

eral service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 15675. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 15676. A bill to modify certain insured student loan programs to make loans more generally available to students in need thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 15677. A bill to provide hospital insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act for persons entitled to disability insurance benefits under title II of such act or to annuities for disability under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 15678. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, and the salaries of judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 15679. A bill to amend section 11-1701 of the District of Columbia Code relating to retirement of certain judges of the courts of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 15680. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 15681. A bill to consolidate and revise foreign assistance legislation relating to reimbursable military exports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 15682. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 15683. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15684. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State poultry products inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 15685. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that educational allowances for flight training be paid on a monthly basis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 15686. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 15687. A bill to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 15688. A bill to extend the executive reorganization provisions of title 5, United States Code, for an additional 4 years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 15689. A bill to authorize a study of the decentralization of certain departments and agencies in the executive branch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 15690. A bill to reserve certain public

lands for a National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15691. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, in regard to the obligation of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 15692. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increased pensions, disability compensation rates, to liberalize income limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 15693. A bill to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. RESNICK, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.R. 15694. A bill to enable potato growers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for potatoes by increasing consumer acceptance of such potatoes and potato products and by improving the quality of potatoes and potato products that are made available to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 15695. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities by the producers thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.J. Res. 1141. Joint resolution proposing 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. FARBERSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 1142. Joint resolution authorizing a study of the feasibility of establishing a JudiCorps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.J. Res. 1143. 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. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 1144. 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. STEPHENS:

H.J. Res. 1145. 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. WATKINS:

H. Con. Res. 666. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the rotation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States in their assignments to serve in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H. Res. 1078. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the relief of Lt. Comdr. Marcus Arnheiter and Capt. Richard G. Alexander; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 1079. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the relief of Lt. Comdr. Marcus Arnheiter and Capt. Richard G. Alexander; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Res. 1080. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the relief of Lt. Comdr. Marcus Arnheiter and Capt. Richard G. Alexander; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

312. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the continental shelf fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

313. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, relative to enacting legislation cited as the Safe Street and Crime Control Act of 1967; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 15696. A bill for the relief of Pyon Chun Cha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 15697. A bill for the relief of Anthony Galluccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 15698. A bill for the relief of Guerino Allevato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 15699. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Benito Lagueruela y Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 15700. A bill for the relief of Mee June Wong, Chee Wing Yuen, Suet Yi Yuen, Wai Kwong Yuen, Pui Yee Yuen, and Man Yee Yuen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 15701. A bill for the relief of C. M. Nance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 15702. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. DeMichiel and his spouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 15703. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frida Fallas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 15704. A bill for the relief of Luis Richardo Britos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15705. A bill for the relief of Alberto

Rogue Jarmi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15706. A bill for the relief of Edgardo

Jorge Munoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 15707. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alberto Furelli, and their children, Franca, and Concesione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15708. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Rosa Penati, and her two children, Mario and Paolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

252. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Laszlo Steurer, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, Germany, relative to renunciation of U.S. citizenship, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Drug Abuse: The Growing Menace

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, many of us are increasingly concerned by the alarming growth of the illicit drug traffic in this country. Large quantities of extremely dangerous drugs are being manufactured and sold illegally. Most importantly, these drugs are being successfully touted to our youth, with no mention of the risks involved or the ultimate price to be paid. Two newspaper articles have come to my attention: one, an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune; and the other, an article from the Washington Daily News, which I believe are pertinent to this subject and will be of interest to all Members.

The articles follow:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Feb. 25, 1968]

NEW LSD DEFINITION: LAWS SOON DUE

"Taking a trip" may soon mean in a Paddy Wagon, if Congress and the Louisiana Legislature pass bills outlawing both possession and use of the hallucinogenic drug LSD.

Current federal statutes forbid only possession of LSD for sale—an act classified a misdemeanor, subject to \$1,000 fine and up to a year in jail, with no need to prove interstate commerce because of a 1965 law citing such central nervous systems drugs as a burden on interstate commerce.

Federal agents relate highway dangers and disasters from LSD-doped drivers. The drug's advocates have tried to minimize these aspects by comparing highway death statistics on liquor-intoxicated drivers. A key distinction needed here, however, is that it is the mere use—not abuse—of LSD that creates the driving hazards.

A 1966 Louisiana statute dealing with use of LSD ran afoul because of a typographical error tagging it Title 14 instead of Title 40. Early in 1967 a bill of information was quashed in favor of a 23-year-old man charged with supplying LSD to a New Orleans coed, who police said, crashed her car into a French Market stand and then attempted to commit suicide by jumping into the Mississippi while under the drug's influence.

State Rep. Arthur A. Crais said he was unsuccessful in getting a new LSD measure admitted into last year's fiscal legislative session but would submit one for certain in the coming session.

Meanwhile, U.S. Reps. Hale Boggs and Speedy O. Long of Louisiana both announced plans for new federal legislation dealing with LSD, presumably to stiffen penalties for its sale and extend them to possession for use. Both solons termed LSD a "growing menace" to the young, who succumb to the tempting thrill "just one time" and soon find themselves sliding into a wasted life in the grips of more powerful drugs.

Drug authorities have tagged LSD for altering chromosomes which may cause the birth of deformed babies; and a nationwide poll has indicated about 10 per cent of college students have tuned in on the wild color carnival that LSD conjures up.

In the same month the case involving the New Orleans coed was quashed, a University of California coed plunged nude to her death, shattering the closed window of her third-

floor apartment. Police quoted the girl's acquaintance to the effect she was on an LSD trip.

Hopefully, stiffer state and federal penalties for those who traffic as a racket in such hallucinogenic drugs, and as added deterrents to would-be victims of LSD pushers, will be successful tools to curtail the "growing menace" or cart off hard-core offenders for longer "trips" to view less colorful prison walls.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 29, 1968]

ARLINGTON STUDENT VIEW: ALL THEY TALK ABOUT IS POT

(By Jack Vitek)

The growing use of marijuana and more potent and dangerous drugs in Arlington high schools comes as no surprise to many students there. They have watched it blossom in recent months and have heard it discussed in casual and frequent conversations over lunch.

Arlington Det. Charles Bonneville broke the story of the crisis Tuesday when he told a P-TA meeting at Williamsburg Junior High that police had the names of 50 known drug users in Arlington's three high schools. The story was exclusively reported by The Washington Daily News.

Det. Bonneville explained that police had not arrested the 50 known users "because we are concentrating on the pushers." He also pointed out a growing trend toward "speed" (methadrine) and "acid" (LSD) in the schools and added, "there's probably a little bit of heroin. I know it's available." Drugs are easily bought and sold between classes, during lunch and after school, he said.

MOVE UP FROM BEER

Knowledgeable Arlington high school students tend to confirm the police fears.

The drug scene in Arlington's three high schools began picking up last November, one student told The News, "when the beer-drinking crowd started on marijuana" and then moved thru the hippie faction "to some of the students you wouldn't expect to use the stuff—the clean-cut ones."

"Speed" and "acid" are becoming popular now, he said, adding, "three weeks ago I heard of a kid mainlining heroin. A couple of days ago I heard of two more."

The youth estimated the number of marijuana and other drug users in his school at 200, adding that he thought the situation was about the same in Arlington's other two high schools.

TWO FACTIONS

He said students converse quite openly about their habits. "They all sit together at one table during lunch and all they talk about is pot—the new users, their hallucinations, their parties," he said.

"In fact, drugs are the number one topic with everybody. The straights sit at the other end of the table and talk about how much they hate the stuff."

This boy said he has seen students making "payoffs" for drugs, taking pills (amphetamines) between classes and smoking marijuana "in broad daylight" across the street from his school. He said some of the students use motel rooms for marijuana parties.

NO PUSHERS THO

There are no real pushers, the student observed. "It's all students—that's why the movement has been so effective and gone so far."

Drug usage is now diminishing, the student indicated, because "the cops have

caught on. They're really cracking down." He said he didn't think the school faculty has been aware of the widespread use of drugs there until recently.

Aggression

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freedom's Real Enemy—Not War But Aggression," written by Dr. George S. Reamey, and published in the Virginia Methodist Advocate of February 8, 1968.

