programs in a specific area of common interest. They will deal respectively with doctrine on social issues, world cooperation on social and economic development, and international political institutions and peace.

The commission on economic development would be constituted in Beirut, Lebanon, in April, when the Vatican and World Council (which represents more than 200 Protestant and Orthodox denominations) will hold their first joint study conference on the economic gap between nations.

The other committees will be filled later this year, the Vatican official said. The first joint office of the Vatican and the World Council probably will be situated in Geneva, where the Council has its headquarters. Priority work will be in the area of economic development.

##### EDUCATION PROGRAM SET

In a related development, the Most Reverend John J. Dougherty, Chairman of the United States Commission on World Justice and Peace, announced the beginning of an education program to "arouse American Christians to their responsibility for promoting justice, development and peace." Initial plans call for a week-long study conference late in June in St. Louis in collaboration with St. Louis University, a Jesuit institution. Expected are 40 American bishops and major superiors—who may take a second look at U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The Vatican and the World Council of Churches need our support at the grass roots. The Knights of Columbus and the Masons of New York State have made an excellent substitution of hospitality for hostility. To date our efforts have been social and athletic, and we have found distinct pleasure in our association.

Now we must get to work. I would have a joint council in every city, made up of Masons, Knights of Columbus, and members of relevant organizations according to the particular tasks we set ourselves. So many needs cry out to us—we need to set up priorities and follow through. Each locality has a myriad of problems—but let us choose one—organize, use every known technique, devise new ones—lick it. It may be Civil Rights, apprentice training; remedial reading; a dental clinic; a new nursing home; hot meals for the aged and infirm.

Keep young people so busy they'll have no time for drugs. Make use of this great res-

ervoir of youth—give them projects to carry out—rekindle the pioneer spirit that is latent in Americans. "Brighten the corner where you are," and soon the whole world will glow!

### The McNamara Story: More Mistakes Than Time Permits

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on the last edition of "Meet the Press," Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara stated that his mistakes during his tenure had totalled "more than time would permit me to list." I could not agree with him more. He may have made this statement facetiously, but I do not.

This answer came following a question concerning the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961. Secretary McNamara stated that this was one of the serious errors of which there were so many.

I would suggest that the decision to invade Cuba through the Bays of Pigs was not the error in judgment, but rather it was the belated decision to remove the air cover from the ground and amphibious forces. Funny, we never hear much about this any more.

Since the Secretary's time was too short to list any of his other blunders—and since he did not even list the real mistake in the Bay of Pigs invasion—I feel obligated to help him out.

While I realize that I could not do justice to his errors, even in a 1-hour special order, I do think I can point out a few of the larger ones and revive a few of the more unpleasant memories.

Starting with some of the larger, overall issues there is always the Secretary's approach to his job; the cost-effectiveness approach which has led to decimation of our defense forces in general.

Add to this his common, daily, colossal error of ignoring the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military experts. It is not difficult to remember that early in his tenure of office, the military was muzzled and words like "victory" were struck out of military vocabularies.

Possibly the awarding of the Project Mohole contracts and the conflict-of-interest charges which surrounded it have escaped some memories. This is a No. 1 example of how to double the cost and call it a savings.

Along this same line is the story of the VTOL plane designated, commonly, as the X-22. Here is another example of dealings similar to the Mohole business, but this one also brings back memories of such names as Korth and Gilpatric.

Can anyone forget the stupidities and even the stupid attempts to justify—the case of the CVA-67? Commonly called the "Floating Edsel"? This was the aircraft carrier that should have been nuclear powered. It deserves its name.

Or how about the RS-70 reconnaissance bomber, and the Skybolt missile, the one that pulled the rug out from under the British, too.

There are lingering questions of other



conflicts of interest with the Department and questions of Defense security and executive clearances of high-level employees. Few of us can have the feeling that security matters have been administered adequately and effectively. The record indicates otherwise.

Of course, no discussion of Secretary McNamara would be complete without mention of the multibillion-dollar bust known earlier as the TFX. It seems that in this one airplane the Secretary looked back at past mistakes, memorized his previous errors and then proceeded to combine them all into one package, after adding a few new twists.

Can we afford to let him forget, also, the Nike-Zeus?

Then there is the whole matter of our defense posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. When he came into office we were well ahead. During his stay they have dangerously closed the gap. He resisted any efforts at antiballistic missile defense systems until his too-little, too-late "thin defense system" proposal and we fell behind the Communists in yet another category.

While they have been improving their hardware, McNamara has stressed disarmament. We have been unilaterally disarming by not developing new military technology.

All of this is the McNamara legacy. While this is not a complete list, I hope it fills the void which the Secretary did not have time to fill while on nationwide television. It is a fitting tribute to the abilities and policies of the "McNamara monarchy" which cannot end too soon.

### Improve Our Vocational Education

#### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, historically, no element in the educational spectrum has had such strong and consistent support from the Congresses as has vocational education, with the exception of the land grant colleges.

The 1917 Smith-Hughes Act was designed to meet the needs of a nation that was coming of age industrially.

In 1946, the George-Barden Act offered post-war training opportunities to a nation coming of age technologically.

In 1963, the Congress expanded and improved the earlier legislation in a comprehensive new Vocational Education Act.

Today, in amendments which President Johnson is proposing to Congress, we hope to further extend and improve our vocational education opportunities.

Later, in this session, I intend to offer an additional amendment to increase scholarship opportunities in postsecondary institutions and thus continue the trend to equalize opportunity in all categories of education. Favorable action on these amendments will insure steady improvement in the quality and the availability of vocational education.

### Consumer Protection in Advertising

#### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Merchandising Week, one of the leading trade publications for retail stores, has just made a major contribution to the public dialogue on consumer affairs with a special issue on consumer protection.

This issue included articles on consumer protection in credit, advertising, in service and in product standards. Each article contains useful insights on the growth of consumer protection from the viewpoint of the retailer.

I have found each of these articles exceptionally well-presented accounts which will help business people themselves understand how and why the consumer is concerned about his role, his rights and his responsibilities. I believe my colleagues will find these articles of special interest as we begin the second session of what may well become known as the Consumer Congress.

One of the articles from this special issue follows:

[From Merchandising Week, Jan. 1, 1968]

#### CONSUMER PROTECTION IN ADVERTISING

Inexplicably tied as it is to today's marketing systems, advertising is being increasingly regarded as an accessory to the crime of consumer "deception."

Instead of providing valuable and necessary information to consumers for their use in making valid buying judgments, say consumer protectionists, advertising has chosen to do its best to add still more confusion to an already complex marketplace.

Advertising, they insist, could be developing well-informed consumers out of hit-or-miss buyers. And well-informed consumers, goes the theory, would be in little danger of investing in inferior products, or signing away their security in unfair credit transactions.

Advertising could be supplying simple, useful "Here's what the product is and this is what it will actually do" data, say those who view it as business' most noticeable flaw; instead, it is busy convincing the housewife that she is only half a woman, an unfit wife and mother, and an untrue American—without a specific product in her home.

The current attack on advertising is the most recent addition to the recurring battle over consumer protection. While advertising has come under occasional regulatory scrutiny before, protectionist outrage has been chiefly directed toward cases of simple fraud. The emphasis in 1967, however, shifted toward the industry's sins of omission—what it should be doing—rather than those of commission—what it has done.

Having decided that there is a definite communications gap between manufacturers, their retailers, and consumers, today's protectionists see advertising as the most likely means of filling it. As it exists now, they reason, advertising is doing little but turn more and more modern shoppers into buying addicts—before they are equipped to handle the side effects.

At retail, advertising's opponents would have a return to the simplistic approach employed before the consumer turned choice-conscious. The woman totally unfamiliar with a refrigerator, for example, had to have each product detail explained to her before she would even consider making the purchase. The advertisement that caught

and held her interest was the one that painstakingly dissected each feature and held it up for her inspection. In those days she wasn't interested in making her kitchen a party center. She was concerned with keeping food conveniently, and, as far as advertising went, that was all that she was interested in.

A more agreeable solution to the problem of providing customer information might well come from the retailer himself, suggest more "dovelike" of the consumer protectionists. If advertising is to devote itself to catching the consumer's eye and bringing her into the store, the retailer should then be totally equipped to handle her questions.

Aside from personal-product information, retailers do have an abundance of customer-oriented material to work with. Manufacturers provide specification sheets, for example, that contain product information too complete to be contained in any education-bent advertisement. The protectionist argument suggests however, that customers too rarely know of such data—and that the data itself is often confusing in wording or presentation.

Some appliance manufacturers, recognizing that such a problem does exist, have anticipated consumer protectionist efforts. They have redesigned their spec sheets into easy-to-comprehend, point-of-purchase consumer aids. Frigidaire, for example, instituted "Information Tags" with the introduction of its 1968 appliance line. The tags, similar to those proposed as part of a mandatory protectionist program by Rep. Congressman Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D.-N.Y.), condense spec sheet information into a 2-page flyer attached to the product in question.

An Information Tag for a dishwasher, for example, will explain capacity and performance limitations, operational procedures, featured product extras, and—in addition—offer a simple condensation of the Frigidaire warranty program.

Following Frigidaire's lead, the independent retailer can create his own information tags or posters if they are not provided by the manufacturer. Based on his own knowledge of his customers, he can make these informational aids as complex or as simple as their needs dictate.

Another big plus for customer information is a product-educated sales force. Back in the good old days of retailing, when the dealer knew his customers by name and face, a sales job was a lifetime position. The salesman had a long history of experience with a product from which to draw on when asked to explain a feature or describe an operation.

With the increased fluidity of today's sales force, however, a man may move from selling shirts to selling the machines in which to wash them in the course of a year. To make sure his salesmen know the right answers to his customers' questions, the retailer should encourage his staff's participation in manufacturer-sponsored training programs and brush-up sessions, or perhaps even turn teacher himself if he finds salesmen have blind spots.

The Assn. of Home Appliance Manufacturers (AHAM) provides dealers with another bridge to span the information gap. Buyer booklets are available from AHAM for in-store use and as customer hand-outs; these aids explain basic appliance operation fully and indicate to consumers what they can—and cannot—expect specific products to do.

Retailers have also popularized in-store product demonstrations as promotional and educational tools. Many large department stores have instituted seminars for new and prospective brides, to explain home appliances to them and provide fundamental lessons in operational procedures. Picking up where high school home economics courses leave off, such classes offer a means of avoiding the pitfalls that an inexperienced con-

sumer can face in establishing and maintaining a home.

Manufacturers sometimes provide sample appliances with special cutaway sections for inspection of the product at work, at times sending in their own demonstration teams to kick off a special appliance promotion.

Given enough information, the consumer becomes able to protect herself from whatever evils the government is trying to shield her from. And as long as she is getting this product information somewhere, her champions can relax their protectionist attentions in the area of advertising.

## Lessons on Folly of Welfare States

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the internationally known chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, Mr. Walter Trohan, in a column on Wednesday, January 31, commented on the political and economic decline of socialism in certain European States. The column follows:

SWEDEN, BRITAIN LESSONS ON FOLLY OF WELFARE STATES

(Report from Washington by Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—The decline of socialism and the welfare state in Scandinavia and Britain should be a lesson to a nation proposing to spend 150 billion dollars to advance the Great Society and fight the war in Viet Nam at the same time.

The latest Scandinavian country to become disillusioned with socialism is Sweden. For many years Sweden had been hailed as the middle way, a monarchy run by socialists. Now the Swedish Social Democratic government faces defeat at the nation's next election in September.

Two years ago the Norwegian Social Democrats were replaced by a non-Socialist coalition. Last week 40 years of Danish Social Democratic rule ended and a non-Socialist coalition is about to take over. The coalition will be formed of the Radical Liberals and Conservatives.

In Scandinavia the Socialists were in power too long. Over the decades they came to feel that no one could govern but themselves. They took on the divine right belief of the monarchs of long ago. The people wearied of them and their promises in Norway and Denmark and are wearying of them in Sweden.

The situation in Britain offers an even greater lesson to the United States than Scandinavia. Britain has become a third rate power like her Scandinavian neighbors under the welfare state which was to have raised the British people to new heights.

UNITED STATES SHARES MANY BRITISH WOES

The United States has been closer to Britain than Scandinavia. Furthermore the United States shares many of the problems which beset Britain, such as world-wide commitments, unfavorable balance of payments, currency decline, inflation, labor power. And mounting welfare statism had led to the decline of the general welfare. The state has slipped from a first class power to a third class power.

Since the beginnings of the welfare state, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, the public debt has grown from 25 billions to over 350 billions. True, not all or even the greatest part of the debt can be traced to welfare statism as much as it can be credited to global commitments in wars and peace, but the New

Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier, and the Great Society haven't cut the debt any. Domestic spending has been growing like alcoholism on what it fed upon. As the old Japanese proverb goes, the man takes a drink, the drink takes a drink, and then the drink takes the man. The welfare state can also become a habit, especially when it means votes.

Some welfare states begin taking care of the young, then take care of adults, and finally wind up taking care of the old. It would seem that welfare can't stop at the cradle but must go on and on to the grave.

TREND MAY BECOME SIGNIFICANT

There is growing suspicion and distrust of the welfare spending here, even tho the President has more power than any living monarch and perhaps even more than some of the kings of old. The trend away from the welfare state is but slight, yet it might become significant.

The first challenges of the welfare system came from Congress, where a curb on payments was suggested. President Johnson has appointed a commission to study the welfare system and suggest how it might be overhauled.

More attention is being paid to private enterprise. The President has urged broader participation by private enterprise in attacking the slum problem, which had long been considered a federal field of action, and he is asking private enterprise to help meet the problem of the balance of payments deficit.

## USIA in Denmark

**HON. DANTE B. FASCELL**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, dollar for dollar the U.S. Information Agency conducts one of the most important and effective U.S. programs overseas. The purpose of the Agency, which is known overseas as the U.S. Information Service, is to further knowledge and understanding about the United States overseas. While this is a small program compared with many others, it has been extremely effective despite severe budgetary restrictions.

A story demonstrating an outstanding example of the effectiveness of USIS was carried in the January 30 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. The story by Mr. Barry Edgar describes the USIS program in Denmark and its accomplishments:

HOW USIS REACHES THE DANES

(By Barry Edgar)

COPENHAGEN.—“The United States invents public relations—so why don't you do a better job of selling your own country?”

This is a question often heard by Americans in Europe. Most Europeans used to consider themselves good friends of the United States, and the feeling was mutual.

But recently primarily because of the Vietnam conflict, the American image in Europe has become severely tarnished.

What, if anything, is being done to combat this problem? What programs exist to put forward and explain American points of view?

More particularly, what is being done to improve understanding between the United States and other countries on a people-to-people level?

By act of Congress, this is the assigned task of the United States Information Service (USIS). Operating worldwide, this agen-

cy is set up to tell the world about the United States—how it strives to overcome its internal difficulties, what its views are on numerous international problems, and generally to promote the United States.

BRANCHES COOPERATE

In Denmark, for example, there is an active USIS organization headed by Brooks McClure. The Denmark branch is the largest in Scandinavia, but there are other branches in Norway, Sweden, and Finland. They work in close cooperation.

The USIS in Denmark operates on an annual budget of \$128,000. The Danish Government spends twice this figure on its own government promotion in the United States.

Scandinavian Airlines System (SAS), owned by the Scandinavian governments, spends \$2¼ million yearly promoting its own and Scandinavia's image in the United States.

The Soviet Union and other East European socialist countries flood the Scandinavian countries with propaganda. Once this was all too dreary, but today it is often imaginative and interesting. The Russians, Czechs, and Hungarians, for example, put out handsome color magazines.

Laurence Sharpe, the United States press attaché in Denmark, says that a similar kind of American mounted program is impossible under the present budgetary restrictions.

OPINIONMAKERS SOUGHT

“However,” he said, “we do have ways of reaching the general public. But first we try to reach the opinionmakers. These are few in number in a small country like Denmark, and it is not difficult to get to know just about all of them personally.”

Mr. Sharpe cited the instance of a young man who said that he had led 1,200 fellow students to the stormy Copenhagen anti-United States, anti-Vietnam demonstrations Oct. 21. Later he came into Mr. Sharpe's office and apologized.

He said, “I don't agree with anything your country stands for and I despise your position in Vietnam. But I shall never do a thing like that again. It was part of a hate campaign. . . . That demonstration served no constructive purpose. I know from my contact with you, that you are decent people. I believe the information you give me—it is truthful because I have proven it so. But I still don't agree with you.”

Lectures form another vital part of the program. USIS officers always are available for lectures or to head discussion groups about almost any subject pertaining to the United States. They say they each make upward of 80 speeches and lectures a year to various groups throughout Denmark.

LIBRARIES MAINTAINED

The USIS here has a library of 640 films, which are made available to motion picture theaters and private organizations, and a 13,000-volume library of books used by 25,000 people a year.

The cultural department, headed by Stefan Munsing, is particularly active. As a people, the Danes have a keen, well-developed artistic sense, and are interested in seeing and comparing the work artists do in other countries.

The USIS helps arrange group presentations of works of American artists living in or visiting Denmark.

The same help goes to the performing arts. When American performers—small groups or popular stars—plan to visit Denmark, the USIS helps spread the word around.

INTERESTS SHARED

Some of these groups are nonprofessional, such as a group of Hawaiian policemen scheduled to travel throughout Europe giving concerts of Hawaiian music and dances. In such cases the USIS helps to arrange meetings



with local citizens—specially those with similar interests.

Thus, a Danish policeman may discuss police problems with a Hawaiian policeman. And a Danish housewife learns about exotic Hawaiian flower arranging while showing her Hawaiian counterpart how to make the colorful Danish open-faced sandwiches called smørrebrød.

USIS officials seem to agree that getting people to visit the United States is by far the soundest method of bringing the communications gap.