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

FREEDOM'S REAL ENEMY—NOT WAR BUT AGGRESSION

Whenever churchmen, particularly of high rank, meet in conference, sooner or later the topic under discussion turns to the very important matter of War and Peace. This is as it should be, for the peril of war and the constant threats of further war are heavy burdens to be borne.

As this editor reads the frequent news reports from church meetings, he often wonders if these discussions, and their inevitable resolutions sent to Washington, are not usually quite short-sighted! The ecclesiastical discussion usually centers on the "rightness" or "wrongness" of war as an instrument of national policy, and it is not surprising that the normal conclusion is that war is wrong, and even if it is ever right, the present American engagement in Vietnam is wrong. Some misguided clerics go so far as to encourage young men to burn their draft cards and to refuse to bear arms, even in response to governmental order.

Has not the time long since come for our entire nation—not only the clergy but all citizens of good will—to recognize much more clearly than we seem to do, just what is Freedom's global problem? Is it simply a matter of whether or not it is ethical to use force to gain one's ends? Is this merely an American problem? Is any single nation divinely appointed to assume full responsibility for the safety of the whole world?

If recent history is any guide, it would appear that there is small need for argument to affirm that the problem of freedom-lovers throughout the world is largely condensed in a single word—Aggression! Russia's dominant aim is, and has been for years, World Conquest through Aggression! And the communist conspiracy is world-wide, China and North Vietnam are involved. Tito in Yugoslavia has his own home-grown variety of "socialism" (communism), and so the story goes.

Interestingly enough, communist aggression frequently means war, but not a war that often engages their own armies. Russia has a huge army, and planes and guns and bombs, but they are sufficiently versatile to further their aims on a global scale without direct military engagement of their own! (To be sure, they are spending, reportedly, five or six billions a year in military supplies to North Vietnam, and additional billions to aid the Arabs, but their own armies are not fighting.) The Russian army doesn't have to

fight, but communist leadership is subtle enough to see that American forces are wearing themselves down in armed conflict! And now they seem to be extending the war to Korea with the capture by North Korea of the intelligence ship Pueblo, and also in the Mediterranean.

With aggression as Freedom's enemy, the first question is, shall freemen simply acquiesce and refuse to defend themselves because war is immoral? Just how moral is aggression? How ethical is human slavery?

The second, and equally important question is, are there no effective means of opposing aggression aside from military conflict? If there are, our leadership in Washington has been quite derelict in discovering what they are, and in using them effectively! This is not here stated as a partisan, political comment. (Others may so speak if they desire.) Russia has long shown us that national ends can be achieved by other means than armed conflict. Are they wiser, more versatile than we? We wonder.

Without elaboration—for extended comment here is not needed—let us mention at least four other methods of dealing with international problems than that of military might; then raise the question, why cannot we make larger use of these?

1. The first method that will occur to some—but one that is not too highly regarded by others except as a sounding board—is the United Nations.

2. Usual channels of international diplomacy through our ambassadorships in the several capitals, and related officials.

3. Joint action of freedom-loving nations, and not isolated action by one self-appointed nation to police the world. It would appear that before this nation, or any other, assumed responsibility for world order, it would recognize the importance of getting as many as possible of the free nations of the world to unite with it in determined resistance to world-wide aggression. Instead we have managed to alienate one nation after another until there is a question as to whether we really have any friends anywhere! Normal channels of diplomacy appear to have signally failed us, possibly because of our use of them is out-of-step with the world of today, and needs urgent renewal and change.

Well, what could these free nations do that is not now being done? One answer can be stated in a single word or two: Organized Boycott! Have no dealings of any kind with aggressor nations or with nations who have dealings with them, and let the world know just why this is being done. A boycott can be a far more useful instrument than armed conflict! Only after all other means have failed, should war be resorted to under any conditions!

4. Most important of all, and yet one that is difficult for even Christians to believe, is: prayer. If Christians of the world could be organized and led to pray earnestly and regularly that God will open the way for communist leadership to be reached with the love and forgiveness of Christ, who knows what might happen? This way might prove difficult, slow, discouraging at times, but if God is in it, and if He is for us, who can be against us?

Russian communists are not only "masters of deceit," as J. Edgar Hoover describes them, but they are masters of infiltration where they accomplish much of their dirty work. But cannot infiltration also be used in a Christian sense? Suppose Christians in the so-called freedom-loving nations were so led, they could and doubtless would wield considerable influence in leading their respective nations to join in a united boycott of communism, and at the same time lead their people in united prayer for the guidance of God that communist leadership everywhere may find God. And while they are praying, they might well include in their petitions to high heaven the leaders of all the nations of earth,

many of whom seem to have but slight knowledge of the ways of God with men!

A Shocking Report on U.S. Foreign Aid

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosures of waste and inefficiency in our foreign aid program, shocking and incredible as they are, regrettably come as no great surprise. The American people have grown accustomed to revelations of this kind. In his message to Congress on February 8, just a few days ago, the President assured us that our aid program is "further improving and streamlining its overall operations." In his foreign aid message last year the President intoned:

Every American citizen is entitled to know that his tax dollar is spent wisely.

Both of these sentences appear under paragraphs of these annual messages captioned "Efficient Administration," which is incidentally perhaps the smallest section in either statement. Yet all the lofty humanitarianism that is spoken in behalf of this program is meaningless unless the actual operation of the program is free from mismanagement and fraud.

This thought has prompted me in part to use my vote on foreign aid legislation in recent years as a protest, hopefully, to encourage the reforms that are obviously needed. In a recent editorial appearing in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., on February 19, 1968, some very cogent comments are made on this subject which I believe should be of interest to all the Members of this House and I, therefore, include it in the RECORD:

A SHOCKING REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN AID

Since the end of World War II it has been the custom of U.S. presidents to accompany their requests for multi-billion-dollar foreign aid appropriations with statements that virtually every penny is vital to the interests of America and the free world.

But Congress has sometimes appropriated less than requested without noticeable, much less catastrophic, effect.

Moreover, there have been many reports of shocking waste and mismanagement which means that far more money has been spent than necessary to achieve the proper objectives of the foreign aid program.

Another report detailing both waste and laxity in U.S. foreign aid was made public last week.

Findings by State Department investigators have a familiar ring. They range from a Vietnam businessman's attempt to buy howitzer and anti-aircraft gun parts for the Viet Cong to purchase of champagne glasses and gourmet foods for the Dominican Republic.

Assuming that the glasses were used, we wonder who paid for the champagne.

This item is likely to be of particular interest to American taxpayers who are unable to afford either champagne or luxury foods.

The report, prepared at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the State Department's inspector general of foreign assistance, also listed these findings:

Eighteen large crates of tools en route to

Paraguay sat for nine years on a Buenos Aires dock.

A shipment of 150 tons of bridge components went from Tokyo to Bangkok, Thailand, by air instead of ship because of an administrative slipup.

A total of \$100,000—\$490 a day—was spent for water service to Saigon ships with not a drop ever delivered.

Sixteen tons of chains for Pakistan were found on a Weehawken, N.J., dock where they'd been sitting since 1965.

American dollars were spent in several countries, contributing to the dollar drain, while the U.S. government held surplus amounts of local currency.

The new disclosures are regarded as an added threat to the aid program's \$3 billion proposed budget, already having rough sledding in Congress.

It also could weaken the force of President Johnson's appeal for prompt enactment of his proposed 10 per cent income tax surcharge which he claims is needed to pay for part of "your extraordinary defense costs" and to curb inflation.

If the funds wasted in the foreign aid program were available for other purposes, there obviously would be less need for another increase in the tax burden.

Sen. Hugh Scott, R-Pa., said the report on foreign aid makes essential the approval of his proposal for a special commission to improve foreign aid operations.

"The aid program is very much in need of an overhauling to protect the taxpayer," Scott said.

We agree and so, we are confident, do the vast majority of this country's taxpayers.

Tribute to Lt. Col. Lloyd "Scooter" Burke

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes we take for granted persons with whom we have daily contact without recognizing outstanding contributions they have made to our country and society. It is my pleasure today to bring to the attention of the House the tremendous deeds accomplished by one of our friends in the Army Liaison Office, Lt. Col. Lloyd "Scooter" Burke.

Colonel Burke has performed his duties as Army liaison officer in an especially fine fashion and I am confident that every congressional office that has called upon him for service has been more than pleased with the assistance he has given. It is only fitting that the military record of Colonel Burke be presented to the Nation in order that we all recognize the valor and devotion to duty which this great soldier has performed for his country.

Colonel Burke is a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor and I set forth the citation which explains in detail the incident which earned him this highest of medals:

First Lieutenant Lloyd L. Burke, XXXXXX Infantry, Company G, 5th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, distinguished himself by conspicuous gallantry and outstanding courage above and beyond the call of duty in action against the enemy near Chong-dong, Korea, on 28 October 1951. Intense enemy fire had pinned down leading elements of his

company committed to secure commanding ground when Lieutenant Burke left the command post to rally and urge the men to follow him toward three bunkers impeding the advance. Dashing to an exposed vantage point he threw several grenades at the bunkers, then, returning for an M1 rifle and adapter, he made a lone assault, wiping out the position and killing the crew. Closing on the center bunker he lobbed grenades through the opening and, with his pistol, killed three of its occupants attempting to surround him. Ordering his men forward he charged the third emplacement, catching several grenades in midair and hurling them back at the enemy. Inspired by his display of valor his men stormed forward, overran the hostile position, but were again pinned down by increased fire. Securing a light machinegun and three boxes of ammunition, Lieutenant Burke dashed through the impact area to an open knoll, set up his gun and poured a crippling fire into the ranks of the enemy, killing approximately 75. Although wounded, he ordered more ammunition, reloading and destroying two mortar emplacements and a machinegun position with his accurate fire. Cradling the weapon in his arms he then led his men forward, killing some 25 more of the retreating enemy and securing the objective. Lieutenant Burke's heroic action and daring exploits inspired his small force of 300 troops. His unflinching courage and outstanding leadership reflect the highest credit upon himself, the infantry, and the United States Army.

In addition to the Medal of Honor, Colonel Burke has been awarded every combat decoration for valor that this grateful country can bestow. He has also been awarded the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Gold Star.

Lieutenant Colonel "Scooter" Burke, a veteran of service in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, is an outstanding example of the type of officer now providing leadership for our great Military Establishment. All of us, I am sure, are honored to know him as a friend and wish him every success in his future life.

Rusby, Ambassador for Peace

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a deserving tribute has been paid to Mr. Paul G. Rusby for his selfless work as a food-for-peace officer in India by the Patriot, a local newspaper serving his home area in Fleetwood, Pa.

Mr. Rusby is the son of a prominent, respected and dedicated college professor, whom I am privileged to know as a constituent and as a personal friend.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the editorial published recently in the Patriot, Kutztown, Berks County, Pa.:

RUSBY, AMBASSADOR FOR PEACE

We can be genuinely proud of our Paul G. Rusby, 43, Fleetwood, recently cited in New Delhi, India, by none other than Ambassador Chester Bowles.

The award of merit was given for his selfless work as acting Food-for-Peace officer last summer, helping to avert a starvation threat to 15 million Indians.

When the \$25 million foodstuff donations began to arrive at Indian ports, Rusby kept a close watch on distribution in various

drought areas. And that close vigilance should dispel doubts that "The food doesn't get there," "It rots on the docks," "It gets into the black market."

We helped to make that distribution possible, through AID (our U.S. Agency for International Development) by which Rusby is employed. We contributed through Lutheran World Relief, Church World Service, Catholic Relief Service and Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE).

Rusby's parents live in Fleetwood. His father, Paul Rusby, is a retired professor of economics, Albright college. His wife is the former Sheroo Motivala, of Bombay. Their son, Paul, five, was born in Saigon, and their daughter Shireen, three, in Daka, East Pakistan.

Sincere congratulations to our Ambassador for Peace.

May we here at home continue to contribute to relief agencies and to believe in "close watch" distribution.

Address by Vicente T. Ximenes, Chairman, Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, Before the Interagency Advisory Group of the Civil Service Commission, February 14, 1968

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Vicente T. Ximenes, chairman of the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, before the Interagency Advisory Group of the Civil Service Commission on February 14, 1968:

Chairman Macy, Mr. Oganovic, Members of the Interagency Advisory Group, Equal Employment Opportunity Officers, and Coordinators for Federal Women's Programs, I am extremely pleased to join you today.

I wish to recognize, here and now, the personal interest taken by Chairman Macy in the matter of employment opportunities for the minority groups of our nation. I am delighted that he attended the Cabinet Level Hearings in El Paso last October and that he has followed through with meaningful implementation of some of the recommendations made at those hearings.

Not many years ago, no one would have considered a meeting to discuss the employment problems of the Mexican American. As a matter of fact, even the composition of this ethnic group was unclear and some confusion still remains. Perhaps, to start with, we should clear away some debris of terminology. For purposes of our discussion I will use the term "Mexican American" to identify approximately 6 to 6½ million people who are concentrated in five Southwestern states, but who have also migrated into the Northwest, Midwest and even parts of the East. The Mexican American may be a descendant of the Spanish explorers Cortez, Cabeza de Baca or Coronado. Or he may have recently immigrated from Mexico and may very well be a descendant of Montezuma.

There are others in the United States who have the same features, background, language, and surnames, but who are not Mexican American. For example, there are Puerto Ricans, Spanish Americans (from Spain), Central Americans (from Costa Rica, Panama, Etc.), and South Americans. There are also Indians in the Southwest who bear similar

features, speak Spanish, and have a Spanish surname, but who are not necessarily Mexican Americans. Although all the above groups may rightfully wish to be identified as something other than Mexican American, they have all shared the same problems and experiences as citizens of the United States. My discussion is intended to apply to all Spanish surnamed groups even though I will use the Mexican American handle.

In many respects, the Mexican American experience has not been a happy one. Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez drew on the essence of that experience when he said that "If you are hungry, hope itself is a distant thing; and if you are defeated, promises of better things to come ring empty. If yours is a world of dirt floors and tin roofs, tomorrow holds no promises and your greatest ambition is to live through today."

For too long, America accepted the Mexican Americans as people who lived in "barrios," or the poorest and oldest sections of town, and who held the menial jobs that were available. The first grade teacher knew the Mexican American children as her most annoying charges. They could not follow class instructions given, of course, in English, and they were seemingly the least motivated to learn.

They were the youths who came unprepared to speak English and they usually dropped out of school and loitered on the corner for want of something better to do. Not many Mexican Americans made it to high school and fewer still ever took part in a student council election, or were asked to join the national honor societies or were given good citizenship awards at school assemblies.

It seems that very few citizens wondered why almost an entire ethnic group fell steadily behind in the progress of America. If they did question it, they most often concluded that, as a people, the Mexican Americans could simply achieve no more. It rarely occurred to them that they should examine the system for possible causes.

The Federal government was not much more enlightened. Little official notice was taken of the Mexican American community's economic and social patterns as they emerged from the Census statistics. Few Federal officials realized that, in the government itself, programs and institutions were not functioning for the Mexican American as they were for others.

The years passed and changes came about. Our country entered into the Age of Civil Rights—engendered by the despair of the Negro population. Studies were made and comparisons drawn among the minorities. Census figures were examined more closely. Rather indirectly, our government began to realize the conditions of the Mexican American community. It learned that—

Approximately 5 million Mexican Americans reside in the Southwest where only one-sixth of our Country's entire population lives, but where one-fourth of America's poor can be found.

The Mexican American community ranked below any other ethnic group, except the American Indian, in the number of school years completed; over one-fourth had completed less than 5 years of schooling; and, among children of school age, the community had the largest number of dropouts.

Whereas the reported unemployment rate in the United States was between 3.7 and 4%, a Department of Labor 1966 survey of slums in Phoenix, Arizona, and San Antonio, Texas, indicated much higher rates for both areas. In the slum neighborhoods of San Antonio where over 114,000 people live, 84% are Mexican American and the unemployment rate is 8%—twice that of the national average. In the Salt River Bed areas of Phoenix where some 10,000 families reside the unemployment rate is 13.2%—almost four times the national average.