Last summer 585 members of the Danish Home Guard and their families paid their own way on a trip to the United States. They ranged in age from 19 to 70 and a more diverse group of Danes would be hard to find. The USIS advised on programs and itineraries and help arrange local United States hospitality.

Before their departure a relative of a member of the group got up and started asking the usual questions: "Why are the Negroes a subjugated race? Why do Americans insist on murdering civilians in Vietnam? Why doesn't America help the needy?"

#### VISIT REQUESTED

Several months later one of the USIS officers was asked to attend a get-together dinner of the Home Guard group. All 585 people who had visited the United States were there—plus the woman relative.

She spotted the USIS official and came up to him and said, "How can I get to America? I've heard so many wonderful things about your country from all these people that I have to go see for myself."

Since 1946 a total of 5,202 graduates undergraduates or graduate students have spent a year in the United States. There are currently 110 United States students studying in Denmark and 580 Danish students studying in the United States.

### "One Stop" Counseling for Vietnam Veterans

**HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent message on veterans' affairs was a most welcome one.

Of particular interest was his description of a new program of one-stop Veterans' Administration counseling for returning Vietnam veterans.

I was particularly gratified that Milwaukee, my home city, has been chosen as one of 20 metropolitan areas in the country which will participate in a pilot one-stop counseling project. It is to be inaugurated in March by the Milwaukee VA Regional Office.

This imaginative innovation will insure that our newly-returned veterans are given full opportunity to make use of the many benefits which Congress has made available.

Often facilities are scattered widely across a city or region, and veterans, particularly those who most need help, find it difficult to make their way from office to office.

The one-stop counseling center is designed to remedy that situation by locating the offices in one place where a veteran can receive personal attention

and information on all the benefits open to him.

From housing and health, to education and employment, the help will be available at the one-stop center.

As part of this program the VA will make more energetic efforts to contact the returned veteran. In some cases, VA caseworkers will visit the veteran in his home to explain available benefits.

In the past the veteran generally approached the VA for aid. For various physical and psychological reasons, however, many of those who most need help failed to apply.

Under the new concept, the VA will go to the veteran if the veteran does not go to the VA.

It is my understanding that to implement this program the Milwaukee VA will add four skilled interviewers to its staff. It will also make available the services of a full-time Civil Service Administration official to explain procedures of obtaining Government employment. Similar steps will be taken at the other 19 centers.

The one-stop center, I believe, is another important step forward in our continuing effort to express our gratitude to the men who have sacrificed much in the military service of our Nation.

For that reason I join in hailing the President's message and commend him for his sound thought and practical programs to aid those who are making so great a contribution today around the world in the preservation of our American way of life.

### Law and Order Are Battling for Survival

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in September 1967, the newsweekly, Human Events, wrote to former Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Charles E. Whitaker, asking if, in his opinion, Stokely Carmichael, could be prosecuted under existing Federal statutes. In his reply Whitaker stated:

Based upon press reported statements, actions and conduct of Mr. Carmichael, and assuming them to be true, I have no doubt whatever that Mr. Carmichael has thereby violated existing federal statutes, and, of course, such violations constitute a basis for his prosecution under those statutes so violated.

I am sure that there are many other Americans who hold with Justice Whitaker that Carmichael should be held accountable for his excesses or, if existing statutes are not applicable, remedial legislation should be enacted. Yet it seems that the prevailing policy at the present time is permissive to the point where any and every excuse is offered in behalf of the wrongdoer and the rights of victims is secondary.

Babson's Weekly Forecast Service, a long-established newsletter published by Business Statistics Corp., comments in its

January 8, 1968, issue on the present attitude of some officials who are apologists for every crime and criminal. The newsletter states that—

Unless those in authority in the United States can be influenced to abandon the suicidal course on which they have embarked—or unless they can be replaced by men who will—we cannot hope to restore in our nation the kind of domestic peace and order which has made our many generations proud to be Americans . . . living in a land of freedom, security, opportunity and justice under law.

I request that the January 8 issue of Babson's Washington Forecast Letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

#### AMERICA BLACKMAILED

HEADLINE 1972

The following news story may hit the headlines some summer day in 1972:

"The President late yesterday afternoon signed into law the so-called Equal Property Act (H.R. 2216), following the capitulation of both House and Senate before the threats of an angry mob of proponents, estimated by District police officials at upwards of 600,000 persons, which had besieged the Capitol for over 3 days, holding Congress virtually hostage . . . pending a vote on the bill.

"As word of the 'surrender' by Congress was passed thru the crowd, its leaders called for a march on the White House. Within twenty minutes, the partisans began gathering before the Executive Mansion and, shortly before 4 p.m., leveled the iron fence and were milling around the lawn of the President's residence and office. The throng became increasingly unruly as no word of presidential action on the legislation was forthcoming from Administration aides, and, at about 4:45 p.m. militant leaders shouted instructions to burn the White House. Within minutes after these orders were issued—and as torches were being carried toward the East Wing of the White House—Presidential Press Secretary Elbert Williams appeared at the main entrance to the Executive Offices and announced that the President had signed the bill into law.

"A tremendous roar of approval arose, and a partisan band struck up the triumphant People's Power theme song, 'March of the Masses.' Following the signing of the bill, the mob separated into apparently planned 'recrimination squads' and systematically sacked, burned, and looted a 12-block area of downtown Washington as District police and a scattering of military units looked on helplessly. Late last night, Metropolitan Police Chief Tweedy estimated total damage at over \$300 million.

"The Equal Property Act completely discards the constitutional concept of private property and sets up a system for the transfer of all private property to all Americans on a so-called equal-share basis. Authority to administer the Act is vested in a Commission in which majority control is to be held by representatives of the poor, the underprivileged, the unemployed, and minority groups which have suffered past discrimination.

"Washington officials see little chance of the Act's being overturned by the Supreme Court in view of threats by People's Power leaders to paralyze all major cities in event of an adverse ruling. The high court is expected to be further guided by the fact that overwhelming People's Power forces earlier this month succeeded in dissolving both the Democratic and Republican national conventions . . . leaving the Power candidate, Arthur Danrig, as the only name on the ballot in November's national election."

#### THE ROAD WE TRAVEL

Sounds preposterous? We'd like to think so. But . . . as a matter of cold, hard fact, this

nation—the land of the free—is moving relentlessly toward such a fate . . . as government by law gradually submits to the blackmailers of America.

Today's blackmailers operate under the phony slogan of the "right to dissent." They have distorted and magnified the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and right of peaceable assembly into a license for intimidation, sedition, riot, and anarchy.

Under this false banner, they have blocked the traffic and commerce of American cities, shut down the operation of government offices, destroyed private and public property, disrupted our educational procedures, interfered with our selective service system, obstructed inductions into our armed forces, provided aid and comfort to the enemy, desecrated our country's flag, and vandalized hundreds of communities throughout the nation.

Our government of laws, our government of constitutional processes, has begun to crumble before a tide of lawlessness which has not only been condoned but even encouraged by many government leaders.

Instead of firmly supporting the enforcement of law and order on the local level, federal officials and other national leaders gave aid and encouragement to the law breakers . . . on the basis that civil disobedience is justified when the violators are acting in a "good" cause.

#### BREAK IN THE DIKE

This was the great breakthrough in the dike of law and order.

For almost two centuries, we had been taught—and we believed fervently—that the law must be respected, whether we felt it to be a good or a bad law.

All of us know the nagging discomfort of living under laws that are inequitable. In such cases, we may exercise our constitutional rights to bring about a change . . . but we do it by lawful process.

Under provisions of the Constitution, the full power of the United States government should have been placed squarely behind local authorities in the breaking up of the very first sit-in in America.

True, it was peaceable assembly . . . but it clearly interfered with the rights of others to carry on their normal activities under the protection of the law.

But . . . prominent national politicians, blinded to legal justice by the possibility of making political hay, placed themselves on the side of anarchy.

We all remember the statement of the late Adlai Stevenson . . . that he would consider it an honor to go to jail for such civil disobedience. His remarks were echoed by hundreds of others . . . and mob power in America was born.

#### AS YE SOW

The Watts riots in California served as Lesson No. 1 in large-scale blackmail. This outbreak of mass crime was not punished. It was rewarded with countless millions of federal dollars poured into the area in the hope that the rioters would "cool it."

After that demonstration of largess, can you blame the Negroes of Detroit, Newark, Milwaukee, Chicago, and scores of other American cities for wanting to get in on the action?

The amazing thing is this: Not only have government officials condoned such lawlessness . . . government employes have played a major role in fomenting many of the disorders . . . under the guise of helping the oppressed. Anti-poverty employes in Newark organized and publicized the police-brutality mass rally which led to the catastrophic riot in that city. A Newark anti-poverty official, Willie Wright, urged Negroes to arm themselves against "honkie cops." The agency's accountant, Charles McCray, was arrested for taking part in the shooting during the riot . . . but officials refused even to suspend him from his job.

The situation has been the same in count-

less communities all over the nation. Sargent Shriver's anti-poverty agency admits that there are convicted criminals on the agency's payroll . . . and that many of them have been given jobs counseling youngsters.

Many of the black-power movement's most militant activists—including riot-inciter H. Rap Brown—have been on the government's payroll . . . often as \$50-per-day consultants.

It's widely said that the government is motivated by a desire to placate the troublemakers.

Actually, the reverse situation prevails. The trouble makers are blackmailing our government . . . successfully and repeatedly. They seek money . . . and power. They're getting both.

#### BLUEPRINT FOR CHAOS

Communists are prominent in nearly all the organizations which are fomenting this anarchy in the U.S. They have been welcomed with open arms into the National Conference For New Politics, a group whose Chicago convention was keynoted by Martin Luther King. One of the leaders of the conference happily commented that Communists would provide leadership for the group.

Bettina Aptheker, an admitted Communist, continues to hold a top position in the peace and draft-resistance movements.

Stokely Carmichael has returned from his Red tour to lead his followers toward "the destruction of the American government."

And dozens of others—with countless citations for Communist connections—hold prominent positions in scores of violent "dissent" organizations in this country.

One of these is the Revolutionary Action Movement which has documented its plans for the revolutionary end of the American way of life. RAM says its followers will "strike by night and spare none" . . . that it will foment "mass riots, blocking of traffic, burning of buildings . . . street fighting."

The planners call for "sabotage in the cities—knocking out electric power first, then transportation—and guerrilla warfare . . ."

The blueprint for chaos goes on and on—in great detail—reminding one of Adolf Hitler's brazen revelations in Mein Kampf.

In this atmosphere in which lawlessness and intimidation are tolerated—even rewarded—it is understandable that the crime rate has soared.

#### THE HARVEST

The FBI reports that the incidence of major crime in the United States is rising at an annual rate of 16% . . . far above the rate of growth in our population.

If the uptrend which has persisted thru 1967 is projected to include 1968, more than 4½ million major crimes will be committed this year. Based on our population of a little over 200 million, this means that you will have one chance in 47 of being murdered, maimed, or robbed in the next 12 months!

More and more, criminals are being coddled by our courts . . . and treated as the unfortunate victims of poor social environment. Punishment is out; gentle rehabilitation is in. Yet, a recent FBI study showed that 57% of offenders released on parole in 1963 were rearrested within 2½ years . . . and that 83% of those acquitted or dismissed in 1963 were rearrested within the same 30-month period.

#### POLICE HANDCUFFED

The Supreme Court has seriously impaired the efficiency of law enforcement agencies by restrictions on investigative procedures and techniques . . . and has so hogtied the police in searches and interrogations that thousands of hardened criminals are yearly set free to prey again on the public.

The sharp uptrend in acquittals, suspended sentences, and refusals to prosecute—particularly in juvenile and minority-group cases—has influenced police officers in hundreds of communities to blind their eyes

to gross law violations. Because of this frustration, police morale today is at an all-time low.

The problem was well summed up by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who wrote in the April 1967 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin: "Morality, integrity, law and order, and other cherished principles of our great heritage are battling for survival in many communities today. They are under constant attack from degrading and corrupting influences which, if not halted, will sweep away every vestige of decency and order remaining in our society."

#### WHOM WE INDICT

Whom are we to indict for sparking this chaos in America? Are the prime defendants the Stokely Carmichaels, the H. Rap Browns, the hippies, the draft-card burners, the peaceniks, the juvenile delinquents, the rabble rousers, the Commies who have gained respectability as "honest dissenters"? Certainly, most of these could be brought before the bar of justice to answer charges of law violations . . . and they should be.

However, there is a stronger, truer bill of indictment which may be drawn against those who have invited the bloody blackmail of America by permitting, even encouraging, mounting civil disobedience. Men of power, prestige, and great influence in the political structure of America have permitted the concept of "freedom of speech" to be expanded to include subversion, intimidation, sedition, and incitement to riot; they have condoned the distortion of "academic freedom" to encompass the adulteration of young minds with Communist doctrine and the disintegration of a well-disciplined educational system; they have allowed "freedom of assembly" to mushroom into disruption of peaceful activity, mob rule, riot, and insurrection.

Unless those in authority in the United States can be influenced to abandon the suicidal course on which they have embarked—or unless they can be replaced by men who will—we cannot hope to restore in our nation the kind of domestic peace and order which has made our many generations proud to be Americans . . . living in a land of freedom, security, opportunity, and justice under law.

The crisis we now face is the most serious, the most dangerous, in the history of our country. Each of us must diligently employ our influence and our effort—in speech, letters, and at the ballot box—to help set straight the way.

#### History of Aberdeen Proving Ground

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, to commemorate Aberdeen, Md., Proving Ground's 50th anniversary, the Harford Democrat has issued an excellent magazine section, "The First Days," with articles illustrating the highlights of APG's past.

The first buildings at Aberdeen Proving Ground, the World War I materiel stored there, some of the early planes based at the post, the contribution of its hospital, and its first civilian employees, are among landmarks reviewed in "The First Days." Aberdeen Proving Ground's Army Ordnance Center and School Museum is described as containing a collection of military weapons specimens, both American and foreign, that is recognized



as the most valuable and outstanding in the world.

Also included in the anniversary book is an article by Lt. Col. G. B. Jarrett, retired, on the history of Aberdeen Proving Ground, from its establishment in 1917 to today. I should like to place this informative account in the RECORD:

#### HISTORY OF ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

(By Lt. Col. G. B. Jarrett, retired)

**ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, Md.**—From 1874 until 1918 practically all experimental and proof work for the development and acceptance of ammunition and cannon was performed at the Sandy Hook Proving Ground, Fort Hancock, New Jersey.

The tremendous increase in work engendered by World War I, however, made it evident that the facilities and space at the Sandy Hook Proving Ground were not adequate to accomplish the proof and development work of the scheduled Ordnance manufacturing program.

Therefore, a site for a new proving ground was sought and the area near Aberdeen, Maryland, was selected because it best fulfilled all requirements. These requirements were: that the area be easily accessible from the principal manufacturing and industrial centers of the country; that it have favorable weather conditions throughout the year; and that it be large enough and sufficiently remote to permit work to be carried out uninterruptedly and without danger or disturbance to adjacent communities.

The Ordnance Proving Ground near Aberdeen, Maryland, was established on 14 December 1917. On 9 January 1919 it was established as a permanent military post and named Aberdeen Proving Ground. The original area comprised 35,211 upland acres and 34,000 underwater acres.

The Army took possession of the property in October 1917 and immediately began the construction of facilities. Sufficient facilities and materiel were on hand to begin the testing of ammunition on 2 January 1918. By June 1919 facilities included 324 buildings, three range towers, water lines, sewers, 11 miles of concrete roads, 22 miles of unimproved roads, and 25 miles of standard railway track.

The original mission was to conduct acceptance tests on ammunition and materiel, to handle all experimental testing, and to operate a school. This was quite different from the present extensive mission which includes fields not even imagined in 1918.

Many of the smaller sections within the old Proof Department formed the nucleus for a present-day major division or mission activity. For example, the Ballistic Research Laboratories, one of the finest institutes of its kind in the world, can trace its history back to the Range Firing Section of the Proof Department in 1918.

Aberdeen Proving Ground began its operation with 45 military and 23 civilian personnel. This rose to approximately 5,000 military and 3,000 civilian personnel at the peak strength during World War I.

The Proving Ground was not slow in demonstrating its capabilities. One of the outstanding early developments of the Proof Department was the invention of the Aberdeen Chronograph. Due to a great shortage of velocity measuring instruments, of which the Boulenge chronograph was the only type that was commercially used, experimental work culminated in the Aberdeen chronograph, first set up and successfully used at Aberdeen on 1 March 1918. Later three greatly improved instruments were made and put into Army use.

During 1918 a total of 416,294 rounds of ammunition were fired for acceptance or development testing. Compared to the 7,000 rounds fired annually at Sandy Hook Proving Ground, this was a tremendous work load.

After the war ended, work requirements decreased and the number of military and civilian personnel was reduced. This number varied greatly from time to time during the years 1919-1940, but on the average Aberdeen Proving Ground employed approximately 300 military and 400 civilians during this period.

A tremendous amount of work was accomplished from 1919 to 1940. This included development of powder and projectiles, bomb testing, study of interior and exterior ballistics, preparation of firing tables, tests of railway and seacoast artillery, and the testing and development of tanks and tractors.

Facilities were also increased by the construction of a small arms ballistic range (1921), a light armor plate range, and a Camera Obscura (1922) for experimental studies of bomb trajectories. In 1935 a new automotive laboratory was completed and automotive test courses were improved in 1937.

Organizational changes were made from time to time during the period to meet existing conditions. A study of old organization charts reveals a gradual move toward the present organization.

On 1 July 1935 a new division was established, which was designated Research Division. Functions of this division were to conduct basic research, to carry out work on technical research problems, computing and other work connected with the range and firing tables, and associated duties. As a nucleus the personnel in the Gun Testing Division, which had been engaged in conducting research work and in making ballistic computations—26 persons—was transferred to this division. In 1939 plans were approved to construct a suitable building to house the new organization which would now be called the Ballistic Research Laboratory. The building was completed in 1941 and provided elaborate facilities to conduct research and experimentation in Ballistics and Fire Control.

In 1936 it was decided to consolidate all of the school activities at the various Ordnance installations into one Ordnance School located at Aberdeen Proving Ground. Construction of buildings was begun in 1938 and by mid 1940 the school was in operation.

The period 1939 through 1942 was one of expansion brought about by World War II. More land was needed for the Proving Ground and 5,976 additional acres adjacent to the reservation were acquired. Also, an area of 244 acres near Churchville, Maryland, about 16 miles from the reservation, was purchased for automotive testing. This brought the total Aberdeen Proving Ground area to 70,905 acres.

The requirement for training large numbers of ordnance personnel led to the establishment of the Ordnance Training Center on 1 January 1941. Following this the Ordnance Board was created in July 1942 with permanent station at Aberdeen Proving Ground. Its mission was to conduct studies and make recommendations to the Chief of Ordnance regarding ordnance equipment.

The peak strength of Aberdeen Proving Ground reaches 5,479 civilians and 27,185 military during World War II. The scope of all fields of research and development as well as that of training were expanded. Scientific knowledge was used to the fullest extent and the Ballistic Research Laboratory took on even greater importance. The Proof Department was also greatly expanded. Facilities were constructed to meet the heavy work load and an additional 1,800 acres of land were added to Aberdeen Proving Ground by the acquisition of Spesutie Island in 1945.

The story of the work performed at Aberdeen Proving Ground during World War II would fill several volumes. It might be said in brief, however, that Aberdeen Proving Ground left its fingerprint on every piece of ordnance equipment that was used by the U.S. Army during the war. Basic research, design, development, and acceptance testing

was carried on day and night. During the course of hostilities 14,000,000 rounds of ammunition were fired, 115,000 bombs totalling 12,042 tons were dropped, acceptance tests were made on 188,000 units of materiel, and thousands of miles were driven over the automotive test courses.

When the war ended there was a drastic reduction in personnel and a return to peacetime level of activity. Research and development was emphasized during 1945 to 1950 in order to provide the design basis for the type of materiel required by a modern, highly mobile army. This effort resulted in many new items of equipment as well as in improvements of existing ones.

Early in 1946 the old Proof Department, after passing through several redesignations and organizational changes, was finally organized along the lines of its present form and designated Development and Proof Services.

The Korean War (1950-1953) was another period of intense activity at Aberdeen Proving Ground. The Ordnance Replacement Training Center, which had been inactivated in February 1947, was reactivated September 1950. Then, because of the heavy ordnance training responsibility, the Chief of Ordnance activated the Ordnance Training Command at Aberdeen Proving Ground in October 1950. It was assigned the responsibility for training and for insuring the state of readiness of all Ordnance troop units. The Ordnance School was placed under the Ordnance Training Command.

There was little slackening of effort after the Korean War and research and development continued at a very high level. Basic research, as conducted by the Ballistic Research Laboratories, was extended far beyond the study of the projectile's flight and entered into the fields of electronic computers, rocketry, space study, and satellite tracking. As climatic testing grew in importance, Development and Proof Services found it necessary to conduct such work in suitable areas and Yuma, Arizona, and Churchill, Canada were selected for this purpose. In 1961 the activities conducted at Fort Churchill were transferred to Fort Wainwright, Alaska. The continued emphasis on science as a means to discover the way toward better weapons led to the study of man-machine relationships, and in 1952 the Human Engineering Laboratory was established with a staff of psychologists and engineers to pursue the field of human factors engineering.

As of 1960 Aberdeen Proving Ground operated with a strength of approximately 5,500 military and 4,500 civilian personnel. From a mission, which in 1919 included only acceptance and development work, Aberdeen Proving Ground had expanded into an organization which had as its mission basic research in science and engineering, research and development testing, climatic testing, human factors engineering, investigation in the field of preservatives and cleaners.

The present facilities of Aberdeen Proving Ground form a huge engineering and scientific laboratory capable of performing a wide variety of missions ranging from mathematical computations to tracking satellites. The cost of this complex represents a capital investment of approximately \$168,000,000. In terms of dollars, the annual business amounts to about \$135,000,000. The payroll of Aberdeen Proving Ground, including both civilian and military, is about \$50,000,000.

There are forty firing ranges, the largest being 40,000 yards. These are used for testing small arms, mortars, artillery, mines, rockets, bombs, and armor plate. Twenty-nine courses are maintained for automotive testing. These include conditions of mud, gravel, slopes, rough road, bumps, and amphibious landing. A large Army Air Field is available to test bombs, rockets, fuzes, anti-aircraft systems, and pyrotechnics. Eight laboratories of De-

velopment and Proof Services are equipped with instrumentation of the most modern type to perform various function connected with research and development. The necessary support to testing is provided by extensive shop facilities.

The Ballistic Research Laboratories make up a scientific institute staffed with physicists, chemists, engineers, mathematicians, technicians, and supporting personnel. Its staff and facilities are capable of dealing with problems ranging from the blast of a 20mm projectile to problems of outer space. Some of their facilities include wind tunnels, free flight ranges, transonic range, shock tube, electronic computers and long-focus tracking telescopes.

Until 1962 Aberdeen Proving Ground operated directly under the Chief of Ordnance as a government owned, government operated installation. The reorganization of the Army has not materially changed the basic and special missions of the activities of Aberdeen Proving Ground in their various fields, but the chain of command has been greatly affected, and some new agencies had been stationed at the installation.

The senior headquarters on post is the U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command, an element of the U.S. Army Materiel Command. The U.S. Army Test and Evaluation Command is responsible for test and evaluation of Army weapons and equipment. It encompasses eighteen activities and installations all over the United States, Alaska, Greenland, and Canal Zone. Aberdeen Proving Ground is one of these installations. The Commanding Officer, Aberdeen Proving Ground, is responsible for administrative and logistical support of all headquarters and activities on the installation, and command control of Development and Proof Services and the Foreign Technical Intelligence Office.

The three Army Materiel Command laboratories on the installation report through the Directorate of Research and Development, AMC. These laboratories are: The U.S. Army Ballistic Research Laboratories; the U.S. Army Human Engineering Laboratories; and the U.S. Army Coating and Chemical Laboratory.

The Deputy President of the U.S. Army Materiel Command Board reports to the Commanding General, AMC, through the Chief of Staff.

Also located on the installation is the U.S. Army Combat Developments Ordnance Agency. This agency, under the U.S. Army Combat Developments Command at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, assumed certain missions of the former Ordnance Board and the inactivated Ordnance Training Command.

The U.S. Army limited War Laboratory was established at the Proving Ground in July, 1962. This laboratory, new in concept, is concerned with providing appropriate equipment, clothing and materiel for personnel engaged in limited warfare.

The U.S. Continental Army Command assumed responsibility in 1962 for all military specialty training in the Continental United States, and with this, the old Ordnance Training Command and the Ordnance School.

The Joint Military Packaging Training Center, a DOD Activity, is the most recent organization to be located at Aberdeen Proving Ground, having been transferred to Aberdeen Proving Ground in July 1963. Its mission is to train military and civilian personnel in the principles of military preservation, packaging, packing, inspection, and loading of military supplies and equipment.

This is Aberdeen Proving Ground today. It is the home of one of the finest teams of military and civilian scientists, research engineers, technicians and administrators in the world. As in the past, this team will continue to advance the techniques and equipment with which our soldiers defend this Nation and the Free World.

## Progress in the Potomac Basin

### HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, residents and friends of the Potomac Basin should be heartened, as I am, by signs that the administration is finally giving priority in funds as well as in rhetoric to the conservation and development of the basin's resources.

The President's fiscal 1969 budget contains two items which, although quite small, have great significance.

The first is the request for \$800,000 to continue land acquisition for the Bloomington Dam and Reservoir on the north branch. Inclusion of this request, in a year of financial squeeze, is a welcome sign that the administration has finally joined the Congress in recognizing that prompt completion of this project is essential for Potomac flood control, water quality control, and water supply. Last year the Congress appropriated \$2 million for Bloomington even though it had somehow been omitted from the budget. Given this history, I am confident that the 1969 request will be well received, and will do all I can to secure these funds.

The second promising item is the National Park Service request for \$478,500 for recreational development projects along the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument, plus an additional \$61,000 for improvements on the canal below Seneca. This item is small, very small, in relation to the need; but it is almost three times as large as the almost token appropriation for fiscal 1968. After years of Federal neglect of this historic and beautiful property, this request is most encouraging to me and all who have sought immediate improvement of the canal as a recreational asset and as a model for comprehensive recreational development along the river.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to schedule a hearing at the first opportunity on my bill, H.R. 7201, to provide additional acreage and establish progressive policies for the administration, restoration and development of the entire C. & O. Canal.

I would also urge the House Committee on Public Works to act with dispatch this year to authorize the Sixes Bridge Dam and Reservoir on the Monocacy River in upper Frederick and Carroll Counties. This proposal, which is a key to the future growth of that area, has the wholehearted support of the elected officials of both counties, and has been endorsed by the State of Maryland, which has agreed to assume the recreational costs involved.

Finally, I would encourage the Congress to give prompt, complete and objective consideration to three reports which, I understand, will be released within the next few weeks. The first is the long-awaited final report and recommendations of the Federal Interdepartmental Task Force on the Potomac, created at Presidential direction about 3 years ago to develop an overall action

plan for the basin. The second is the report of the sub task force on recreation, which will contain the details of the Federal park proposal, now called the Potomac National River, which has already spurred so much discussion. The third is a new report by the Corps of Engineers on water supply and water quality needs and projects in the basin.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect long-range and innovative proposals, such as a sound interstate compact for water resources management, and a major recreation plan, to be developed, refined and approved overnight. We cannot expect miraculous resolution of the persistent controversies over some aspects of Potomac conservation. But we can act now on those projects, such as the C. & O. Canal and the Bloomington and Sixes Bridge Dams, where our way is clear. Above all, we can promote informed, thoughtful discussion in Congress and throughout the basin of the many recommendations which have been advanced by Federal agencies, the States, local governments, and concerned and knowledgeable citizens. If we follow this course, 1968 will be a year of real progress for the Potomac.

## California Veterans Support Our Fighting Men in Vietnam

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while our young men are battling for freedom's cause in Vietnam, it is encouraging to receive letters from all over the Nation supporting their gallant efforts. I have received a number of letters from California, and I would like for you to hear some of the things they write from there.

From Edward A. Gafford, adjutant of the DAV chapter at Santa Ana, Calif., comes this letter:

With a membership in excess of 351 Disabled Veterans of all wars, I can assure you and other members of the Congress that the Disabled Veterans take a dim view and object very much to the sad display of loyalty and patriotism by the so-called dissenters. We also question the motivation behind the actions of many misled groups of individuals who, under the guise of free speech, spout off at the drop of a hat against the United States of America. We hold further that these demonstrations are not spontaneous but well planned, financed, sponsored and thought out by small minorities whose aim it is to destroy the American way of life. We concur in the words of a patriot so long ago: "Our Country in her intercourse with other nations may she ever be right, but right or wrong, Our Country." We add, "Damn the votes, full speed ahead."

Lawrence E. Smith, of the DAV post in Concord, Calif., writes:

We are in unanimous consent with our government's policies in Viet-Nam and elsewhere. We are against any dissension against our government or its policies. This is America, we are Americans, and this is what it takes to make America what it is today—



and this is what it will take to make a better and stronger America tomorrow.

Paul B. Jensen, of the DAV chapter in Redwood City, Calif., writes:

We are pleased to advise that Redwood City Chapter No. 136 DAV has passed a resolution unanimously supporting President Lyndon B. Johnson's foreign policies especially the Viet-Nam war, and we are against these recent upsurges of discontentment. We feel they are probably communistic inspired and this obnoxious nuisance should be promptly abated.

Nathaniel Goodwin, of Hollywood, writes:

Every American, in my opinion, should support our fighting men who are carrying out this commitment. Every force necessary should unrelentingly be used to support our fine, loyal fighting men and get them home as soon as possible.

Mrs. Charlotte M. Baccio, of Placerville, Calif., writes:

I heartedly agree with you in your approval of support for our Government . . . It's easy enough for us to talk when we shouldn't. I know our leaders can't please everyone but I'm sure they are doing their best with all the problems facing them.

From La Habra, Calif., comes this letter from James A. Robinson, commander of the VFW post:

We want it known that we stand for an America that is bigger than the Vietnam conflict, even with its enormous cost in dollars, its terrible loss of life. The American Ideal is of first importance, whether the war is right or wrong—good or bad—wise or unwise. If we are a highly principled people, and our ideals are worth supreme sacrifice on the battlefield, they are certainly worth a lesser sacrifice: namely submitting to the draft, having respect for authority, and uniting to form a home front.

Rodney E. Simon, of the VFW post in Castroville, Calif., writes:

Boasting a chartered membership of sixty-one members, we would like to bring to your attention our unanimous support for our country and the fighting men in Viet-Nam. Unfortunately, the average Americans have remained silent to the current riots and demonstrations across our great Nation. We are appalled at the current disheveled and mounting un-American and un-patriotic views voiced by draft-dodgers and peaceniks. We believe these views and demonstrations only prolong and hinder the Americans' cause. It is time for patriotic Americans to speak out and let the fighting men of Viet-Nam know that we, as proud citizens, on the home front support and are thankful for the tremendous job and sacrifices that they are making for their nation, and for the cause of freedom.

### Disagree or Dissent?—The United States Faces a Grave Problem

**HON. JAMES B. UTT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article which appeared in the San Diego Union last October or November. The article includes part of a speech by Prof. Daniel J. Boorstin, professor of American History, University of Chicago, entitled, "Disagree or Dis-

sent?—The United States Faces a Grave Problem." I submit it herewith for your close study:

**HISTORIAN SPEAKS: DISAGREE OR DISSENT?—THE UNITED STATES FACES A GRAVE PROBLEM**

CHICAGO.—Following is a condensation of a speech by Prof. Daniel J. Boorstin, professor of American History, University of Chicago, on Dissent and Disagreement in American life. The speech was delivered Oct. 18 at the convention of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association:

"It seems to me that dissent is the great problem of America today. It overshadows all others. It's a symptom, an expression, a consequence and a cause of all others.

"I say dissent and not disagreement. And it is the distinction between dissent and disagreement which I really want to make. Disagreement produces debate but dissent produces dissension. Dissent means originally to feel apart from others.

"Peoples who disagree have an argument, but people who dissent have a quarrel. People may disagree but may both count themselves in the majority, but a person who dissents is by definition in a minority. A liberal society thrives on disagreement but is killed by dissension. Disagreement is the life blood of democracy, dissension is its cancer.

"The spirit of dissent stalks our land. It seeks the dignity and privilege of disagreement, but it is entitled to neither. All over the country on more and more subjects we hear more and more people quarreling and fewer and fewer people debating.

#### "IMMIGRANT SOCIETY FACES PROBLEMS"

"The very character of American history has accentuated our tendency to dissent. We are an immigrant society, made up of many different groups who came here and who felt separate from one another, who were separated not so much by doctrine or belief as by the minutiae of daily life. Until the 1930s and 40s, the predominant aim of those who were most concerned in this country with the problem of immigration was to Americanize the immigrant.

"But in the last few decades we have had a movement from assimilation to integration. And this is an important distinction. It was no longer the right of the immigrant to be Americanized, to be assimilated, it was now the right of the immigrant to remain different.

"The ideal ceased to be that of fitting into the total society and instead became the right to retain your differences. It brought with it the assumption that the only 100 per cent American is the person who is only partly American. It led General Eisenhower to make something of his German name and German background; it encouraged John F. Kennedy to exploit his Irish background.

"This sense of separateness and the power of minorities developed along with the growth of literature of the social sciences which came to show minorities who they were, where they were, and what their power might be.

"People in small groups were reminded that they had a power and a locale which they had not known before.

"This is a parable which was illustrated in the stall-ins and sit-ins. At a time when certain students seized the administration building at a neighboring university. All the salary checks flowed through the IBM machines in that building and they were able to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery.

#### "MINORITY VETO PSYCHOLOGY DEVELOPS"

"This has the effect of developing a minority veto psychology. Small groups have more power than ever before. In small numbers there is strength. This results in the quest for minority identity.

"It's worth noting that some of the greatest American champions of the right to dis-

agree and to express disagreement—Jefferson, Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., and others—were men who also were great believers in the duty of the community to be peacefully governed by the will of the majority. But more recently dissent itself has been made into a virtue. Dissent for dissent's sake.

"Professional dissenters do not and cannot seek to assimilate their program or ideals into American culture. Their main object is to preserve and conceal their separate identity as a dissenting minority. They're not interested in the freedom of anybody else. The motto of this group might be a revised emanation of the old maxim of Voltaire: 'I do not agree with a word you say. And I will defend to the death my right to say so.'

"The affirmation of differentness and feeling apart cannot hold a society together and in fact these tend to destroy the institutions which make disagreement possible.

"A society of disagreeers is a free and fertile and productive society. A society of dissenters is a chaos leading only to dissension."

### Administration Spokesmen and "Meet the Press"

**HON. JAMES A. McCLURE**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, two key spokesmen for the Johnson administration, Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara appeared jointly on "Meet the Press" last Sunday afternoon, giving the Nation's leaders an opportunity to offer their version of the recent crises in Vietnam and Korea.

Between the two of them, Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara alternately confessed:

RUSK (on Vietnam). Now, some of our mistakes, if you like, have been through an effort to bring it to a peaceful conclusion without an enlargement of the conflict.