Measuring unemployment beyond the "traditional" terms which exclude the special problems of limited employment, low wage employment, and completely defeated people, who no longer seek jobs the Department of Labor found that one out of every two residents of the San Antonio slum had a serious employment problem and the same held true for more than four out of every 10 residents of the Phoenix area. Almost three-fourths of these people had not graduated from high school and nearly half had not gone beyond the 8th grade.

The causes as summarized by the Department closely coincide with the opinion of the subemployed themselves. The report concludes that the problem is "a matter of personal rather than economic condition. No conceivable increase in the gross national product would stir these backwaters. The problem is less one of inadequate opportunity than of inability, under existing conditions, to use opportunity. Unemployment in these areas is primarily a story of inferior education, no skills, discrimination, unnecessarily rigid hiring practices, and hopelessness."

Concerned by these facts which were bolstered by personal knowledge, President Johnson completed the process of involvement for the Federal government. The President determined that our government can and will lead the way toward bringing the Mexican American community into the good life that our country offers. He has brought us to the point at which we now find ourselves.

To accomplish this task will take all our determination. For, if the unemployment rates are alarming, the prospects for the employed Mexican American are not very bright. In a 1966 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission survey of private industry and in the 1966 Civil Service Commission report on minority employment in our government, the Mexican American employees are found to be in the less skilled and lower-paid jobs. Private industry, municipal, state and Federal institutions are all guilty on this point. For example, the

Department of Agriculture reported 93,260 world wide identified employees of which 32,979 held GS 9-18 level positions. Of these 32,979, only 140 were Mexican American.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development had 7,475 high level slots, 26 of which were held by Mexican Americans.

The Selective Service had no Mexican Americans in top level assignments.

The Department of Justice had 501 Mexican Americans out of a total force of 30,548. Out of a total of 11,695 positions, only 62 were occupied by Mexican Americans.

The 1967 preliminary reports from governmental agencies are somewhat more encouraging, but we have a very long way to go in the area of equal employment for Mexican Americans.

Today, you have asked me to make recommendations as to how we can brighten this picture and remove the obstacles hampering the progress of the Mexican American community. I have, therefore, come prepared with recommendations from the community itself.

First, we must make contact with and appoint more Spanish surnamed Americans to positions of decision, policy-making, implementation and programming in our government. It may well be that the future success of our employment programs and all other governmental efforts that touch on the life of Mexican Americans depends on the personnel making the policy and carrying it through. The most repeated and urgent demand made in El Paso by the participants was for more outreach and better understanding by the government. For this we need the talents of Mexican Americans in high level posts. Further we need the capabilities of Mexican Americans who, if they are not interested in leaving their professions for government service, can be ap-

pointed as consultants and advisors for government programs in every field from personnel through community development. Another source of talented manpower is the young Mexican American college graduate. In the past we have neglected to reach out and bring him into government work and, consequently, we have lost out on developing the future expertise that our country needs. It is here, in the professional brackets, that our government can and must exert the highest kind of leadership—make it stand—set an example: for there is no such thing as not being able to find a "qualified" Mexican American. There are most certainly Mexican Americans who did manage to acquire an education and very high qualifications.

Our second concern is the up-grading and mobility of Mexican Americans who already are employed by the government. The primary considerations of the community are the need for improved employee-management relations, the need to examine procedures relating to promotions, the need to make our equal employment opportunity programs more effective and the need for extended on-the-job training opportunities.

So often relations between Mexican American employees and their supervisors, who are frequently Anglo, are strained through lack of understanding and communication. I think, at times, we overuse the word "communication", but there is no real substitute for it in our language just as there is no real substitute for it in our lives. In this case, the Mexican American employee tends to judge the actions of his supervisor by the kind of unfair treatment he and the majority of Spanish surnamed Americans have received for so long. There are many good reasons for this mistrust. Proposals to train supervisors in equal employment opportunity efforts are excellent and I very much hope they will become a reality. Perhaps, the Regional Training Centers for Federal employees which have been established by the Civil Service Commission in 10 major cities would be a good place to begin the process.

The merit promotion system is viewed with the same mistrust by the community and, unfortunately, it has been justified in many cases. I am convinced of this by the daily bulk of mail I receive in my office concerning discrimination in promotions. The suggestion has been made that a re-evaluation be made of the supervisor's appraisal as a ranking factor in promotions and that close examination be given to cases in which minority employees are passed-over for the better positions.

Vice President Humphrey has said that the discrimination problem is not behind us and that this factor "... is still the number one stumbling block in our quest for equal employment opportunity—one that shows up in testing and training as much as in recruitment and promotion." I know that it is still a grave factor in the dead-end jobs held by many Mexican Americans. The experience has been especially bitter at military installations. A case at hand—and one on which I receive much correspondence—is the existing situation at Kelly Air Force Base and other military installations in San Antonio, Texas. These installations are located in an area where almost half the population is Mexican American and where government is the employer of a large number of Mexican Americans. However, this very sizeable group of minority employees hold jobs in the lower grades and are consistently denied promotions on the basis that they are not qualified. Efforts by local Mexican American organizations to correct the problems have been unsuccessful.

The hearings in El Paso brought forth statements on the ineffectiveness of our equal employment programs. It was suggested that the person responsible for enforcing equal employment opportunity programs should not be appointed by the head of the installation or agency at which he is to serve. An-

other suggestion was that an outside agency, perhaps the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, should carry out the equal employment objectives of the government.

Discrimination or simply a lack of efforts to communicate have also been factors in the small number of Mexican Americans who participate in on-the-job training to upgrade their employability. It will be necessary to make a conscious effort to let Spanish surnamed employees know that such programs are available. The community is anxious to better itself and to take advantage of training while they work. In the Phoenix and San Antonio slum survey, 80% of the people interviewed said that they would be most willing to take training on the job—if they had jobs and were training offered. I know there are proposals on just this kind of thing, such as Operation MUST, and we must give them priority to get them off the ground.

Our third area of concern is the recruitment and hiring of the disadvantaged who have been unable to achieve Civil Service status and who long ago became discouraged about even applying. Further, we have been weeding out those whose skills and aptitudes do not come through on standard forms of measurement—particularly the Mexican American person who has difficulty with the English language. I am greatly encouraged by the recent attention directed toward the cultural biases and faults of presently used exams, job descriptions, entry-level position requirements and interview procedures.

When we speak of employment opportunities then, these are the major areas of concern for the Mexican American. The community is hopefully awaiting the leadership of the government and, I am certain that we can fulfill that role. To do so, however, means that we make certain our concern makes itself felt in the regional offices and the local offices where the actual work is done. We cannot accept any gestures of compliance as worthwhile unless they render hard and fruitful results.

I would like to leave with you, for your consideration, a few "hard" recommendations.

1. Establish systematic and widespread means of contact with Mexican-American organizations for employment referrals and to generally improve communication with the community.

2. Let the Mexican-Americans know that top-level positions are not beyond the realm of their capabilities and that you welcome their applications.

3. Make the knowledge of the Spanish language and culture a part of the requirements for positions in areas of concentrated Mexican-American population.

4. Conduct sustained efforts to visit colleges with a high Mexican-American enrollment and include Mexican-American recruiters on your teams.

5. Utilize the Spanish language communications media to advertise job openings.

6. Examine the merit promotion system which has been used to enhance, facilitate, and legally justify discriminatory practices.

7. Strengthen the effectiveness and inherent objectivity of the Equal Employment Opportunity officer's position and perhaps require that he report to a board or advisory group of Mexican-American citizens as well as to his supervisor and the Civil Service Commission.

8. Utilize the personnel facilities of the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs. We can provide the names of qualified applicants for many posts to be filled.

Before closing, I wish to re-emphasize that the Inter-Agency Committee will help with any request you may have. Specifically, the Committee is ready to: (1) supply you with a roster of names of individuals who can be called on to act as consultants and advisors; (2) assist you in establishing lines

of communication with community leaders and Mexican American organizations; (3) provide the services of staff members to act as advisors; and (4) assist you in your efforts to improve mutual understanding and communication with the Mexican American community through press and radio coverage.

There is in our country a restlessness against the inequity of opportunity. Senator Yarborough pinpointed the feeling when he said that "This restlessness is afoot today among 5 million Americans whose heritage is grounded in the Spanish language. It is not a violent restlessness but an eager . . . movement. It says . . . Let me be a meaningful citizen. Let me be a real American."