McNAMARA (on the Bay of Pigs). So I was responsible for that.

#### Contradicted each other—

RUSK (on the recent Vietcong raids). After all, the other side has to take into account the fact that something in the order of 15,000 of their people have been killed and another four or five thousand have been taken prisoner . . . they have had disastrous losses.

McNAMARA. The population of North Vietnam is about 17 million. I think it is quite clear they have a manpower supply that will continue to support losses of the kind they are absorbing.

#### And even contradicted themselves—

McNAMARA. The ship (the Pueblo) went undetected by the North Koreans for 10 to 12 days. \* \* \*

McNAMARA. There was a period of radio silence appropriate to its mission from the period of roughly January 10 to January 21, and it is in that period that we lack knowledge.

By the end of the program it would not have surprised me to hear a plea for the election of a Democratic administration next fall to carry on these wonderful programs. But even then there would have probably been a hitch. Mr. Rusk would have been advocating Mr. Johnson, while Secretary McNamara would have been thinking of Senator KENNEDY.

A columnist in the Washington Post called the program a contest between candor and fudge, which illustrates one of the big dangers inherent in this sort of an administration—you end up laughing and nudging the next person in the ribs even when these spokesmen are talking about national survival.

Several of their comments cannot be allowed to go unnoticed.

For instance, the Secretary of Defense said:

Three and a half years ago the South Vietnamese forces were on the verge of defeat.

Well, that would have been in the period preceding the Gulf of Tonkin incident. And what was Mr. McNamara saying then?

On April 24, 1964, he predicted "dramatic progress" in Vietnam by July or August. A few weeks later he was confident that U.S. troops would soon be home: "perhaps some could return later this year; some next." By July he felt that the morale of the Vietnamese people had improved, observed that the desertion rate in the South Vietnamese Army had dropped, and said he was encouraged.

During last Sunday's program, the President's Defense Secretary also referred to the July 1965 period as a time when "the North Vietnamese and their associates, the Vietcong, were on the verge of cutting the country in half and destroying the South Vietnamese Army."

I recall that only a few weeks prior to that time he had told the American people that the Vietnamese situation was improving. As a matter of fact, between 1963 and 1965, McNamara had issued optimistic statements on the course of the war on no less than 14 separate occasions.

It is probably coincidence, but during that same month—July 1965—his own Assistant Secretary of Defense, Arthur Sylvester, reportedly told the Overseas Press Club:

If you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid.

Perhaps much of the Secretary's optimism was really election year enthusiasm. Perhaps that is how we should judge much of what we heard last Sunday as well.

For his part, Secretary Rusk contributed the most intriguing comment of the day. Speaking of recent peace explorations, he said:

We have exercised some restraint in our bombing in North Vietnam . . . we have not had a pause in the traditionally accepted sense, but we have limited the bombing to certain points in order to carry forward these explorations.

Past performance would indicate that a limited bombing phase might be a time when the administration would have preferred calling a halt to all bombing entirely, but could not because of the almost certain wrath of our military leaders in Asia and the American electorate back home.

At any rate, it poses a question as to whether our bombers have been hitting relatively meaningless targets. I must leave it to the military to make that determination. But I hope we never hear that our pilots risked their lives against

low-priority objectives. I hope that we never hear that our bombers were on meaningless missions at a time when the enemy was pursuing its most savage thrust of the war.

Credibility has never been this administration's long suit.

It is therefore reassuring to see secretaries of Defense and State getting together on national television as they did this past weekend. It serves two very real purposes: First, it gives them an opportunity to coordinate the stories they hand out to the American people; and second, it is a vivid reminder to the voters of how badly we need a change in leadership.

### Hail President's Plan To Improve Student Aid Programs

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in his message on education to the Congress yesterday, the President urged enactment of consideration of legislative proposals aimed at making the benefits of education available to more American children.

One of the most important of the programs he suggested is an extension and expansion of the different types of Federal student financial assistance programs benefiting our Nation's young men and women enrolled in U.S. institutions of higher education.

In the past 5 years, under the leadership of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the Congress has moved swiftly to help our college students meet the rising costs of financing their education beyond high school.

Now, we will be asked to expand the educational opportunities available. The President—in his state of the Union message—said he will call upon Congress to enact an Education Opportunity Act, giving these programs new flexibility and hopefully allowing our colleges and universities greater latitude in conducting their individual financial aid activities.

Four years ago, when we embarked on our national effort to allow freedom of choice in higher education to any individual with the qualifications to achieve a college education, all of us were aware of the impact on our country's institutions of higher education of the postwar baby boom.

Now, to help all students, we have such Federal assistance as the college work-study program, the educational opportunity grants, the guaranteed student loan insurance program and other types of assistance to help students achieve the fullest possible education within the limits of his or her individual ability.

These programs represent a sound investment in the future of this country. They merit our strong support and careful attention and I am confident that the Congress will move to expand these opportunities for our young men and women.

Appearing in the recent winter issue of the Marquette University magazine was an excellent article which described the impact of these programs on one university. The article also served to point up the dedication which one individual brings to his job in seeing that these Federal funds are used to the maximum.

The individual, Mr. James G. Dwyer, director of financial aid at Marquette, attests to the fact that these programs of financial assistance have meant much to one university and the students enrolled there.

The article indicates that financial aids have nearly tripled at Marquette University in the past 5 years, bringing new opportunities to college-age students.

Some of these new programs are either State or privately sponsored. All have helped alleviate the high cost of learning.

I commend this article, Dollar Signs and Diplomas, to the attention of my colleagues and hope that all of us will move to provide additional opportunities through our support of the higher education legislation soon to come before us. The article follows:

**DOLLAR SIGNS AND DIPLOMAS: A VARIED PROGRAM OF FINANCIAL AIDS IS HELPING TO BRING A COLLEGE EDUCATION WITHIN REACH OF MORE AND MORE STUDENTS**

Next to getting into college, the most troublesome problem is affording to stay there. The high cost of learning is an accepted fact of life, and for thousands of families it is also a major source of financial worry. Paradoxically, however, it is now true that practically no student with intelligence need forsake a college education solely for lack of funds.

The reason for this glimmer of light in what could be a bleak picture is that various forms of financial assistance to college students have caught up with rising costs, at least temporarily. "We can take care of any student with a legitimate financial need," says James G. Dwyer, director of financial aids at Marquette University. Though Dwyer adds certain qualifications to his statement—a student must be willing to borrow to pay for his education and he must be willing to work part-time—the fact remains that there is money available to put academically able students through college.

Only a decade ago, when Dwyer first started working in financial aids at Marquette, he could not have made such an optimistic statement. Drop-outs for lack of funds were relatively common, and aid was often limited to only the academically elite. In a few short years, however, college students have been blessed with a dramatic increase in financial aids. Much of this benevolence has been at the hands of federal and state legislators, whose members have exhibited wide concern for the problems of the economically disadvantaged and culturally deprived. "In Wisconsin," Dwyer said, "the state legislature has passed more education bills in the last three years than were passed in the previous 20 years. Unquestionably, this has been a spur toward freedom of choice in education."

The "freedom of choice" idea is one of the foundation blocks supporting the whole philosophy of financial aids. Without some form of assistance, higher education would simply be out of reach for most children in low income families. Moreover, many children of middle income families would be forced to limit their choice of college to a relatively low tuition institution. Private colleges and universities, where tuition is necessarily higher than at public institutions, would be in serious danger of becoming enclaves of only the very rich.



The basic motivation behind financial aid programs is to remove financial barriers so that a student can choose to attend any college that suits his aims and talents. Thus, if a family is able to contribute \$1,000 a year to their son's education, he would not be limited to selecting a college where his annual bills would total \$1,000. He could choose an institution where the cost would be \$2,000 or even \$3,000, and a package of financial aids would, ideally, make up the difference. The cost to the family would be the same—\$1,000—but the amount of aid would vary, depending upon the college which the student attended.

Statistics supplied by the College Scholarship Service, a private co-ordinator of aid programs, indicate just how big a business financial aids in higher education has become. The CSS estimated that \$440 million was available four years ago in all types of aid; last year some \$710 million was offered. Dwyer has his own yardstick for measuring how massive and complex the business of financial aids is. "We don't just shuffle papers," he quipped. "We shovel them."

#### COLLEGE COSTS RISE

The reason behind the bulging financial aids business is, of course, the rapid acceleration of college costs. In 1955, the average annual cost for room and board, tuition and fees at a private college was about \$1,300. Today the same items would run up a bill of better than twice that much. Nor have students at public institutions, where state taxpayers shoulder much of the financial burden, been immune to the money squeeze. In 1955, a resident student at a state college or university would have paid about \$800 a year while today he pays an average of about \$1,200.

But while the bills for attending college have jumped, they still do not even begin to pay the institutions' cost-per-student. At Marquette, for example, tuition in 1957 was \$550 a year, compared to next year's base tuition rate of \$1,450 a year. But the cost-per-student over this same period has mushroomed to an even greater extent. In essence, higher faculty salaries, new buildings and more expensive equipment have increased the cost of running colleges far out of proportion to their incomes.

Because most students who are receiving financial aid do so under a package plan—combinations of loans, grants, scholarships and employment—it is difficult to figure exactly how many students are benefiting from financial assistance. Dwyer has estimated, however, that one out of seven of Marquette's full-time students is on some kind of scholarship, and one out of four is receiving some kind of aid. Last year the Marquette financial aids office processed over \$1 million in educational loans and awarded about one-half million dollars in scholarships that were based on academic achievement. In addition, students employed in University offices earned over \$400,000 working their way through college.

Few Marquette students can get all the way through school on a full scholarship—a grant that covers all tuition costs and fees. The idea of packaging aid—combining a scholarship grant with a loan and a part-time job—is more prevalent because it permits the University to stretch the resources it has available. In this way, more students can be assisted than if a policy of full aid were followed.

When a student visits the financial aids office to apply for aid, or applies through the mail in the case of incoming freshmen, he or she avails himself of all types of aid through a single application. If the student is interested in a type of aid that is awarded on the basis of financial need, he must undergo a need analysis. Financial need—not scholarly brilliance—is the guideline colleges use in distributing monetary scholarships,

most loans and grants and some jobs. In this way, the colleges insure that the money goes to those students who need it most.

The need analysis is an objective method, developed by the College Scholarship Service and uniformly employed by most financial aids offices, whereby a college or university can evaluate just how much monetary assistance a student needs. The key element in this analysis is a Parent's Confidential Statement (PCS), a document which reveals the family's financial standing. The detailed nature of this statement, which includes a listing of annual income, expenses, assets and liabilities, is further assurance to the colleges that financial aid will be distributed fairly on the basis of complete information, rather than haphazardly on the basis of casual conversation or vague guesswork.

After a financial aids counselor has reviewed a student's application and determined just how much assistance he needs, a package of aid is offered to the student. Depending upon the amount of aid needed, plus other factors, the student may be offered one or several of the different forms of assistance provided at Marquette.

#### THREE KINDS OF SCHOLARSHIPS

A *scholarship* is perhaps the oldest and most familiar kind of college aid. In effect, this is a grant which covers all or part of a student's tuition and academic fees. Usually, it is an award that is related to academic distinction, coupled with some evidence of financial need.

Dwyer explained that students can attend Marquette on scholarships that fall into three broad categories, determined by who makes the selection and who finances the award. A *designated scholarship* is one where Marquette is not involved in either the selection or the financing of the award. For example, a student may win a \$500 scholarship from a service club in his hometown, and use this money to finance his attendance at Marquette. A *controlled scholarship*, on the other hand, is one where Marquette decides who will receive the award, but the University does not directly finance the scholarship. Examples of this kind of awards are the General Motors and Western Electric scholarships, which are made available to Marquette by benefactors outside the University. Finally, a *funded scholarship* is one where Marquette both selects and finances the award. Funds for these kinds of scholarships are drawn directly from University operating income and from income from Marquette's endowment.

This year about one-half million dollars in controlled and funded scholarships were awarded by Marquette. About \$330,000 of this total was financed by the University itself, Dwyer said, including about \$80,000 in scholarships that came from income on endowed scholarships.

Dwyer explained that the University uses a matching system to determine who will receive the awards, and how much each award will be worth. By March 1 of each year, all applications for scholarship assistance must be in the hands of the financial aids office. Then the University's undergraduate scholarship committee meets to evaluate these applications. The committee ranks the applicants, from top to bottom, on the basis of academic achievement, leadership and other qualities having no relationship to individual financial need. After this ranking is completed, the committee looks at each applicant's financial need and makes its awards accordingly.

#### GRANTS BASED ON NEED

If a student lacks the academic achievement to qualify for a scholarship, he still may be eligible for a *grant*, another form of financial assistance that need not be paid

back. Most grant programs administered by Marquette are set up for students of average—or even below average—achievement who give evidence of financial need. The Wisconsin State Tuition Grant program, for example, is open to students who are residents of the state and are attending a college or university in the state where the annual tuition exceeds \$400—in effect, a private school. Under this program, now in its third year, grants are made to the student, on a sliding scale determined by family income, up to a maximum of \$500 a year. Last year 524 Marquette students received over \$180,000 through this program.

Grant programs also are supported by the federal government. The Higher Education Act of 1965 gave birth to the Educational Opportunity Grants for exceptionally needy students. "It is estimated that the average family can contribute \$600 to \$800 for nine months for a child's college education," Dwyer explained. "If the family's expected contribution falls below these figures, there is evidence of what is called *exceptional financial need*." Grants from this program range from \$200 to \$800 a year, but may not exceed half of the college's estimate of the student's financial need. The remaining aid must come from other sources, such as a scholarship, loan or employment. Last year 161 Marquette students received \$66,958 in Educational Opportunity Grants.

Funds allocated to military veterans who attend Marquette under the New GI Bill also can be classified as grants, though they are not administered through the financial aids office. The bill provides an educational allowance—the minimum is \$130 a month for an unmarried student—for veterans who have put in more than 180 days of active service since February 1, 1965. According to Mrs. Helen Fitzpatrick, Marquette's veterans' co-ordinator, 475 students—many of them veterans of the Vietnam war—are attending Marquette this year under terms of the New GI Bill.

A *loan* is the third major type of financial aid available to Marquette students. This is a form of monetary assistance given at low or no interest and usually subject to repayment after the student leaves school. The low interest and "study now, pay later" characteristics are among the most attractive features of this kind of assistance. Students of average as well as superior achievement are eligible for loans under most of the programs administered by Marquette.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE LOANS

"You have to remember that most full-time students aren't able to obtain a regular loan from a bank," Dwyer remarked. "Most of them would have no permanent employment, no collateral, no security. From the banks' viewpoint, this person would be a poor risk. On the other hand, if the parents took out a loan for their child's education expenses, the interest rate could be six percent or more. So you can see how advantageous these college loan programs are."

The most widely used loan program at Marquette is the gigantic National Defense Student Loan program, established by the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Last year alone, some 554 Marquette students received \$433,615, or an average of \$783 per student, through this program. The terms of this loan are relatively simple: a student may borrow up to \$1,000 a year to meet college-related expenses, with no accrual of interest to the student during his formal studies. The loan bears simple interest at a rate of three percent a year, beginning nine months after the end of student status, and the entire loan must be paid off in 10 years.

One of the chief lures in the National Defense Loan program is the "cancellation of obligation" clause. For each year that the borrower serves as a teacher, up to fifty per-

cent of the loan, plus interest, may be cancelled, at a rate of ten percent each year. Moreover, another five percent per year may be cancelled for each year the borrower serves as a full-time teacher in an economically depressed area or works with handicapped children. Thus a \$4,000 loan can be cut to \$2,000 by a graduate who teaches for five years, or to nothing by a graduate who teaches for seven years in a low-income neighborhood.

**WORK THEIR WAY THROUGH COLLEGE**

Though often overlooked as a source of financial aid, *employment* is one of the most popular forms of meeting the cost of a college education. In addition to about 200 Marquette students who are working their way through college as part of the federally-supported work-study program, hundreds more are helping to pay the bills by working part-time at jobs on campus and throughout the community. Dwyer reported that last year 173 Marquette students participated in the work study program, earning a total of \$113,000. Jobs were provided for hundreds of other students in Marquette offices, amassing a total payroll of \$292,000.

Under the work-study programs, jobs with a maximum work load of 15 hours a week in University departments are found for students who have financial need. The federal government backs the program by paying 85 percent of the student's salary, with Marquette paying the remaining 15 percent.

Other part-time jobs on- and off-campus are provided for students through an employment clearing house in the financial aids office. On a recent day, a bulletin board in that office listed over 100 job opportunities, ranging from babysitting and tutoring to washing walls and clerking.

Dwyer soft-pedals the notion that working part-time will hurt a student's academic record. "I used to feel that the more hours a student had to work, the bigger the toll he would have to pay scholastically," Dwyer recalled. "But since then I've learned of too many exceptions. Several years ago I talked to one of our professional school students who was married, had a child and was working 40 hours a week. Rather smugly, I asked him how he was doing in class. When the student answered that he wasn't doing as well as he should be, I felt justified in my suspicions. But when the student went on to say that he was ranged only third in the his class, and he felt he should be first, that conversation taught me never to jump to conclusions on how heavy a work load a student can handle. If any generalization is to be made, however, the average student probably shouldn't exceed 12 to 15 hours of employment per week."

Financial aids counselors frequently have to refute the claim that millions of dollars in scholarships are going to waste because students are unaware of them and therefore don't apply for them. "This simply isn't true," Dwyer stated, flatly. "I would estimate that less than one-tenth of one percent of available scholarship money is not being used. And in most cases, these unused scholarships have restrictive requirements that make it almost impossible for a student to qualify. With very few exceptions, every dollar in scholarship aid, and nearly every dollar in grant and loan assistance, has a qualified taker."

Bearing eloquent testimony to that statement is the fact that financial aids have nearly tripled at Marquette in the past five years. Only a decade ago, it was taken for granted that a college education was out of reach for the economically disadvantaged. Today, however, numerous programs have been tailored to help these same students get through college. The financial aids business is booming, and as long as it does, a dollar sign will never be able to trip a student on the way to his degree.

**The Late Clark Hasbrouck Schooley**

**HON. GEORGE H. MAHON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, recently in Lubbock, Tex., we mourned the passing of a former congressional secretary, a former newspaperman, and teacher of journalism at two Texas universities, who for the past 17 years had been a publications editor at Reese Air Force Base, at Lubbock. Clark Hasbrouck Schooley, 65, was congressional secretary and aide to Representative Frank W. Fries, of Illinois, during the 75th and the 76th Congress, 1937 to 1941. During that time he was active in the Little Congress, as the association of congressional secretaries was then called, and was speaker of the Little Congress. At that time, he earned some distinction as the first secretary to a first-term Congressman to be elected to head this association. President Johnson, when a congressional secretary in the thirties, was likewise active in the formative days of this association, and served as its "speaker."

Since 1950, Mr. Schooley was civilian publications editor at Reese Air Force Base, and under his supervision the periodicals and journals there earned numerous recognitions, and awards. The passing of Mr. Schooley, and his professional contribution to his community and fellow man has been noted in publications in my home community of Lubbock, and because of his competent service as a House staff member, for which he is well and favorably remembered, I include excerpts from these publications at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal, Jan. 4, 1968]

**CLARK H. SCHOOLEY DIES HERE**

Clark H. Schooley, 65, veteran newspaperman and civilian employe in the public information office at Reese Air Force Base the past 17 years, died at 6:15 a.m. today in Highland Hospital.

Schooley also was a former faculty member of Texas Tech, serving on the journalism department teaching staff from 1945-50.

Burial will be in an Effingham, Ill., cemetery. Time has not been determined.

**BORN IN ILLINOIS**

At the time of his death, Schooley was a civilian employe of the RAFB public information office. He served as editor of "The Roundup," a weekly base newspaper, which under his editorship had been selected best in its class in judging conducted by Headquarters, Air Training Command, in 1959 and 1964.

Born in Effingham, Ill., he attended Effingham schools and was graduated in 1927 from the University of Illinois School of Journalism.

While attending the University of Illinois, he worked for three years on the editorial staff of the student newspaper.

He worked for the Champaign-Urbana, Ill., News-Gazette, as reporter and telegraph editor in 1928-29 and for the Effingham County Review, Effingham, Ill., writing a weekly column, "Dugan's Lemon Squeezer."

He served other stints as a reporter for the Decatur, Ill., Review, Illinois State Register,

Gillespie, Ill., News, and worked as a reporter for the Associated Press in Pittsburgh, Pa., New York City and Pittsburgh, Pa., from 1930-33.

Schooley also was former secretary to the late Illinois Congressman Frank W. Fries, 1937-39.

Schooley was owner-publisher of the Bement, Ill., Register, 1941-42.

He taught at Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, from 1943-45.

Schooley also was employed by the Abilene Reporter-News while teaching at Hardin-Simmons.

Schooley was a member of Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalism society, and the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Lubbock.

Surviving are his wife, of 2815 52nd St., three brothers, Frank E. Schooley, Champaign, Ill., Eugene and C. Hershel Schooley, both of Alexandria, Va., and a sister, Louise Schooley, Falls Church, Va.

[From the Reese Air Force Base Roundup, Jan. 5, 1968]

**ROUNDUP EDITOR, C. H. SCHOOLEY, DIES**

Characterized by a shuffling gate and a crusty mannerism, Clark Schooley, 65, editor of the Reese AFB Roundup for the past 17 years, was best known throughout this entire area as "Mr. Schooley."

Mr. Schooley was a completely unique individualist, who projected his exterior self as an unemotional, untouchable nonconformist. His self-designed disguise deceived few!! Underneath his would-be veneer, transparently reigned a gentleman of the highest order, a gentle and sympathetic heart, and an enviable acuteness of mind and memory.

Few of the military members could individually parallel Mr. Schooley's interest, dedication, loyalty, or contributions to Reese AFB. His attributes, knowledge, and know-how are pronouncedly documented in the annuals of the Roundup. His talents and devotion to newspaper work made possible innumerable recognitions of achievements for Mr. Schooley, Reese AFB, and the Air Force.

Such a man as he shall not pass this way again! With a shuffling gate and a crusty departure, our esteemed, honorable, and respected editor of the Roundup died yesterday. However, his many, many friends, associates, and loved ones can take pride and consolation in the knowledge that his welcome at the Lord's Table shall be made known by a simple and dignified placard labeled, "Mr. Schooley."

**News**

**HON. JAMES G. O'HARA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the news media, whose importance to the democratic process has been aptly recognized in Mr. Douglass Cater's phrase—"the fourth branch of Government"—often seem to many of us to fall short of their potential as public servants. One of the most common sources of difficulty is the excessive concern of editors and reporters with so-called hard news—the short, often sensational, story that is thought to sell copy. Behind such news coverage, of course, lies something more difficult to capture and convey—



the complicated realities of our social, economic, and political life.

If there is room for hard news there should also be room for the more thoughtful kind of analytical piece that examines events in their real proportions. Behind the sensational coverage of auto accidents, daily battles, and draft card burning lie the realities of our true situation, and these realities must be accurately conveyed by our friends of the press if they are to fulfill their appointed role in the democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Melvin Bleich, editor and publisher of the *Romeo, Mich., Observer*, has recently written a thoughtful editorial on this subject. I include Mr. Bleich's editorial at this point in the RECORD:

## NEWS

(By Melvin E. Bleich, editor and publisher)

You may have noticed in this column that the subjects discussed are frequently referred to as being "in the news." Quite naturally, I like to use as a theme those ideas, problems or concerns which are uppermost in people's minds. Many of them are common in other communities and therefore are regional or national subjects.

But more and more, I find myself wishing to emphasize in a preface that the treatment of the subject by the news media does not really describe accurately its significance to society or the average citizen hereabouts. Which brings us to the question, "What is news?"

One of the simplest answers is that news is a matter of judgment—it is what editors think is news. Their first category is that of "hard news" which is the trade term for the crimes, accidents, hurricanes, and other such occurrences which might also be summed up as bad news. The capsule report of Vietnam (you've heard or read it many times): unit X met the opposition at a certain hill and the result was a given number of casualties.

What happened in Detroit today: one bank robbery, three auto deaths, a spectacular fire, two charges of wrongdoing by public officials and a new strike at a local plant. This is the backbone of the front page news or the skeleton of the electronic newscast. But do you think this really reflects what happened to a community of a million population on a given day and all the people in it?

This rather narrow view of what is news is quite traditional in the news business and it dies slowly. The result has been a rapid increase in popularity of the daily news. And in the dailies themselves, often on Sunday, more and more space is being devoted to this kind of long article which deals with the major movements and happenings in the community. But editors have not gotten around to filling their front pages with this kind of reporting.

For instance, about 25 Americans are killed in Vietnam each day. More than twice that many Americans are killed on the highways each day, plus an enormous number injured and immense property damage. We agonize over Vietnam. Why don't we show at least the same concern for the highway carnage?

I have discoursed before on the motor vehicle death-injury situation. These are not "accidents." This is a kind of Russian roulette. The National Safety Council has it figured out that for every so many passenger miles traveled someone is going to be killed and others injured. That is how they can predict the fatalities during a holiday. They come up with a pretty good estimate of how many miles are to be traveled and it follows there will be so many deaths. Simple. It is so simple and so routine, so much with us that we are immune to its significance.

Out of 10 million young people in these United States, several thousand may be

found in hippie land in San Francisco, a like number in downtown New York, several hundred in Detroit, other cities having a dozen or a hundred or some such figure. This pitifully small number of pitiful figures has nonetheless branded the entire younger generation as hippies.

In a university containing perhaps 20,000 or 30,000 students, a few dozen may seek to protest the draft by some spectacular means such as a sit down or a card burning or some such device. And there will be hundreds of others who will watch and perhaps show some sympathy for the protest idea. But the non-action of the other thousands is not an item of news to compare with the protest stuff we have been reading for a year now.

The thousands upon thousands of young men who dutifully report when called into service are a fact but not news in the traditional sense. And there are millions of young people who are not hippies. They may have some faddish hair and clothing styles. But I can recall some fads of a generation ago which were quite far out.

The point is this: many of the problems which we talk about because they are in the headlines are not as significant to society as they might seem. To be sure, Vietnam, hippies, draft-dodgers are serious problems along with many other headlines. A significant part of the problem is created because certain aspects are over emphasized in the news or perhaps because we readers fail to dig into the background reporting to see these things in true perspective.

One of the functions of a column like this is to try and examine events in their real proportions. A shallow reading of the news will leave you with a few statistical facts: so many killed and injured, so many in protest, so many involved in serious troubles and so on. While this kind of news is factual, it can be overwhelming if you don't try to see the whole picture.

## The Farm Bureau and the ASCS

## HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that the American Farm Bureau Federation's hostility to Federal programs actually masks the incestuous relationship it maintains with the Government. The formal and informal ties between the Farm Bureau and the Department of Agriculture's extension service are too well documented to require more than passing mention. The relationship between the Farm Bureau and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, however, is less well known.

On the one hand, the Farm Bureau is opposed to price supports and production controls—the business of the ASCS. On the other hand, in several States, the ASCS is actually administered by Farm Bureau members. In the accompanying letter to the editor of the *Des Moines Register*, December 15, an Iowa farmer wonders whether this apparent contradiction is "bad communication or hypocrisy." After more than 7 months of investigation, I am prepared to conclude that it is the latter.

Under unanimous consent, I submit the following article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

## SAYS FARM BUREAU DOES NOT PRACTICE WHAT IT PREACHES

To the EDITOR:

In an address given to Iowa Farm Bureau county leaders, J. Merrill Anderson [Iowa Farm Bureau president] had this to say: "Effective communication is one of the greatest challenges farmers face today." He further stated farmers should "point out that we in the Farm Bureau firmly believe and without reservation that the private enterprise system provides more for both the so-called 'haves' and 'have-nots' than any other system yet devised."

It appears that a very large communication gap exists within the organization. The official position of the Farm Bureau is quite clear. It calls for terminating the present feed grain program right now. Charles Shuman [National Farm Bureau president] has repeatedly labeled the present program a complete failure.

Despite the Bureau's official position, and Anderson's plea for better communication, the local leaders and rank-and-file members continue to milk the federal government in the name of a program that they have collectively rejected. This is either bad communication or hypocrisy.

Many Iowa Farm Bureau members are also Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service committeemen. As such, they are a part of an agency that promotes as well as administers the present feed grain program. This is a little bit like belonging to both the Masonic Lodge and the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. Anderson, if you wish to communicate with anyone outside the Iowa Farm Bureau, you must first explain the strange kind of integrity that allows your own leaders to say one thing and do the exact opposite.

DICK WADSLEY.

EARLY, IOWA.

## The Last Act in Vietnam

## HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on rare occasions one reads an article that comes quite close to expressing one's own views. Last Sunday I read such an article in the *New York Times Magazine*. The article, entitled "An Administration Critic Presents His Version of the Winning Scenario for the Last Act in Vietnam," was written by Richard J. Barnet. Mr. Barnet, formerly with the State Department, is codirector of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington. His most recent book, written with Marcus G. Raskin, also codirector of the Institute, is "After 20 Years." The ideas in the *Times Magazine* article are forcefully and articulately expressed. They are, in my opinion, worth the consideration of every Member of Congress. The article follows:

One of the great problems with thinking about a way out of the Vietnam war is that the word "negotiation" is used by different people to describe totally different things. The United States and North Vietnam have announced many times, publicly and privately, the broad contours of what each regards as an acceptable "negotiation." These two conceptions of the process of settlement are totally contradictory. The purpose of this article is to examine what "negotiation" actually means in this 23d year of the Vietnam war. We shall consider the terms on

which a negotiated peace might be attainable, and what it would mean to the United States to accept them.

A good place to start is to sketch what people in the State Department and Pentagon like to call the "scenarios" of settlement—the one in Dean Rusk's office and the one in Ho Chi Minh's.

What the United States would like to see is the following train of events: Ho will "signal" that he is ready to talk with the United States about the schedule of withdrawal of both North Vietnamese and United States troops, that he is ready to order an end of all guerrilla activity in the South, and that he is prepared to accept a South Vietnamese Government reorganized to include a broader national coalition than the present military-dominated one—but that he no longer insists on any significant participation by the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong.

This point is absolutely crucial to the United States position. Up to the present, the State Department has insisted that the only enemy with which it will negotiate is the Hanoi Government. For more than a year, it is true, the United States has indicated a willingness to permit the National Liberation Front to join the Hanoi delegation and "make their views known." Last November, for example, Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg proposed that the N.L.F. might be an independent participant in a reconvened Geneva Conference or at the United Nations. And perhaps, junior United States officials say privately, some minor ministries might be given the non-Communist members of the Front. But the basic line of United States policy has not changed since early 1966 when George W. Ball, then Under Secretary of State, put the American position in the clearest terms:

"The National Liberation Front is not a political entity expressing the will of the people of South Vietnam—or any substantial element of the South Vietnamese population. It is a facade fabricated by the Hanoi regime to confuse the issue and elaborate the myth of an indigenous revolt."

If the National Liberation Front were recognized as a legitimate force in Vietnamese politics, then it would have a claim not only to be represented at the peace negotiations, but also to be included in any future South Vietnamese Government. The State Department has no confidence that a coalition government which included representatives of the Front could avoid ending up a Communist government. Non-Communist forces in Saigon are so weak, the department feels, that they could not stand up to the N.L.F. once the real source of their political strength, the American military machine, was gone. Thus, "negotiation" continues to mean a political arrangement for Vietnam in which the National Liberation Front does not play a significant role.

Rusk's "scenario" contemplates a number of possible first acts. There could be a Geneva scene, a U.N. scene or a Rangoon scene. Representatives of the Front could play bit parts, making their views known, even eliciting some recognition of their legitimate status from participants other than the United States and the Thieu-Ky Government. But when the final curtain comes down, the representatives of the Front are still minor characters. The hero is Thieu or Ky or some other American candidate. The United States troops sail away. (The finale takes from three to five years.) As the final scene fades, a gradually broadened South Vietnamese Government takes control of the country, using the enormous complex of United States-built bases, airfields and weapons stores to improve the quality of its rule.

Such a "negotiation" is, of course, nothing more than the ratification of a decisive United States military victory, an event which has not occurred and does not seem likely to occur. Hanoi and the National Lib-

eration Front end up with nothing—or perhaps the Ministry of Tourism. They gain none of the objectives for which they have fought for more than 20 years—essentially political power in South Vietnam and eventual reunification of the country. Since Ho Chi Minh believes that these objectives were once won on the battlefield when the French were defeated in 1954, he is not prepared to give them up in a "negotiation" unless he feels compelled to surrender. Even the prospect of an amnesty for the guerrillas, which is included in the current Rusk production, is not particularly tempting, even for the most harassed Vietcong soldiers for the memory of Ngo Dinh Diem's amnesties and his subsequent persecution, torture and murder of Vietminh veterans is still too vivid.

There is another reason why Dean Rusk's phone, an important prop in the scenario, has not been ringing. Ho lacks the power to surrender on Rusk's terms, even if he should want to. The script calls for Ho to "stop doing what you are doing to your neighbors," which means not only that he must halt the infiltration of guerrillas and regular army units from North Vietnam but that he must also call off the guerrillas in the South, who represent by far the bulk of the fighting force there. It is by no means clear that he is in any position to do that.

The relationship of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front, which has been the subject of a great deal of controversy, is a complicated and a changing one. Nonetheless, a few basic points are clear. While Hanoi sought almost from the beginning of the guerrilla activity in 1957-58 to control and direct events in the South, the movement developed primarily because of Diem's repression rather than Ho's agitation. As the war escalated, so also did the Front's dependence on Hanoi for leadership, arms and strategic direction. But even today most of the soldiers and the weapons facing United States forces have never been north of the 17th parallel. Thus it is fanciful to think that merely stopping the flow of arms and men from the North will stop the Vietcong.

But the script calls for Ho to broadcast an order to the guerrillas to lay down their arms, whereupon, since Hanoi "controls" the Front, the guerrillas troop dutifully to the local police station to hand in their weapons. This particular scene from the Rusk script suffers from a basic lack of verisimilitude.

A remote national hero may be able to "control" a guerrilla movement while he is supplying it and holding out a plausible strategy for victory, but not when he counsels surrender. It does not follow that he will be able to convince men who have become guerrillas because of personal desperation to lay down their arms merely because he may have been able to persuade some of them to take them up. True, he convinced the victorious Vietminh in 1954 to give up at the conference table much of what they had won on the battlefield, but only because everyone assumed that it was only a matter of months before a Communist Vietnam would emerge as a result of a nationwide election which the Geneva accords called for no later than July, 1956. (In November, 1954, John Foster Dulles told Gen. J. Lawton Collins that the chances of avoiding this result were 1 in 10.)

The current State Department scenario is a remake of an old favorite entitled "The Greek Solution." The Greek Civil War ended with what the State Department regards as the best kind of "negotiation." The guerrillas, largely because they had made grave political and tactical errors, stopped fighting. (Tito also closed the border and stopped giving aid. But in his recent study of that war Maj. Edgar O'Balance has concluded that the decisive factor in the defeat was the in-

ternal political dissension and the rise of incompetent leadership rather than any action by Tito.) It is the opinion of a number of Pentagon officials with whom I have talked, military and civilian, that one cannot anticipate a Greek Solution without committing at least another one million men for at least five years. Without the crucial scene in which the guerrillas, or at least most of them, fade back into the hills or silently rejoin Vietnamese society, the State Department's whole script for "negotiation" takes on an air of fantasy.