With concerted effort, we can make this dream a reality.

Thank you.

Department of Housing and Urban Development and Department of Transportation Approve President's Plan To Coordinate Mass Transit Programs

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed a reorganization plan which proposes to place in the new Department of Transportation a new Urban Mass Transportation Administration which would assume responsibility for the awarding of grants to cities under the mass transit program.

Heretofore, our Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations has recommended funding for the needs of this program as a part of the responsibility of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

However, because of an overlapping of responsibility between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the newly created Department of Transportation, Secretary Weaver of HUD, and Secretary Boyd of DOT worked out an agreement dividing the responsibility between these two agencies and coordinating the mass transit phases of the program. Secretary Boyd and Secretary Weaver conferred with me recently in regard to this line of demarcation, and under this proposal, which has now been made by the President formally, mass transit planning in urban areas will continue to be handled by HUD and coordinated with all the other aspects of urban programs, while grants will be made through DOT.

The net result of this reorganization plan will be to eliminate overlapping and duplication and will provide a more efficient operation and approach to the problems of mass transit in urban areas.

I approve of the President's proposed reorganization plan, which was presented February 26 to the Congress and which will go into effect at the conclusion of 60 days from that date unless the Senate or House disapproves of the proposal.

This plan makes sense and will provide for an orderly approach to this most important urban problem, preserving the

planning coordination necessary for the relating of mass transit to other urban problems while at the same time giving the new Department of Transportation the responsibility to administer grants which relate to a most important part of the mass transportation system.

Cancer Thrives on Lack of Attention

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, cancer is a dread disease that in most cases can be controlled—even cured—if sufferers will heed warnings promptly.

Cancer will not go away by itself, and those who put off a medical checkup on first warning may well be complicating their own problem.

We in Buffalo, N.Y., are most fortunate to have the renowned Roswell Park Memorial Institute, widely accepted as one of the great centers of cancer research.

Huge strides have been made at Roswell Park in understanding, treating, and controlling cancer.

But the one big factor is the necessity for those stricken with cancer to seek medical attention promptly.

Miss Susan Hedling has prepared an informative nine-part series of articles on cancer for the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express. Here are the first three articles in the series:

MYTHS KEEP MANY FROM CANCER CURES—I

(By Susan Hedling)

Throughout history, man has explained the unknown with myths and fallacies. He has covered his lack of knowledge and information with a blanket of fabricated stories, and he has protected himself against the mysterious by turning it into a "taboo."

In the twentieth century, myths have been stripped from areas such as religion and racial questions. Emphasis on the history of man himself has been shifted from the story of Adam and Eve to the facts of Darwinian Evolution. But cancer remains an enemy to many through fear and ignorance.

Cancer is a disease, and like any other human ailment it has a cause, symptoms and methods of treatment. Unlike other diseases, however, the cause is yet to be discovered, and a cure for all cancers could be decades away.

Because of this, cancer has become the most dreaded disease. It invades often without warning and can spread throughout the entire body. It is a silent enemy.

Much has been found about the enemy, however. Much can be done for the cancer patient today that was impossible yesterday.

Some cancers are being cured today, and tomorrow may bring a cure for all.

It is the tomorrow that counts for the cancer patient. It is the hope for a universal cure that motivates him to hang on to life with all his strength.

But the threat of cancer today locks many in the jaws of fear and ignorance, and the myths many believe in prevent them from early diagnosis and treatment.

According to the American Cancer Society, there will be an estimated 22,534 new cancer cases in 1968 in New York State. The society states, however, that one-half of all cancer victims could be successfully treated by present methods if diagnosed early.

"Sixty years ago, a person afflicted with

cancer had only a remote chance of being cured," the society reports. "By 1946, however, the 'cure rate' expressed in terms of five-year survival, had risen to 1 in 4.

"By 1955 this rate had risen to 1 in 3 and many authorities are convinced that this could be improved to 1 in 2 if all patients were diagnosed and treated adequately by presently available methods."

The advances researchers and physicians have made in combatting the disease have been impressive. Cancer was known to medical science in the 19th century. In the 1890's surgery was first used as a method of cure.

In 1895, Roentgen's discovery of the X-ray added a second method of treatment for the cancer patient. For many decades, these two methods remained the only effective measures, but in the 1940's chemotherapy was added.

Chemotherapy, the use of chemical agents to combat tumors, has proved effective with some types of cancer. Drugs administered to skin cancer patients can achieve a 98 per cent cure. In other words, only 2 out of every 100 skin cancer patients are "incurable." With leukemia, drugs have been successful in reducing $\frac{3}{4}$ of the leukemic cells in a patient's system.

With these advances, and with the hope of the cancer patient coming closer to full realization each day, why do so many people fear the disease to the point of letting it prevent them from treatment?

The answer seems to lie in the mistaken fears people hold, and the myths attached for many years to cancer which cause the disease to become a stigma to the patient and his family.

Like mental illness, cancer has been identified with families. One member's affliction could color the entire family name and become a source of shame and embarrassment.

This stigma probably stems from the belief still held by some that cancer is hereditary. It is associated, therefore, with a family weakness and is a disgrace for each member.

Authorities discount the notion of cancer being hereditary. Dr. James T. Grace, Jr., director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute, said the belief is prevalent in some sections of the country, however.

"People believe this," Dr. Grace said, "and cancer becomes a stigma like venereal disease. A woman with a tumor in her breast will wait to have it looked at because she is afraid it will be cancer. Then, when she finally goes, the cancer is incurable. This is a tragedy."

Another common myth which makes cancer an enemy through fear is the idea that cancer is contagious. Dr. Grace said "there is absolutely no evidence that any human malignant disease is contagious." The fallacy may stem from the theory that cancer is caused by a virus.

However if it is caused by a virus, it is not the usually highly contagious virus as for example, the measles virus. The virus theory hasn't been proven with man. A virus has been found to cause some cancers in animals. Even if the theory is true with humans, the virus would not be a contagious one.

Some people have used an instance where a high rate of leukemia was found in a group of young persons in a certain town. Dr. Grace said that this does not mean the leukemia was being passed on from person to person through contagion.

"Those clusters of leukemia cases have not been anything unaccountable for by an unusual coincidence. There is no evidence that the leukemia was contagious."

According to Dr. Grace, one of the most vicious and destructive myths existing today is the belief that someone has a magical cure for cancer that the American Medical Association is deliberately trying to suppress.

"Quacks have made fortunes out of phony cures," Dr. Grace said. This sort of thing not only costs the cancer victim his money, but it could cost him his life if it prevents him from medical treatment.

"Any significant improvements in cancer treatments are very rapidly disseminated throughout the medical profession," Dr. Grace said. "We at Roswell would go out of business and like it if it meant a cure. Cancer hits the physician and his family, also."

Public information is the most important weapon in combatting the fear people have of cancer. The mistaken ideas they hold about the disease makes man his own worst enemy. The longer these myths persist, the more lives will be lost to the disease because of that fear.

INVOLVEMENT IS MARK OF CANCER NURSES—II

What will I say to a little 10-year-old boy with acute leukemia who looks up at me and says: "Am I going to die?" How will I react when I see my first patient with a facial deformity? And how will they react to me?

These are only a few of the heartbreaking questions any girl who considers becoming a cancer nurse must answer. The cancer patient has definite needs, and the nurse must be able to answer them.

The cancer patient enters a hospital such as Roswell Park Memorial Institute through referral. He may be facing radical surgery that will leave him disfigured, or he may just be facing a series of tests to determine whether or not he has a malignancy.

The cancer patient can be an elderly man with skin lesions, a young woman with breast cancer, or a small child with leukemia.

Some patients will leave the hospital cured, or at least with their cancer under control. Some patients will never leave at all.

They all have something in common—a battle against a dreaded disease. It is their common problem, and it binds them in a kind of fraternity within the hospital walls that excludes the "normal" person.

Miss Patricia Burns, director of nursing education at the institute often tells a story of a public health nurse in a class Miss Burns was teaching.

Miss Burns was discussing the relationship patients unconsciously form, and the public health nurse volunteered her own story to the class.