Ho Chi Minh's scenario also begins tentatively, but in one respect at least the denouement is crystal clear. As the curtain falls on the last act, the United States is out bag and baggage, and since Ky and Thieu are part of the baggage, they are gone, too. At least, they no longer hold power. The National Liberation Front takes control of the South Vietnamese Government, probably in conjunction with other "nationalist"—i.e., non-American-dominated—elements of the population such as the Buddhists, Cao Dai and Catholics. Eventually, after perhaps as long as 10 years, the reunification of the country would be arranged.

Once Americans make the basic decision to leave by a certain date, Ho holds out a number of possible introductory scenes. "Singing children will strew the way with flowers," he once suggested. It is clear from numerous official pronouncements that the troops need not leave immediately—that, in fact, the introductory scenes might be protracted even a year or two if, and the "if" is crucial, the United States has really made a believable commitment to leave.

The leaders of the Front in South Vietnam favor essentially the same script, although there are differences in emphasis. While Hanoi puts greater stress on reunification and the building of a Socialist economy, the National Liberation Front stresses land reform, decentralization and step-by-step accommodation of the two governments and social systems which share the territory of Vietnam. As Prof. George Kahin concluded from recent discussions with leaders of the N.L.F.:

"The N.L.F. (whatever the long-term economic goals of its leaders) continually insists that the Socialist economy of the North is not the policy of the N.L.F. in the South, and that any movement toward a Socialist system will have to be taken step-by-step over a long period of time. They continue to emphasize that the N.L.F. is a Southern regime oriented to the needs and expectations of Southerners."

It is true that the Front has a strong propaganda interest in stressing its independence from North Vietnam, but it is equally true that real differences in interest and outlook exist. To put it in the simplest terms, it is the leaders of the Front and not the men in Hanoi who must figure out how to rule and reconstruct their tortured land.

The Front's program is deliberately moderate not only because its leaders are looking for non-Communist support abroad but also because their only hope of bringing effective rule to South Vietnam is to attract a coalition of the many diverse elements which make up what is, historically, a nation but, organizationally, a collection of duchies. The Communists would face the same choice as Diem or Thieu. They can either permit a degree of local autonomy for such groups as the Hoa Hao, Montagnards and Buddhists, or they must repress them, thereby prolonging the civil war. Unlike Poland or Bulgaria, Communists cannot hope automatically to rule the nation by seizing the machinery of the state, for the machinery hardly exists. Diem precipitated



his downfall by pushing centralization too far and too fast.

The Front recognizes that the two most popular issues, other than simply ending the war, are the termination of all "foreign" intervention (which to most Vietnamese means Americans, not other Vietnamese who happen to live in the North) and the granting of autonomy to those factions in the society which represent regional, religious and social interests. It may well be that they will be able to construct a monolithic Socialist Vietnam, but they know that this will not be easy and that it will take a long time.

The crucial scene in the Front's scenario is the creation of a coalition government. The Americans began to sail away. Thieu and Ky receive faculty appointments at the National War College in Washington. An interim government takes office to prepare the way for new elections. This is the climatic moment. According to Ho's and the Front's scenario, the N.L.F. must either control the interim government which manages the election process or at least play a major role in it. Otherwise, they are convinced, there cannot possibly be an acceptable last act, for electoral experience in Vietnam down to the recent victory of Thieu and Ky makes clear that the incumbent gets re-elected. Having observed in the recent elections the arbitrary exclusion of popular neutralist-leaning candidates such as General Minh and Au Truong Thanh, Ky's former Economic Minister, the closing of opposition newspapers, the appearance in several districts of more votes than voters, and the awarding of extra votes to the army, the N.L.F., confident that it represents at the very least the largest single minority in the country, is adamantly opposed to running in another military-managed election. (For exactly parallel reasons, the Saigon Government and the State Department are opposed to giving the N.L.F. a role in the interim government and the management of the election.)

Thus, according to Ho's script, the N.L.F. will come to power in South Vietnam as a consequence of new elections provided that the Front is not excluded from the interim government. Although the N.L.F. calls itself on occasion "the sole genuine representative of the Vietnamese people," it has emphasized that it continues to stand by the 10-point program of December, 1960, which provides for the formation of a coalition government pending elections. "The N.L.F. is willing to cooperate in a common action program and work parallel with representative groups which share at least some of its objectives," a high official of the Front told Professor Kahin recently. Although he declared that such cooperation required their "joining" the N.L.F., he emphasized that this did not require an organizational link, but only that such groups as the Buddhists declare publicly their general sympathy and support for one or more of the five major goals of the N.L.F.: "Peace, Independence, Democracy, Neutrality, Reunification."

There are some solid grounds for believing that the N.L.F. cannot eliminate all other elements of Vietnamese society from a share in power. For one thing, strong religious factions, such as the Buddhists Struggle Movement under Thich Tri Quang, and the Cao Dai, are as anti-Communist as they are anti-United States intervention. Presumably, when the intervention ceases, and they are no longer torn between nationalism and anti-Communism, their ideological antagonism to the N.L.F. leadership will grow stronger. The religious groups, along with other semiautonomous factions such as the Hoa Hao, which now runs Angiang Province with virtually no interference from Saigon, are as unlikely to submit to tight N.L.F. control as they are to Ky's. The Catholics, too, who are well organized, are a force which cannot easily be ignored by the N.L.F. Indeed, the N.L.F. has demonstrated its aware-

ness of the necessity of enlisting the cooperation of these various groups by pointedly including in its own Central Committee representatives of the Buddhists, Cao Dai and Catholics.

None of this means that, if its scenario were to be enacted, the N.L.F. would not at some point take full control of South Vietnam and arrange for its eventual reunification under Ho. At this point, this looks like a probable development, but by no means an inevitable one. Many South Vietnamese intellectuals who are anti-Communist but also are appalled at seeing their country become an American colony, have either reluctantly cooperated with the N.L.F. or have left the country. (There are more Vietnamese doctors in Paris than in all South Vietnam.) Presumably, many would return if peace were restored, and if they did, they would also represent a force for moderating ideological dogmatism. With the end of the war some of the moderate elements in the N.L.F. might well break away.

Ironically, the United States has pursued the policy of undercutting the independent power of non-Communist nationalists by giving full backing to the military junta. The State Department rightly fears that the non-Communist elements will not be strong enough to resist domination by the N.L.F., but by supporting the exclusion of neutralists and compromisers it makes this result more likely.

We can now turn to the opening scenes of the Ho-N.L.F. scenario for "negotiations." On this they have been quite explicit. The script calls for a double negotiation—the first, military, the second, political.

If the United States stops the bombing of North Vietnam, representatives of that Government will meet American negotiators to talk about military de-escalation, a series of questions on such matters as graduated withdrawals, infiltration, use of the demilitarized zone and the schedule for the final removal of United States forces. The United States should also take this occasion to demand that the North Vietnamese remove their troops from Laos.

Provided the second negotiation is proceeding satisfactorily, Hanoi representatives have indicated that they are prepared to be quite flexible about the timetable of United States withdrawal. But they will not talk about the political future of South Vietnam, for to do so would undercut their whole position—i.e., that the Front is the legitimate party to such discussions and the United States is not. More important, they cannot talk for the Front on this point.

Since the political reconstruction of Vietnam is what the fighting is about, the second negotiation is, of course, the crucial one. The N.L.F. has taken the position that the Thieu-Ky Government cannot participate in such discussions. The present Saigon leadership is not a legitimate element of Vietnamese politics, the N.L.F. insists, because its members represent only themselves and rule only at the sufferance of the Americans and under their direction.

If, however, President Thieu should invite into the Cabinet representatives of the Buddhists and other nationalist and neutralist elements who wish to see an early end of the war and the American intervention, such a government could begin negotiations with the N.L.F. for a coalition government and elections. The Front would probably be willing to deal with a government which included some of the Saigon generals if they appeared merely as representatives of one of the factions that must be reconciled in order to restore peace, but not if they claim to be the legitimate government.

To the familiar question, "How can the United States extricate itself from Vietnam?" the answer is rather clear. The stark alternatives appear to be either a decisive military victory followed by a prolonged occupation

or a process of negotiation which, regrettably, is closer to Ho's scenario than to Rusk's.

Despite their relative military weakness, Ho and the Front enjoy certain advantages in a war of attrition. The war is increasingly difficult for the United States to carry on because many of her citizens believe that it was wrong to fight in the first place. North Vietnam and the Front have little incentive to accept a "negotiation" which means exclusion from power in South Vietnam and a continuation of dominant United States influence in the country. There is no reason to believe, therefore, that the "other side" will ever agree to such negotiations unless they are prepared to surrender. Even if such an agreement could be coerced, the war would probably still go on, although at a lower level, as a new generation of guerrillas continued the struggle. American troops in large numbers would still have to stay, fight and die.

Whether a process of negotiation leading to a termination of the war can now begin depends critically upon the decision of the White House. President Johnson could begin the process with a telephone call to President Thieu insisting that the Cabinet be made representative of all non-Communist elements in South Vietnam and that talks be begun with all factions including the N.L.F. The President would have to make it clear that negotiation for extrication rather than negotiation for victory was now really United States policy, for until he clarifies this point, the present South Vietnamese Government, well aware that their rule will end with a settlement, will continue to veto any United States initiatives in that direction.

Over the past year, members of the State Department, recognizing that direct negotiation among the Vietnamese is indeed the only way out, have hinted that the United States would promote this course once the non-Communist elements in South Vietnam were stronger. The assumption behind the delay is, of course, that time is on our side, that the political structure of South Vietnam is becoming stronger. However, it seems clear that the opposite is the case. Instead of building a coalition that would be representative of various sources of power in Vietnam in the hopes of balancing off the power of the N.L.F., Thieu has stocked his Cabinet with old barracks buddies. Since the trend in South Vietnam is toward further political disintegration, it is in the interests of the United States to achieve a political settlement sooner rather than later.

Is not the only process of negotiation which has a chance of succeeding really tantamount to a United States withdrawal? In a sense it is and in a sense it isn't. "Withdrawal" is another much used word in the Vietnam debate which has several meanings.

The first meaning and the one most commonly used is "immediate evacuation of all United States troops." (In official State Department parlance, "turning tail.") It is quite clear that neither North Vietnam nor the Front is demanding this. Logistical considerations alone would require a schedule that at a minimum would take months. Ultimately, of course, the troops would have to go. To this, officially, at least, the State Department has agreed.

The second meaning of "withdrawal" is that the United States give up all claim to dictate or to shape the character of the South Vietnamese Government. It is the political withdrawal rather than the military which must be immediate and unconditional if the war is to end promptly. The United States must withdraw from its present unattainable political objective—keeping South Vietnam out of the control of the N.L.F.

We can put the South Vietnamese Government in as strong a position as possible to

negotiate from strength with the Front by insisting that it include opposition leaders and become more representative. But we do not have the power—our conspicuous failure on the battlefield to put down the insurgency has proved it—to dictate the composition of a coalition government. The longer we demonstrate our inability to fasten a political solution on Vietnam, the weaker those in Vietnam who have depended upon us will become. We can arrange our departure in such a way as to make it more difficult for the N.L.F. to seize total power, but we cannot prevent it if it should turn out that the non-Communist elements are too weak to play a significant independent role.

Once the United States abandoned the unattainable goal of determining the character of the South Vietnamese Government and retaining its decisive influence over it, it could better use its power to promote objectives that are both more in its own interest and more realistic. We could demand an amnesty for Saigon officials who have literally staked their lives on the United States commitment, and insist that such guarantees against reprisals be monitored by the International Control Commission established under the Geneva accords and by temporarily remaining United States troops. But, again, candor requires us to face the fact that while the United States can influence events in Vietnam, it cannot control them. The Federal Government cannot prevent the death of innocent people on the streets in Washington. It cannot accomplish more in Vietnam. It can only make sure it is causing no further deaths itself. The United States could help considerably to reduce terrorism and reprisal, especially by using its influence to promote national reconciliation and by focusing world attention on the problem, but it cannot reasonably expect to guarantee instant peace in a land that has been riven by civil war for almost a quarter-century.

It is quite clear that a Vietnamese settlement could be arranged through a United States-Hanoi negotiation on mutual military withdrawals and an N.L.F.-Saigon negotiation on political reconstruction. The denunciation of such a double negotiation is not wholly clear, although at this point both Hanoi and Washington assume the result would be a Communist South Vietnam.

However the negotiations came out, it is hard to see how they would threaten essential United States interests. Were Ho Chi Minh to come to power in Saigon the day the conferences closed—which he would not—Americans would be neither less safe nor less rich as a consequence. Had the pattern of events in Vietnam which had already taken shape by the end of the Indochina war been accepted gracefully, Ho Chi Minh would still be known, if not as the George Washington of Asia, as Newsweek once called him, at least as the Gomulka of Asia.

Administration officials in Washington admit privately that the decision after the Geneva Conference of 1954 to create and defend at all costs a United States-sponsored South Vietnam was a ghastly mistake. The United States vital interests do not inhere in the Vietnamese soil. They were sent there. An expeditionary force of 500,000 men, casualties of more than 100,000, the expenditure of \$100 billion and a string of permanent airfields and massive harbors, like Camranh Bay and Danang, do not merely demonstrate the United States commitment; they are the United States commitment. Since 1964, when it became clear that Dulles' 1-to-10 gamble to establish a permanent United States protectorate in Southeast Asia was about to be lost, the United States has tried to save the situation through a reckless commitment of the national honor.

With every speech about resisting aggression, preventing World War III, and our determination to fight to the end, the Presi-

dent increases the commitment of national honor—and more and more Americans feel dishonored in the process. As the costs of the Vietnam war have plainly exceeded any rational United States interests in that small country, the Administration has discovered a series of transcendent interests for which the war is ostensibly fought. These interests have to do with China and with the rest of Southeast Asia.

State Department officials say that if the United States should change its present course, however ill-conceived that course might be, the resulting humiliation of America would propel China into the position of the first power in Asia. But China, except in a military sense, has already been propelled into that position by geography. Short of destroying her, there is little we can do about her size and power or the fact that the surrounding nations will have to make some kind of peace with her. While there is considerable evidence that China is encouraging the continuation of the Vietnamese war because it is embarrassing and debilitating for the United States, she did not start that war nor is she able to start other insurgencies.

The United States and most of the other nations of the world would have a strong interest in preventing a Chinese military expansion in Southeast Asia, and because such naked aggression would arouse genuine fear and outrage around the world, an effective coalition could be formed against it. But neither Chinese practice nor Chinese doctrine suggests that Peking would embark on such a course. On the contrary, despite repeated border violations, the landing of a large United States expeditionary force, and a series of threatening statements from the State Department and the Pentagon, the Chinese have been exceedingly cautious in committing their military forces in Southeast Asia. (They did not intervene in Korea until MacArthur was practically on their border.) Our experience with China suggests what common sense dictates: The Chinese will turn more to military force as military force is used against them. If we are worried about stimulating dangerous and irrational behavior in Peking, the prolongation of the Vietnam war seems to be the worst course for it reveals, from China's viewpoint, both threatening intentions and, at best, a marginal capability to use our military power for concrete political ends.

The Chinese would not be fooled by America's renunciation of what she cannot do anyway—establish a government to her liking in South Vietnam. They know that America still has the economic, military and diplomatic power to play a role in Asia and that she will insist on continuing to play it.

China knows also that the nationalist revolutionaries in Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, Laos and Burma fear her and that these revolutionaries will do everything in their power to resist falling under Chinese domination. This does not mean that they, or the present Governments of these countries, would dare continue an avowedly anti-Chinese foreign policy once United States troops left the area, but that they would seek trade and aid from other sources, so as not to become satellites of their historic national enemy. (The N.L.F. continues to assert that it will seek United States aid once United States troops are gone.) The United States has no interest in promoting hostile states around the periphery of China—only independent ones.

The second vital interest which the State Department alleges would be jeopardized by facing the facts of life in Vietnam is the "loss" of Laos, Thailand, Cambodia and, eventually, the rest of Southeast Asia. The "domino" metaphor disguises two different policy arguments. The first is that the guerrillas in Thailand would be disheartened by the failure of the N.L.F. in Vietnam, but encouraged by their success. While this

is no doubt true, the implication that the fate of one insurgency has a decisive impact on another has very little historical support. It is what Trotsky believed, but it is not what has happened. Despite early efforts to replicate the Bolshevik Revolution in Hungary, Germany and other likely places, Lenin failed. An insurgency will succeed only where local conditions are ripe for it. Whether the insurgency in Thailand grows or diminishes will depend upon the ability of the Government to administer the areas in which the guerrillas are now operating. Local politics, not international revolutionary euphoria, is the decisive factor.

The other meaning of the "domino" specter is more substantial. If the U.S. signifies that it cannot support a military dictatorship in South Vietnam—despite the commitments it has made—it is in effect telling the Government of Thailand, for example, that if insurgency reaches the same level, the United States cannot support Thailand, either. The likely effect is that the Thai Government must follow a strategy of conciliation in dealing with the guerrillas rather than a strategy of pure repression. This means that it must give at least as much attention to meeting the economic and political needs of its people as it does to policing them.