She told of her admission to Roswell Park for diagnosis. Other patients gave her encouragement, and drew her to them in her anxiety. Once the tests were run, however, and her problem was not found to be cancer, the relationship she had established with these patients evaporated.

"They were happy for her," Miss Burns said, "and they expressed their well wishes, sending her little gifts. But this woman no longer shared 'their problem.' That close bond was gone and she was 'normal.'"

This type of thing doesn't happen in a general hospital, because there patients are treated for a broad spectrum of illnesses. The close relationships between cancer patients is perhaps desirable, however, because each one tremendously encourages the other, Miss Burns said, and the general atmosphere is optimistic.

The "club" is not founded on resentment toward "normals," Miss Burns said, but on a common battle to fight.

The cancer nurse must be aware of these things and use them in dealing with the patient. Her biggest job is the psychological one—giving hope and understanding to a patient without going beyond the limits of what is realistic.

Miss Burns said she thought the majority of patients should be told when they have cancer. Some doctors advise the family not to discuss it with the afflicted member, but Miss Burns said this usually does more harm than good.

"By not telling a patient about his cancer, you create a barrier because he can't talk to anyone about it. Usually the patient knows himself, anyway, whether he is told or not, but by not telling him we can't give over the spirit of hope so important to anyone with cancer."

"From a nursing point of view, I fully believe in facing the problem and discussing it," she said.

Placing a specific time span on a person's life is not right, however, because it's almost impossible to be accurate, she said. "The human thing to do is to give the patient a little hope, yet tell him he is seriously ill."

The cancer nurse, she said, must be someone who cares about people. "A good nurse who deals with these patients has to be dedicated. She has to take the time to listen and get involved with the patient's worries and concerns."

At the same time, she must not be sympathetic to the point of letting the patient feel sorry for himself. Miss Marsha Bain, a student nurse at D'Youville College, who took part in the American Cancer Society Miss Hope contest this month, spoke from personal experience.

As a child, she was hospitalized for a congenital heart condition. "I withdrew into myself and felt I couldn't go to anyone else. I withdrew into a world of television and books."

Then, Miss Bain said, she met a nurse who drew her out about her illness without making it obvious she felt sorry for her. "She gave me someone to talk to, someone who understood how I felt, someone who didn't cry."

"When I went to the institute as a student nurse," she said, "I saw patients there who were like I had been. I thought that if I can give just one of these people what that nurse gave me, I will have accomplished a great thing. What she gave me was hope."

Most nurses also see their function as a teaching one. They feel they should perform part of the enormous job of going into the community to educate people on the warning signals of cancer and the importance of early detection.

In the student nursing program at Roswell Park, Miss Burns notices two different reactions. "Some student nurses find it depressing and say they couldn't possibly work here. Many, however, are overwhelmed by this place and the dedication all around."

If the nurse is impressed enough to stay and become a cancer nurse, she must meet all the qualifications. She must be understanding and compassionate, yet realistic.

She must be able to answer the question: "Am I going to die?" And she must answer it every day with hope.

THEY BATTLE LEUKEMIA—III

I entered Roswell Park Memorial Institute's hospital early that morning to begin a day that would give me greater insights into methods of fighting leukemia.

The corridor I entered with the doctor is a 16-bed ward containing mostly leukemia patients. A young, sandy-haired boy started to leave his room and enter the corridor. He saw me and quickly turned back inside.

Without a white uniform designating me as a nurse or technician, I was conspicuous amongst the staff and pajama-clad patients. My purpose there that day was not to draw attention, or to satisfy my own curiosity about a cancer ward, but to learn.

Leukemia is a vicious class of cancer. In one of its most serious and acute forms, its prime targets are youth. Adults are prone to several kinds of the disease. Leukemia is a disease of the blood-forming tissues (the marrow) and eventually the leukemic cells overgrow the patient's normal leukocytes (white blood cells) so that he is unable to ward off infection.

Happily, my own education that day was combined with an opportunity to contribute a small part to the research being conducted on the disease. The same tests which are conducted on a leukemia patient also are performed on normal persons to gain comparative data and thus have a yardstick to measure the patient's condition.

The Leukocyte Mobilization Experiment, which I underwent, determines how rapidly and extensively the white blood cells mobilize to a wound to ward off infection. As a "normal," young woman with no detected diseases, they predicted I would be a rapid fighter of infection, as compared with a leukemic patient who might not ward off infection at all.

The experiment began with a deliberately inflicted wound. Dr. Hansjoerg Senn, a Swiss doctor in a research fellowship at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, shaved a portion of my forearm and swabbed it with alcohol and then iodine. Using a tool resembling a dentist's drill with a small abrasive square at the tip, he ground off a small patch of my skin.

The wound looked like a brush burn and hurt no more than a skinned knee or scraped elbow. A child inflicts such pain on himself almost everyday.

Dr. Senn placed a plastic chamber over the wound and injected the chamber with my own blood serum (which had been removed a few days earlier). The serum was simply my own blood from which the cells had been centrifuged.

The doctor taped the chamber securely and bound my forearm in an elastic bandage. My movement was hampered only slightly.

Throughout this stage, which involved slight pain, I noticed myself reacting in a rather nervous fashion. Most normal persons do notice the discomfort and remark on it, Dr. Senn said.

But the leukemic patient, who is so used to tests, doesn't seem to remark on it at all.

Two hours later, Mrs. Bonnie Chu, a lab technician, removed the serum from the plastic chamber. She then counted the number of white blood cells that had surfaced within the wound. Under the microscope she found that 100,000 white blood cells were present.

A leukemia patient, at this point, might have 10,000 or 20,000 white cells in his chamber. Sometimes no cells at all have surfaced.

At the same time, the technician made a smear with the remaining serum. Later, she counted the number of each different kind of cells because the percentage of cells varies between a normal person and a leukemia patient.

Throughout the day, the serum in the plastic chamber was removed and the white blood cells counted. The next count revealed one million cells, and the next three million. By the end of the day I had five million cells in the chamber.

This is sufficient to ward off an infection, but for the leukemia patient no such protection exists because the disease has crippled their infection-fighting powers.

Each person has an individual level of white cell mobilization, but there are two and perhaps three typical response-patterns for normal persons. Likewise, each leukemia patient has a different, but invariably low level, often depending on the severity of the disease.

Through this test, doctors are able to establish comparisons of just how well the patient fight infection in comparison with normals and other patients. In this way, any normal person who volunteers for the test is contributing valuable data to research.

Anyone is eligible to contribute in this way, and for other significant tests and donations, by expressing their desire to be a volunteer research subject through the volunteer office at the institute. In addition to this test, the more tangible donation through plasmapheresis also aids the leukemia patient.

With this procedure, the donor's blood is taken and the platelets, critical components for clotting, are removed with the plasma and given to leukemia patients. The remainder of the blood is given back to the donor. Platelet donors thus can contribute several times a month.

The platelet transfusion program has cut

down tremendously on the number of deaths due to hemorrhaging in leukemia patients.

Dr. James F. Holland, chief of Medicine A at Roswell Park, said another volunteer opportunity consists of a test to determine the level of synthesis of albumin by the liver.

The albumin level in cancer patients is often decreased. If researchers could determine how and why the level drops, perhaps they could then determine how to reverse it and perhaps improve the patient.

Dr. Holland said it is impossible to always use staff members as volunteer normal subjects for all the different programs at the institute, even though the staff does conduct a number of experiments on themselves. A broad range of types and ages of volunteers is needed because doctors need to be able to match a patient with a normal his own age.

The important volunteer programs are countless. Blood donations, plasmapheresis, leukocyte mobilization and albumin tests name only a few.

As new research evolves, new needs will exist for volunteers. This is a way that the well can help the sick now. Someday, if the hope of an immunizing agent is realized, normals will be needed to test the immunity, just as with the Salk polio vaccine tests.

As I left the ward for the final time that day, the youth I had seen earlier was walking down the corridor. By this time, someone had evidently told him what I was doing.

He didn't hurry into his room this time. Instead, he flashed a quick grin at me and said hello. If I could contribute to more tests, I would—for the sake of that boy and others like him.

Apathy or Maturity?