We should know by now that if a Government is unwilling to deal seriously with the economic and political conditions from which domestic rebellion springs, the U.S. cannot successfully suppress its discontented population for it (why we should want to, in any event, is another question). Che Guevara's final adventure in Bolivia tells us that it is very hard to launch an insurgent movement by infiltration, for if the constituted Government enjoys any popular support, or if the people are merely apathetic, they are much more likely to report the guerrillas to the police than to support them. And unless the people do support the rebels, as in Vietnam, the guerrillas cannot hold out against the overwhelmingly superior force of the Government. Thus, while it is true that a negotiated settlement in Vietnam would require the U.S. to change its thinking about the rest of Southeast Asia, particularly its campaign of counterinsurgency in Thailand, such a change is vital if we wish to avoid another disastrous commitment of the national honor.

The Vietnam war is the greatest political and moral crisis of our history because for the first time we can see the possibility of extrication from a catastrophic involvement only through a national confession of failure.

To be sure, the President could take Senator Aiken's advice and announce victory as he withdraws the troops. But I fear that while most of the world might perhaps either believe him or not care, the American people would know the truth, and frustration and cynicism in the country would rise to new heights.

Diplomats around the world have been searching for a third scenario for ending the war, an alternative to Rusk's invitation to surrender and Ho's program for takeover. Supposing, they say, the war drags on for another year or two. The Vietcong find it increasingly difficult to recruit men to replace their enormous losses. The economy of North Vietnam is virtually destroyed by the bombing. The United States makes it clear that despite rising casualties and growing protests at home it will not accept a process of negotiation that could lead to a Communist South Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh continues to reject surrender but has become convinced that the United States will never allow him or the Front to take political power. In such a situation would not both sides be prepared to settle for less than present objectives? Could not such a settlement lead to a coalition government guaranteed by the outside powers, or perhaps to continued partition of the country?



In the search for alternative political outcomes to the war, proposals for alternative military strategies, such as General Gavin's "enclave" approach, have been put forward. Others have suggested that the negotiations might proceed step-by-step with the arrangement of local cease-fire zones, to be followed by local and regional elections. Government forces might continue to administer the parts of the country they control while the N.L.F. would be recognized, perhaps tactically, as the legitimate authority over the provinces it, in fact, administers.

Those who cherish the hope that a prolonged war of attrition might cause the belligerents to strike a compromise do not realize how narrow are the margins on both sides for political maneuver. Unless the United States redefines its war aims to accept the possibility of an N.L.F. Government in South Vietnam, the N.L.F. has no incentive to negotiate, for its essential war aim is participation in political power.

If the United States is unwilling to accept this possibility under any circumstances, then it would have to avoid any "compromise" involving the removal of its troops, for once the forces left, even the most carefully conceived arrangement for a coalition government or partition might well lead to a Vietcong political victory. If, on the other hand, the United States was willing to accept a negotiation with a risk that it might lead to an N.L.F.-controlled Government, we would have no interest in resisting the process of settlement which Hanoi and the Front have indicated they are willing to accept—the double-negotiation scenario.

Indeed, it would be in the United States' interests (and South Vietnam's) to initiate such discussions as soon as possible and to bring into them those indigenous non-Communist elements in South Vietnam now excluded from power who put the restoration of peace and the ending of the destruction of their people ahead of anti-Communism. In such negotiations, compromises will no doubt emerge. They will reflect the relative strengths and political skills of the various Vietnamese political forces. Such compromises can neither be arranged nor enforced by the United States unless American troops remain in Vietnam indefinitely, a possibility completely inconsistent with a compromise settlement. Perhaps a point might be reached at which the North Vietnamese and the Front would decide that temporary de-escalation was worthwhile, so that an "enclaves" strategy would not jeopardize American troops. Perhaps peace could come to certain regions. But there is little evidence that such strategies could end the war. No one has yet figured out how to convert military stalemate into political compromise in Vietnam.

The difficult question for the President is not how to compromise differences in Vietnam—these will be compromised or not depending upon the strengths of the various interest groups in Vietnam—but how to heal the wounds that the war has inflicted on our country. The task is not to maintain the national honor, but to recover it.

Truth is a radical remedy. It has a dangerous snowballing effect. Officials who start down this unfamiliar path face the risk that they will be compelled to peel away more layers of fantasy than they intended. Truth hurts when people or nations have grown accustomed to living lies. A nation which has been told that it can do no wrong when it comes to fighting Communism is likely to react with anguish and terror at the loss of the Battle of Vietnam.

While the United States would emerge from a negotiated peace far stronger for having extricated itself from a quagmire, a decision to make peace would be a public admission that the 14-year policy to create a U.S. protectorate in Southeast Asia by military means had failed. Those who worry about a resurgence of McCarthyism following

such a national trauma should not be dismissed as alarmists. It would be a dangerous time, for a vocal minority in the country would feel outraged—even betrayed. The stalemate in Korea had a good deal to do with the climate of frustration and hysteria in which McCarthy flourished.

But this problem will not get any easier as the war mounts and passions rise. Were the President to put the issues frankly before the American people, many of those whom he has persuaded that the obliteration of Vietnam is the only way to stop World War III would support him in an honest effort to promote negotiation among the Vietnamese themselves.

The implications of any other assumption are truly terrifying. If it is true that the President refuses to stop the most unpopular war in our history, even though it is doing serious economic and social damage to our country, out of a fear of the consequences of belated candor, then he is exercising his enormous powers over foreign affairs primarily for internal political manipulation. If we have really arrived at a time when a President can court a general war with China in order to delay accounting for past errors, when "patriotism" requires support for the compounding of error, then we must face the reality that the American experiment did not last even 200 years.

### A Proud Father Writes of His Soldier Son

#### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time one happens upon something so poignantly beautiful that words cannot be found to tell about it.

And so it is with the following poem from the Nashville, Tenn., Banner, which came across my desk today.

It is my pleasure to make this poem available to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

THE PRIDE OF A FATHER IN A SON NOW SERVING  
IN VIETNAM'S JUNGLES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In these days of insurrection riot at home, appeasement mouthing and draft evasion, The Banner is honored to present this powerful and patriotic expression of a Nashville father showing pride in his son's service in Vietnam. The author was an officer in the Pacific in World War II. He is a member of a family whose father and sons have served their country with military distinction since the turn of the century. One of the brothers of the man who writes the proud words below, fought to the bitter end on Bataan, was held prisoner for several years and died on a prison ship bound for Japan.)

Scripture tells us that the sin of pride is a deadly sin.  
And yet I wonder.  
Is it a sin to be proud you've raised a son who is a man?  
Who in this winter time is far away in Vietnam.  
Who endures tropic heat and jungle rot,  
Who dally risks hidden mines and snipers' bullets,  
Who eats from cans, and is often wet and dirty,  
Who lives with death all about him:  
Who is only twenty-one?  
Yet never complains, much less whimpers.  
A son who says, "this is where I should be."  
A son whose only desire is to live at home in peace

But knows he first must win a war?

Is it a sin?

Is it pride to remember the generations who have gone before

And to know that from such a son there will be generations to come

To whom liberty will be more than life?

Surely, he could have stayed at home.

He's smart, and college is a haven.

Or he could have married some sweet girl, and hid behind her skirt.

The draft wouldn't catch him, and he could have used the old canard

"I'm ready when they send for me."

Many boys do.

But this man of mine knows privilege beyond duty;

Knows liberty must be earned with bullets and danger and blood;

He knows those who truly deserve liberty, preserve it.

So he left the haven, and is there in Vietnam, While amiable youths dance and study and wait for the draft at home.

Or claim they are too good to go to war.

May God protect him.

No one can pluck him out of the Father's hand.

This we know, and in this we both take comfort.

All the time I know there are other sons like mine,

Thousands of them. And fathers and mothers like me,

Who endure the waiting, far more difficult than going oneself.

Who share with me the so-called sin of pride. Life this year has an acrid taste of anxiety and fear,

And I wonder how long fathers can endure, Showing a cheerful face, and not jumping when the phone rings,

And going about their daily tasks.

Then I think of how it is to spend one's days in battle,

Ten thousand miles from home and family, and not complain.

Surely, when we come to give account,

The God of Freedom will not judge us harshly

When we say with pride,

"I am the father of a son who is a man."

### What Is Congress' Policy Toward Government Contractors?

#### HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Western Electronic Manufacturers Association hosted Congressmen and Senators from the western States at their annual congressional luncheon. The principal speaker was Robert M. Ward, this year's president of WEMA. I believe my colleagues will find his address to be extremely timely and of great interest. The text follows:

#### WHAT IS CONGRESS' POLICY TOWARD GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS?

In behalf of my colleagues who have come across the country to be here today, I welcome you to our seventh annual Congressional Luncheon.

This is an annual get-together. We're here today because we believe that regular contact with our legislators is important to both of us, and that this luncheon is one good way to accomplish this.

The businessmen here are a representative delegation of the 450 companies comprising WEMA. If all 450 could have come, this

meeting would look like a convention and we couldn't get everyone in this room that Senator Hayden has so graciously made available.

I'd like to take 8 to 10 minutes to talk about a specific concern that I share with most of our members. Let me start with an observation made a year ago by WEMA past president, John McCullough. It was:

An increasing number of manufacturers are taking the position that they are ill-served in undertaking government contracts. They will readily sell "off the shelf" to government agencies what they are making in the normal course of commercial business, but they are not anxious to subject themselves to . . . the hazards of government contracting.

I'd like to elaborate on this point today because events of the past year have aggravated what was already a very frustrating situation.

In these 12 months, as a result of certain congressional hearings, we have been confronted with newspaper headlines proclaiming "Defense Firms Bilk Public," and "House Committee 'Appalled' At Defense Spending," and "Defense Contract Profits Held Excessive." More than once the cry of "war profiteering" has been raised, and the widespread uneasiness in the country over the progress of the war has given rise to inferences of a sinister cabal on the part of the so-called "military-industrial complex."

We acknowledge the fact that, in America, public business is conducted publicly. While we are annoyed when wrongdoing is so often alleged on the basis of disputes over different interpretations of rules, and generalizations are so freely made about all companies contracting with the government, that is not enough to arouse our concern. I'm sure that you of the Congress, conditioned by the rigors of debate and criticism, can't sympathize with wounded feelings alone.

We are deeply troubled, however, over what is going to result—and has begun to result—from this discontent.

Over the last 30 years there has developed a vast, intricate, ponderous system of controls and requirements calculated to protect the government against error in procurement. Mistakes nevertheless happen; bad deals are still negotiated; a few contractors do, on occasion, make sizable profits. Each time the GAO, or a congressional committee, or the press turns up a "horror story" of something that has gone wrong, there is a rush to tinker and patch the apparatus by inventing new controls, adding further procedures for both contracting officer and contractor to follow, and proclaiming additional powers of review for the government's benefit.

Most recently, as a result of relentless pressure, the Defense Department decided to initiate a policy of post-award audits of firm, fixed-price contracts.

As many of you know, the FFP contract is one in which the government and the contractor agree to a definite price in negotiations. The businessman, by signing the contract, declares his willingness to take his chances with his bid. Depending on whether his cost estimates are borne out, he may either make money or lose it. The government does *not* share in his costs and, assuredly, does *not* guarantee him a profit. Further, the government already has the right to audit the company's cost estimates before awarding the contract.

The right to audit years after negotiations is the right to rely on hindsight; to recover lost ground; to assure that the government is made "whole" regardless of what happens to the contractor.

This new policy is designed to apply to what many in public life call the "defense industry." In fact, the Comptroller General in 1963 drew a parallel between the defense industry and the public utility industry as "protected elements of the economy."

The public understanding of who com-

prises the "defense industry" is inaccurate and the parallel drawn is untrue.

I'd like to clarify this with the following thoughts.

First, our own member companies, 450 in all, range in size from five employees to 30,000—and most of them have less than 300. Some have no government business at all. Many others, either directly or in some way, design or make something that finally becomes part of equipment purchased by the government.

Virtually all our companies have in common the need to attract capital in the open market and must, therefore, generate earnings or profits. They all conduct their own, independent research and development out of funds that would otherwise be taken down as profit. This, *in fact*, is what makes our companies go.

They all have another thing in common. None of them is "protected." When they do depend mostly on orders from government agencies or large contractors to these agencies, they can expect stretchouts or outright cancellations without warning.

A small company president, whom several of you know, had to discharge over half his work force—330 people—because of such a cancellation. That happened two weeks ago. (He isn't here. He's home cleaning up the wreckage.) Is he protected? Are his 200 ex-employees protected? Are his remaining 130 employees protected?

Now, we believe that our 450 companies are pretty much like that far greater number, nationwide, who are involved in business with the government. We dispute that there is a "defense industry," unless it strictly means contractors on weapons systems.

Some of our companies do make hardware that goes directly to war. Others make scientific devices needed in other wars—like the war on cancer.

In any case, we do not fall neatly into any classification of industry so dependent on government sales that warrants price and profit fixing by the government.

In truth, no single concept of the government's relationship with its suppliers prevails. Far too many people have a hand in determining procurement policy for it to represent one person's concept or design.

The fact is, the system suffers from lack of rationality. In time of war, powers are authorized to assure the swift mobilization of industry. We readily concede the necessity of this. Further, controls are invented to guard against profiteering at a time when speed overrides caution in negotiation. We certainly do not for a minute object to sanctions on scoundrels who would try to "make a fast buck" during a national emergency.

But these powers and controls have a tendency to endure. A case in point is The Defense Production Act. Enacted during the Korean War, it has remained intact throughout each of the past 18 years. Among other things, this law empowers the President "to require acceptance and performance of . . . contracts or orders in preference to other contracts or orders by any person he finds capable of their performance."

A few weeks ago, Chairman Patman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production reported there was increasing need for use of the act's powers in 1967. Since the nation is waging war, this is not extraordinary. But, technically, since the war never began, who is to say what happens when it is concluded? Since the Defense Production Act was not suspended following the Korean War, will it be terminated when peace finally comes to Vietnam?

These questions are simple compared to the subtle issues entailed in the complex of attitudes, procedures, regulations, and contract clauses originated and shaped by wartime circumstances.

Is the relationship between government and industry different in peacetime than it is

during war? If so, how do you really define "war" and "peace"?

Are all the companies who sell to the government on the same footing? Is there really a clearly-identifiable "defense industry," composed of stereotyped companies?

We believe a careful examination will show that companies who sell to the government, and specifically, to the Defense Department, vary widely in their capital requirements, investment in R&D, reliance on technology, susceptibility to obsolescence, and, indeed, their desire to participate in that market at all.

Many of our companies have withdrawn from the defense market and confine their government sales to the "civilian" department and agencies who look to the electronic industry for instruments and systems to cope with problems in pollution, rapid transit, medicine and education. Yet, they find practices and requirements appropriate to wartime defense procurement following them as the young agencies turn to borrow, without rhyme, reason, or relevance, from DOD's "book."

If the National Institutes of Health want the most widely-used electronic measuring instruments made in America, they must obtain them through the General Services Administration. But NIH won't get them. GSA now demands of the instrument makers the same price discounts it gets on aspirin tablets, and that just can't be done. True, the government will find *some* instruments. But they will be neither the best, nor even the most appropriate, instruments in America. Further, in pursuit of "bargains", the government is apt to wind up with instruments for which no maintenance or replacement is available because the manufacturer has gone out of business.

We believe that, whether the government needs a microwave radar tube for missile detection or a laser for research in cancer treatment, it should have the most reliable, effective product available. Yet, quality producers are becoming so beleaguered by the conditions imposed on selling to the government that their shareholders are questioning not only the profitability of accepting government contracts, but the wisdom of even selling standard commercial items.

I referred at the outset of my remarks to recent congressional investigations. We do not resent these inquiries so much as we regret they do not go far enough. The system is badly in need of the deliberate, thoughtful appraisal that Congressman Hollifield and Senator Jackson advocate to be conducted by a panel similar to the Hoover Commission. In the months ahead you will pass upon legislation to create this commission.

We support this study in the confidence that our case will bear scrutiny and that the nation *can* have economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in government procurement. We solicit your help in this effort.

Thank you very much.

### Local Action Curbs Crime

## HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there can be no substitute in the fight against crime for vigorous law enforcement at the local level. In the past few weeks we have had dramatic evidence of this fact in the city of Miami, Fla., which I have the honor to represent.

Faced with a rising crime rate and a



frightening increase of violence, Miami Police Chief Walter Headley has acted quickly and decisively to discourage the thugs who are threatening the safety and security of our streets, not only in Miami but in cities across our country.

After three murders and 58 robberies on Christmas weekend, Chief Headley reacted swiftly, stepping up patrols in crime-ridden areas, increasing the effective number of policemen on the streets, and above all, arming his men with confidence by assuring them that they would be backed to the hilt in their efforts against crime.

Since the implementation of this "get tough" policy, the number of robberies and strong-armed thefts have dropped 65 percent from the December level. While it is still too early to say for sure what the long-term effects of the crack-down will be, it is already clear that what has long been known has been confirmed—that systematic, vigorous local law enforcement must be the prime ingredient in any serious effort to reduce the threat of crime in our streets.

Of course, we will never really begin to win the war against crime until we understand the causes which produce criminals and begin to effectively deal with them. The poverty program is a good beginning in this direction, but it is no substitute for forceful action against today's criminals. In the meantime, we must use what resources we do have, including police power, to safeguard the lives and property of the whole community against the violence of the few. For that reason, Chief Headley is to be commended for the steps he has taken to safeguard the citizens of Miami.

The effectiveness of Chief Headley's campaign demonstrates what could be done in each of our cities if the police were given the men, materials, and support they need to combat crime. This is especially true when it is realized that right now there are more than 50,000 vacancies on our Nation's police forces. While it is important to continue to search for ways to eradicate crime, it is crystal clear that the time has now come to begin to do something about it and I applaud Chief Headley's efforts in this regard.

### Use and Abuse of Credit Ratings

#### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last week I offered an amendment to the truth-in-lending bill which would have given an individual the right to see credit rating reports on himself, simply upon request to the credit rating agency.