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the February 24 issue of the UT Daily Beacon, student publication of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is worthy of consideration, and I would like to call this statement to the attention of RECORD readers by inserting it at this point:

APATHY OR MATURITY?

The favorite criticism of many outsiders in a discussion of UT is the fact that the student body, faculty, and administration are apathetic.

In fact, a representative of U.S. Sen. Mark Hatfield of Oregon was on the campus earlier this month to discuss the apathy of UT students as well as those at other colleges.

This label of apathy is placed on the University for a variety of reasons, mostly related to an apparent lack of interest in the issues of the day. While we cannot help but agree with our critics that the University community does not openly display its feelings on major issues, we wonder if maybe our University is really in a better shape because of this open apathy than many of the colleges throughout the nation.

A brief look through various college newspapers that come to the Beacon office reveals the immature manner in which many students react to problems faced on their campuses. Pickets have been formed at many colleges when recruiters for Dow Chemical Co., makers of napalm used in Vietnam, were on the campus. One of the most recent demonstrations against the company, although it was very orderly, occurred Feb. 14 at the University of Kentucky.

The possibility of a demonstration caused

Air Force recruiters to cancel a scheduled session earlier this year at Ohio State University. Draft card burnings and demonstrations have been a common occurrence at Berkeley. Some students at Harvard University are currently conducting a fast in opposition to the war in Vietnam.

These are but a few of the examples of immature action displayed by the supposedly "concerned" students on our nation's campuses. They are so vitally interested in the issues of the day that they will risk fines or imprisonment to let their feelings be known.

We cannot help but be thankful that these students are at other colleges and not UT. The argument may still be presented that at least these students are showing concern, but we can counter this with the fact that UT students are concerned but are mature enough to control their animal instincts.

Every male or female student on this campus probably has a brother, sister, good friend, fiancé, or husband who is or soon will be eligible for the draft. And any person with a certain degree of common sense could reason that these students would be concerned.

The main difference between UT and other schools is in the methods used. UT students show responsibility, not immaturity. The charges will probably continue that this University is apathetic, but if this is apathy, then we say more of it. Responsibility and pride are more important than self-centered interests.

Inspection of Poultry

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as you know, legislation has been proposed to revise and improve the inspection of poultry to protect the Nation's consumers. I am pleased to place before the House a telegram to President Johnson from Mr. Stanley I. Trenhaile, president of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, expressing the association's support of the legislation. I have been authorized by the Honorable Phillip Alampi, secretary of agriculture of the State of New Jersey, to say that New Jersey supports the position of the association. The association's telegram to the President is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE,
February 6, 1968.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The Board of Directors of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture has today unanimously approved the following statement:

We recognize the need to update present poultry inspection laws, both state and national, to keep pace with the nation's rapidly growing population and the ever increasing efficiency of poultry production and marketing. The nation's agribusiness complex has developed poultry production and marketing to where it is a marvel of the world, making it possible for the nation's consumers to enjoy an abundance of wholesome poultry. We shall be glad to cooperate with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and others in the development of federal-state poultry inspection legislation and program that best meets

the needs and interest of consumers, industry, and farmers, and continues to assure consumers the most complete protection possible in light of today's scientific knowledge.

STANLEY I. TRENHAILE,
President.

College-Investor's Soundest Buy

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, testimony on Federal aid to students before the House Labor and Education Subcommittee produced some whopping figures on what the U.S. Office of Education would like to spend in the years ahead.

What those figures are saying is that the taxpayers cannot continue to support the education program as it now stands, and that we Members of Congress are going to have to be more realistic about appropriations in this field.

An obvious and immediate duty is to get the Federal Government out of the scholarship business and help States finance revolving student loan programs. Otherwise the burden on taxpayers will become so heavy that there will be nothing left for students to borrow in the years ahead.

Furthermore, the scholarship system is patently unfair to those who do not attend institutions of higher learning, for as taxpayers they must contribute to the subsidization of contemporaries whose income will on the average be much higher. For the RECORD, I include at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the November 28, 1967, Washington Post showing that a man with at least 4 years of college education will earn \$120,659 more during his career than the average male high school graduate.

With this incentive, any boy should be more than happy to be able to borrow college expenses with the understanding that he will repay in order that there will always be funds available to give the next fellow a chance. While I have no statistical support to offer, there is every reason to believe that most students who must work or borrow for their education have a deeper appreciation of their opportunities than do many of the student body who have the apparent advantage of a free ride.

There is another factor in the elimination of Federal scholarships which should be of general concern in Congress. Many of our States are experimenting in scholarship and loan programs, and surely the Federal program on top of it all is responsible for a great deal of administrative duplication and waste that would be eliminated if the States were assisted in establishing revolving student loan funds and Washington were to bow out of this function.

Anyone for economy in education will join in insisting on this switch as soon as possible.

The Washington Post article follows:

COLLEGE CALLED THE INVESTOR'S SOUNDEST BUY

(By Willard Clopton, Jr.)

A college education is likely to be a sounder financial investment than playing the stock market, a newly published study shows.

The report concludes that the increased lifetime earnings a man enjoys because he has a college degree will average more than he would have made if the money he spent on college had been put into investments paying dividends of 5 or even 10 per cent.

The study was done by Melvin Borland, a teaching assistant in economics at Washington University, and Donald E. Yett, director of the Human Resources Research Center at the University of Southern California.

They report that a man who puts himself through at least four years of college will earn \$120,659 more during his career than the average male high school graduate.

Had he not gone to college but invested a sum equal to his college costs in securities yielding a 5 per cent rate of return, he would collect \$94,699 in dividends during his life. If the investment paid 10 per cent, he would receive \$114,915.

The authors note, however, that some stocks yield returns of 12 per cent or more, suggesting that at very high dividend rates securities can provide a bigger payoff than the fruits of higher learning.

Reported in the November issue of *Transaction* magazine, the study is based on 1960 census data and uses some complicated statistics to determine the income and college-cost figures.

It was found that Negroes and college dropouts do less well, in terms of lifetime earnings, than college graduates as a whole.

The report shows that Negroes with four or more years of college earn \$67,164 more during their lives than the average high school graduate—compared with the \$120,659 figure for all graduates.

The corresponding amount for college dropouts is \$42,193 and, for Negro college dropouts, \$7251.

A dropout is defined as a person with one to three years of college. The authors point out, however, that the census-takers included graduates of two-year junior colleges in this category.

The figures show that the lifetime earnings of Negro college graduates was only \$16,260 more than they would have earned had their college costs been invested in 5 per cent securities, and only \$4,205 more than the return from investments at 10 per cent.

The authors predicted, however, that "the presently lower returns for nonwhite investments in higher education would virtually disappear" in future studies.

A major reason, they said, is that Negroes have made significant advances in job and educational levels since 1959, when the data for the 1960 census was gathered.

The researchers' overall conclusion is that "practically any investment in higher education can be expected to yield a higher return than an equivalently risky investment in nonhuman capital."

Public Law 480 Helps U.S. Cotton Move Abroad

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, while Public Law 480 has been principally devoted to food aid, we should not lose sight of the fact that fully 12 percent of the value of U.S. shipments under this legislation has been in the form of

raw cotton. Thus, under this program, we have been able not only to feed the hungry millions of the free world but to clothe many of the needy as well. And by insisting on self-help measures, we give reason to look for sound economic development in these friendly countries.

At the same time, by selling cotton on Public Law 480 terms to countries which could otherwise not afford to buy it, we have exported substantial quantities which would not otherwise have moved. This has helped us to reduce excess domestic stocks, has contributed to price stability, and should be of long-term benefit to our balance of payments.

Exports now take more than half of the U.S. cotton crop, with close to one-third of these shipments moving under Public Law 480. Since the start of Public Law 480 back in 1954, more than 15 million bales of cotton have been exported under this program, at a value of about \$2 billion.

The benefits bestowed on the Nation and on the cotton farmer by Public Law 480 are thus clear. Perhaps less evident, but scarcely less important, are the direct or indirect benefits which accrue to persons engaged in processing, storing, and shipping the cotton, especially in a State like Arkansas.

Public Law 480 thus has the happy effect of promoting our domestic economy while assisting our friends abroad in their struggle for economic development. The success of this march toward development should, in turn, create future dollar markets for our farm products, including cotton.