Although the amendment was accepted by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the amendment was defeated on a voice vote.

One of the reasons I believe the amendment failed was an unawareness of the problems which daily are besetting many Americans because of credit rating abuses and mistakes.

Because of publicity given the amendment in the press, I have received a number of letters in support of the proposal. Several other Members of Congress also have heard from their constituents on the issue.

It is evident that far more people than one might surmise have suffered embarrassment, inconvenience, and even financial loss because of mistaken or incomplete information.

As yet another indication of rising interest in this problem, the Wall Street Journal yesterday devoted a long feature story to credit bureau operations.

The article points out that more than half a million derogatory items stemming from lawsuits are entered into the credit records of New York residents each year. Yet the disposition of the lawsuit is never recorded.

Thus, a nuisance suit, even one quickly thrown out of court, can cost an individual a good credit rating.

The credit bureaus decline responsibility saying that their reports are only advisory and that it is the creditor's responsibility to check out derogatory items. Yet it is clear that this seldom, if ever, is done.

Further, an individual denied credit on this, or other grounds, is powerless to review his own credit record to rectify mistakes.

The Journal article tells of a New York attorney and State assemblyman who was able to correct a case of mistaken identity only with tremendous effort—and outright pressure.

Today he is the author of a bill in the New York Legislature similar to mine. It would require credit bureaus in New York to supply an individual with a copy of his report upon request.

It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to introduce my proposal as a bill in the near future. This measure will be similar to my amendment, but will incorporate improvements which will make it more clear and precise in its efforts.

In order to acquaint my colleagues further on the need to establish the right to see one's own credit report, I am including in the RECORD at this point the article from the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 5, 1968]

**PRYING FOR PAY: HOW CREDIT BUREAUS COLLECT AND USE DATA ON MILLIONS OF PERSONS—CRITICS HIT SOURCES AND WIDE DISSEMINATION OF MATERIAL—SEX, DRINKING ARE CHECKED—BUT FIRMS NEED INFORMATION**

(By Stanford N. Sesser)

ATLANTA.—Some people look upon it as "Big Brother Inc." Others defend it as an essential tool for the conduct of business.

The organization at issue is Retail Credit Co., an Atlanta-based company with 1,800 offices across North America. You may not have heard of Retail Credit, but there is a good chance that it has heard of you; each year it investigates millions of Americans who apply for insurance or employment.

It has records on more than 45 million individuals, with information ranging from the size of their families to the amount of liquor they consume. A file might touch on any number of allegations, including reports of extramarital affairs and homosexuality. A total of 40,000 customers get 35 million reports from the firm each year.

The business of credit, insurance and per-

sonnel investigations is burgeoning, and Retail Credit Co., though by far the largest individual firm in the field, is only part of the industry. There is also, for example, Associated Credit Bureaus of America Inc., an affiliation of 2,200 local credit bureaus by which each bureau has access to files on 110 million persons.

#### ASSAULT ON PRIVACY?

Organizations such as Retail Credit and Associated Credit Bureaus (ACB) are pursuing their business relatively unhampered by state or Federal regulations at the same time a debate rages in Washington about a proposed National Data Bank. It would use a centralized computer system to collect information on individuals scattered through many Government files. Congressional investigators wonder if private industry isn't quietly accomplishing much the same thing—a centralization of personal and potentially harmful information.

The staffs of the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate anti-trust and monopoly subcommittee are taking a searching look at the operations of credit bureaus and insurance investigators, and many industry executives seem resigned to the prospect of eventual hearings. "I expect we'll have our day in court like everyone else," says Frederick E. King, president of Hooper-Holmes Bureau Inc., a Morristown, N.J. credit firm.

The many critics of credit investigators acknowledge the need for such organizations in today's society. The increasing use of credit cards has made the business of credit-checking more essential than ever. The critics' complaints center on the way information—or, occasionally, misinformation—is used.

Consider Credit Bureau of Greater New York Inc., the largest local bureau in the nation. This cooperatively owned organization, which does credit checks for department stores, auto-rental firms, oil companies and other large credit grantors, has records on 8.5 million persons. Its filing cabinets occupy an entire floor of an office building.

#### IN THE FILES

A typical file contains a person's address, family status, place of employment, approximate salary and credit history—where the person has charge accounts and what his payment record has been. Often there is a more controversial item: Most banks will divulge to credit bureaus the approximate size of a customer's checking account and, in rare instances, the size of his savings account.

Each year about 780,000 so-called "derogatory items" go into this vast compendium of information on New Yorkers. Some items involve nonpayment of bills. Others record court judgments. But the vast majority of them, about 550,000, are information on lawsuits gleaned from court records. One important fact—how the suits were decided—never gets recorded.

This practice can produce inequities. A woman in one Eastern city tells this tale: She ordered a rug. A carpet of the wrong color was delivered. The merchant refused to take it back and sued for payment. The suit was thrown out of court, but the woman's credit record showed only that she had been sued for nonpayment. As a result, her credit was cut off elsewhere.

"It's impossible to get the disposition of a suit," says Rudolph M. Severa, executive manager of the New York credit bureau. "It would be extremely expensive." Mr. Severa explains that each case would have to be looked up by researchers, and he says, "Our members know they should draw no conclusion from the fact that a suit has been filed. It's up to them to check into it further."

#### LOOKING INTO THE RECORD

Can a person get his credit record corrected? "We'll sit down with a person and

talk over his file in general terms," Mr. Severa says, "but we won't tell him who said what." Whether the credit organizations do recheck disputed entries is a matter of considerable debate.

Chester J. Straub, a Manhattan lawyer and New York State assemblyman, says he was turned down by a major credit card company because of an erroneous report from a credit bureau. "The entry indicated that a judgment was outstanding against me which in fact wasn't mine," he says. "It belonged to someone with a similar name."

But at the outset, all Mr. Straub knew was that he had been turned down. He went to the credit bureau. "All they would tell me was that my credit report was unfavorable," he recalls. Only after repeated telephone calls—emphasizing that he was an assemblyman—did he find out about the error.

"I'm an assemblyman," Mr. Straub notes. "What happens to the poor guy who walks in off the street with no leverage of any kind?" The incident has led him to introduce a bill that would require credit bureaus in New York to provide a person with a copy of his record.

At the Credit Bureau of Greater New York, any of the 500 employes have easy access to the 8.5 million files; so do any of the 14,000 employes of ACB affiliates across the nation. Last year ACB members exchanged more than seven million reports, largely those of persons who changed their residences.

Eventually any of ACB's 110 million files will be available to local bureaus at the touch of a button. ACB, working with International Business Machines Corp. and the Dallas and Houston credit bureaus, is designing a computerized system that it expects to become nationwide in time. A central switching system will connect computers at all local bureaus.

Credit bureau workers aren't the only ones who can look into the files. Investigators from such Federal agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the State Department get copies of more than 20,000 records from the New York bureau each year, Mr. Severa says. What are they used for? "Frankly, we don't ask the Government what they're doing," Mr. Severa says. "We don't feel that's our prerogative."

With equal ease, Government agencies can get copies of insurance investigation reports by visiting Retail Credit or Hooper-Holmes, whose combined files contain information on 54 million persons who at some time have applied for insurance. "The FBI can do just about anything they want to do," says Mr. King of Hooper-Holmes. "They're constantly in our files."

#### THE SENSITIVE FILES

If the information in credit records is potentially troublesome, the allegations in insurance inspection files can be devastating. Credit bureaus concentrate on financial and legal information, but the insurance companies are interested in what they call "moral hazards"—extramarital affairs, homosexuality, heavy drinking or other aberrations that could lead to violence, blackmail, accidents or death. Some insurance companies won't write policies for persons they believe to be homosexuals.

"When someone accuses you of violating their privacy when you investigate them—yes, you are invading their privacy, there's no question about it," Mr. King acknowledges. But, he adds, "That person has initiated a request to the insurance company to gamble thousands of dollars on him."

And how does an inspector go about obtaining this delicate information? Mr. King candidly describes the procedure with a married man suspected of an extramarital affair. "You go to a neighbor and establish rapport," he says. "Then you ask, 'What's your opinion of X's home life; how do you think of him as a family man?' This will usually elicit

some hint—through the expression on their faces or the way they answer. Then you start digging. You press them as far as they go, and if they become recalcitrant, you go somewhere else. If you go to enough people, you get it."

Homosexuality, Mr. King concedes, "is one of the most difficult things to determine." But he points out, "If you have that sixth sense that something is wrong, you dig. The tipoff is their mode of living, their circle of friends and the organizations they belong to." Is it fair to simply report the suspicions of neighbors? "We won't say he's homosexual," Mr. King replies. "We'll report, for example, that certain people feel he has homosexual tendencies."

#### JUST COLLECTING INFORMATION

In defense of the system, Mr. King says information won't be recorded unless it is reported by more than one source. Even when it is recorded, Hooper-Holmes doesn't "make judgments," he says. "We're just reporting what we have in our files."

Almost any plausible customer can get access to the files of Retail Credit or Hooper-Holmes. Charles M. Watt, vice president and secretary of Retail Credit, says material from the insurance files may be used when a prospective employer calls about a job applicant. And another Retail Credit executive notes that the company will handle as few as 10 investigations for a customer a year; thus small customers as well as large can delve into the files.

There is one notable exception to the generally easy access—the person who wants to see his own record. Retail Credit won't even confirm that it has done a report on a person. This, Mr. Watt says, is to avoid lawsuits. If a person raises a question about his record, he is invited to write a statement about whatever may be bothering him, and, says Mr. Watt, "we tell him if we did a report, we'll send the statement to anyone who asked about him."

In some quarters of the industry, there is concern about inaccurate and freely disclosed information. Credit Data Corp., a rapidly growing, computerized company whose biggest customers are New York and California banks, won't let Government agencies look at its files without a subpoena. "We're very sympathetic to the people who are concerned with the invasion of privacy," says Harry C. Jordan, president. Such invasion, he is convinced, occurs "not because of a computer but because of unauthorized access to the data."

Dale L. Reistad, an official of the American Bankers Association, said recently that bankers should demonstrate concern over "some obvious intrusions into individual privacy today." He proposes a "consumer-oriented" credit bureau whose files would be organized by identification number rather than name.

A person would carry an ID card, for presentation to a merchant seeking a credit report. The report would be a "mathematical credit score" that would add up all relevant factors on a standardized basis. The merchant wouldn't find out the person's salary, bank balance or other personal data. And finally, the person would be guaranteed the right to review his own credit listing.

**Jacob Palmer: Prince Georges County  
Civic Leader**

#### HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding civic leaders in Prince

Georges County, Jacob P. Palmer, recently passed away after a long and productive life.

As president of the Prince Georges County Civic Federation since 1963, and vice president the decade preceding his presidency, Mr. Palmer provided leadership that was responsible, creative and of untold benefit to the people and government of Prince Georges County.

At this point I wish to insert a news article from the Washington Evening Star of January 24, 1968:

[From the Washington Evening Star,  
Jan. 24, 1968]

#### JACOB G. PALMER DIES—CIVIC FEDERATION LEADER

Jacob G. Palmer, 65, Washington field superintendent for the Home Beneficial Life Insurance Co. and active in Prince Georges County civic work, died yesterday at Prince Georges General Hospital.

He lived at 6316 Landover Road, Landover. He had been president of the Prince Georges County Civic Federation since 1963 and vice president for the 10 preceding years.

#### BORN IN VIRGINIA

Mr. Palmer's career in insurance began 35 years ago with the Washington National Life Insurance Co. Since the mid-1940s, he had been with Home Beneficial.

Mr. Palmer was born in Waynesboro, Va. He was reared and educated in Prince Georges.

In his 20s, Mr. Palmer worked at switching stations for the Pennsylvania Railroad for 10 years.

He began his civic activity in the Landover Civic Association, which he served as president in the late 1940s. As president of the Prince Georges County Civic Federation he also belonged to the Inter-Federation Council for the Washington Metropolitan Area.

#### ELDER IN CHURCH

Mr. Palmer was an elder of the Eastminster Presbyterian Church in Bladensburg, and a member of the Westgate Masonic Lodge A.F.&A.M. No. 220 in Mount Rainier.

He leaves his wife, Martha; three sons, Dr. John G. of Laurel, Leonard M. of 3700 64th Ave., Landover, and Thomas P. of Seaford, Va.; eight grandchildren, and a brother, R. L. Palmer of Houston, Texas.

Friends may call from 7 to 9 p.m. today and after 10 a.m. tomorrow at Gasch's funeral home, 4739 Baltimore Ave., Hyattsville.

Services will be at 11 a.m. Friday at the Eastminster Presbyterian Church, 56th Place and Randolph Street, Bladensburg. Burial will be in Fort Lincoln Cemetery.

**Congressman Claude Pepper Introduces  
H.R. 15101, a Bill To Improve Employee-Management Relations in the  
Federal Service**

#### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government employs almost 3 million civilians. Naturally we all have a sense of pride in the accomplishments of our Nation's largest employer, but we must also recognize that the Federal Government has frequently been accused of engaging in unfair labor practices.



These accusations against a Government that we would all prefer to see paraded as a model employer is not an unfounded criticism; it is true that there is still no legislation in existence which establishes a firm labor-management policy for public employees.

For this reason, I have introduced legislation which would correct this deplorable state of affairs. This proposal, H.R. 15101, would set clear and precise guidelines for stable and lasting employee-management relations procedures.

This legislation is needed and has been needed for quite some time. Several well-respected groups have commented about the Government's personnel management problems since the end of World War II. Among these groups have been the members of the first Hoover Commission and the special committee on labor relations of the American Bar Association.

The Hoover Commission included the following observations in its report released in 1949, a few years following World War II:

The Government has lagged behind American industry in improving employer-employee relations.

Federal employees, while given some degree of protection against abuse, discrimination, and unjust treatment, are not provided a positive opportunity to participate in the formulation of policies and practices which affect their welfare.

The President should require the heads of departments to provide for employee participation in the formulation and improvement of Federal personnel policies and practices.

Six years later the American Bar Association's committee similarly commented:

The special legal status claimed for government as an employer which placed gov-

ernmental employees in a less advantageous position than private employees in the area of management-labor relations is an apparent anachronism.

This anachronism has been somewhat alleviated since 1962. During that year, President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988 which sought to begin a new era in employee-management relations in the Federal civil service. Dated January 17, 1962, the Executive order set forth a policy outlining the responsibilities of employees and administrative officials; it was a set of directives long-needed.

Executive orders, however, no matter how helpful and concise, do not provide the strong and lasting impact of enacted legislation. Important topics such as those involving numerous employees and general governmental policy should bear the legislative stamp of approval.

This legislation, H.R. 15101, includes a declaration of policy that is an excellent summary of policy for any progressive business enterprise. The declaration reads as follows:

Participation of employees with management through employee organizations or unions in decisions which affect them, contributes to the effective conduct of the public business. Therefore, strong, democratically run employee organizations or unions are in the public interest and their development should be encouraged by lawful means.

The right of officers or representatives of a union or organization of Government employees representing the employees of a department or agency or subdivision of such department or agency to present grievances in behalf of their members without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal is recognized and encouraged. Violation of such right on the part of an administrative official shall be cause for his suspension or removal or such other punitive action as the head of the department or agency may deem advisable.

After this declaration, the bill sets forth the specifics of obtaining good employee-management relations. Most of the responsibility for carrying out the provisions are given to the Secretary of Labor, and specific procedures for the settlement of differing opinions are clearly laid down.

When problems arise which cannot be settled through regular channels, either party would be permitted to invoke the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. If such efforts would fail, either party could then turn to the services of the Government Labor-Management Relations Panel. This Panel would be composed of a chairman, an executive secretary, and from four to six additional members, most of whom would be appointed by the President, and would not be otherwise employed by the Federal Government. This Panel could hold hearings if they themselves could not first help the parties arrive at a settlement, and following these hearings, the Panel's decision would be binding.

It seems to me that these provisions are helpful and necessary. As the needs of our Nation continue to expand, our dependence on the public servants responsible for our communication process through the mails and for administering various economic and social programs will continue to increase. A firm and stable legislative set of guidelines covering our Government's employee-management relations is therefore mandatory.

Let us work together to make charges of "unfair labor practices" in the Federal Government into a past-tense phrase useful only in our history books.

I, therefore, urge the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to conduct the necessary legislative hearings to make this long-overdue legislation a reality.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 7, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. C. Fred Williams, D.D., minister, Central Methodist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

*Humble yourselves under God's mighty hand, that He may lift you up in His own good time.*—I Peter 5: 6 (Good News for Modern Man).

O God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, remind us of our dependence upon Thee. Remind us also that Thou dost depend upon us.

Thou who are the guardian of our souls, and the Guide of our pilgrim way, have mercy upon us. Forgive us for surrender to the idols and the half-gods which command us; save us from arrogance and from national vanity; protect us from obsession with pomp and power.

Deliver us from conformity to easy answers; save us from rashness in speech and from hastiness in conduct. Keep us sensitive to Thy will, with our ears keen, amid the clamor of a noisy day.

Grant that our motives and methods may be seasoned by the spirit of Him who went about doing good. May we shun

the condescending pose. Give to us, a favored nation, the desire and the judgment to be an answer to the world's needs, instead of adding to its tragedy.

In our moments of quietness, may we hear a voice, saying:

"Though the road be long and dreary  
And the end far out of sight,  
Tread it bravely, strong or weary,  
Trust in God and do the right."

Thus, do we pray as citizens, lawmakers, and humble servants of God. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 14743

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have cleared this with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the ranking minority member on the Banking and Currency Committee, and it is satisfactory with him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the gold bill, H.R. 14743, reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

### SCOUTING HELPS THE COUNTRY "BE PREPARED"

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House