I strongly recommend to the Congress that the law be extended.

Legislation To Improve the Federal Labor-Management Program

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation introduced by the highly esteemed Member from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service.

This legislation, which will create an effectual labor-management program in the Federal Government, affirms the right of union officers to present grievances in behalf of their members without restraint or reprisal.

For many years, disenchantment has been allowed to linger in many of our Federal agencies because genuine grievances have not been properly aired. The legislation introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] will, I believe, provide the means whereby a milieu of agreement and unhampered productivity may prevail. It will, among other things, reassign the responsibility of handling grievances from the Civil Service Commission to the Department of Labor which is indeed the most qualified Federal body to resolve these differences.

I urge that all of my colleagues vigorously support this legislation.

Is Our Vietnam Involvement a Mistake?

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, escalation of the Vietnam war in the past year, recent reports of serious reverses suffered by the United States at the hands of the Vietcong, and rumors of increased draft quotas and possible activation of Reserve and National Guard units are all contributing to a crystallization of U.S. public opinion on our commitment in Southeast Asia.

The voices of those favoring deescalation are daily becoming louder. Reports of South Vietnamese apathy, refusal to support our effort among other factors are lending support to these voices.

An editorial, "Have We the Character To Act Honorably?" which appears in the February 26 issue of the *Salina, Kans., Journal* is worthy of note. The writer, Mr. Whitley Austin, is a highly respected writer with an excellent background on political affairs of Asia.

I include the editorial in the *RECORD* at this point:

HAVE WE THE CHARACTER TO ACT HONORABLY?

It is crystal clear that unless the Vietnam war is stopped it will develop into a war between the United States and Russia—a world conflagration.

President Johnson says he seeks peace with honor. By this, it is also clear, he means peace with victory, and that we will negotiate only if we seem able to get our way. The Viet Cong, the North Vietnamese, and the Russians and Chinese who are supplying them, are equally determined to win. They are matching with troops and weapons the men and arms we are sending across the Pacific.

Mr. Johnson believes he is honor-bound to step up the war.

But there is no course more honorable than to admit a mistake. The moral strength to confess error is the hall mark of the honorable man or the honorable nation. It is the greatest, the most crucial test of character. Is, then, our Vietnam effort a mistake?

If the war continues, both North and South Vietnam will be destroyed and there will be nothing to save. The government we have established in the South does not govern, cannot protect its people and lacks their support. It is not a democratic institution.

The Vietnamese people, refugees, widows and orphans now, no longer want to fight—if many of them ever did—and considering their increasing plight, this is understandable.

We have not contained Communism or stopped the so-called "wars of liberation." Instead, Red guerrilla forces are on the march throughout Asia. We have stimulated the Communists, not checked them.

At the same time, we have lost the best of our young men, wasted billions of dollars, handicapped our own economy, and forfeited the leadership of the free world. To the extent that we have weakened ourselves we have improved the Communist position.

If our efforts in Vietnam have been proved a mistake, it would be a worse mistake to continue them, as the *Wall Street Journal* pointed out in the editorial re-printed on this page Sunday.

It is hard for a proud nation such as this to admit defeat and error. But if we are a moral, honorable nation with a sense of duty and destiny, we cannot go on killing and destroying to perpetuate an error and deepen it. At this point, pride becomes damnable,

leading to our own destruction, now and everlastingly.

Our only honorable and wise course is to de-escalate the war and to prepare to withdraw from Vietnam in the best order and with the fewest casualties possible.

If President Johnson finds his personal pride too stubborn, the weight of defeat too grievous, then the Congress should reassert its constitutional authority, if necessary remove him from office, and put this nation back on the paths of peace. This is the way to true strength in our democracy.

It would be an honorable as well as a practical course for the United States we cherish and that is now endangered by the mistakes of prideful men in power.

It could save the world as we know it from extinction.

Dow Chemical Co. Directs Its Efforts to a Better Tomorrow

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Dow Chemical Co.—whose headquarters are in Midland in my district—has been the object of some of the most vicious abuse in recent months, largely generated on college campuses by the new left fringe. Why? Because Dow is the sole producer for the U.S. Armed Forces of napalm, a material of war of inestimable value to our men in Vietnam. Mr. H. D. Doan, president of Dow, has recently written an excellent article setting forth the company's position. The article which first appeared in the Dow Diamond, the company's publication, is as follows:

DOW WILL DIRECT ITS EFFORTS TOWARD A BETTER TOMORROW
(By H. D. Doan)

A letter writer complained to a Chicago newspaper recently that the Dow Chemical Company was getting a million dollars worth of free publicity from anti-war protests on college campuses.

This kind of publicity we don't need, for it fixes us in the public mind only as the company that makes napalm. There's a real risk, in fact, in the article which follows for it adds more mileage to what has already been a grossly overexposed subject. But the risk is worth it if we can clear up a few of the issues in the controversy which seems to swirl about our company.

Dow does make napalm under contract for the U.S. government and has done so for about three years. We did not develop the product. Napalm was first developed in 1942 and has been used in warfare by many nations since that time. Dow was asked to bid on a contract for its production in 1965 when the Air Force developed a new formulation incorporating polystyrene as a principal ingredient. Dow is a leading producer of polystyrene, a plastic raw material. There have been other producers of napalm but Dow at present is the only producer.

The contract has little economic significance to Dow. It amounted to less than one half of one per cent of total sales last year—in the range of \$5 million—and an even smaller percentage of total profits. This year it will be in the range of one-fourth of one per cent and again a smaller percentage in profits. We are not a major defense contractor. All of our business to all branches of government comes to less than five per cent of sales.

Why do we produce napalm? In simplest

terms, we produce it because we feel that our company should produce those items which our fighting men need in time of war when we have the ability to do so.

A quarter of a century ago this answer would have satisfied just about anyone who asked this question. Today, however, it doesn't. Today we find ourselves accused of being immoral because we produce this product for use in what some people consider an unjust war. We're told that to make a weapon because you're asked to do so by your government puts you in precisely the same position as the German industrialists who pleaded at the Nuremberg Trials that they were "only following orders."

And these are just a few of the milder charges in a barrage of protest that has included picketing of some of our plants and sales offices, boycotts against our products, thousands of letters of protest to the company and to individuals within the company, and, most publicized of all, organized demonstrations on campuses across the nation which have ranged from peaceful protest to violence and physical obstruction of Dow job interviews.

THERE COULD BE NO OTHER CHOICE

The central issue, of course, is the war in Vietnam. This is not a popular war. No one likes war, least of all the men who have the dirty and dangerous and heart-breaking job of having to fight it. All of the debate in the world about how we got there or how we get out is proper and right in its place but it doesn't change the fact that we are there nor the fact that our men are there and need weapons to defend themselves.

When Dow first began to face this protest movement, more than a year ago, our board of directors took another look at its original decision to make this product for our government. We discussed at great length among ourselves the very serious charges and protests against us and finally resolved that there could be no other choice but to continue making this product.

MEN IN VIETNAM CONFIRM OUR REASON

In recent weeks, since the increased publicity about campus protests against Dow, we've begun to hear from the men in Vietnam in letters that confirm our reason for this decision. A Congressional Medal of Honor winner has written, for instance, "War and killing is not at all pleasing to anyone. The infantry in Viet Nam fights to win and stay alive. We need and are thankful for napalm."

An army enlisted man writes: "The war would not end if companies such as yours suddenly refused to manufacture napalm and other military supplies."

An infantry captain: "Your napalm has saved the lives of countless American soldiers."

Fourteen GIs signed a letter including this comment: "The effectiveness of napalm in saving U.S. lives is overwhelming."

And a Marine Corps lieutenant: "War is never a pleasant form of existence, but we believe we are here to further the cause of peace, and stem the tide of communism. Napalm is just one of the instruments which we must use to support ourselves."

Protesters argue, however, that napalm is an immoral product in and of itself and that it is used indiscriminately against civilians in Vietnam. Many protest leaders will readily admit, in fact, that Dow has become a focal point for protest because of the emotions that can be aroused by napalm.

NAPALM ANSWERS MILITARY NEED

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has said of these charges in a recent letter to Dow, "The implication that napalm is used indiscriminately in Vietnam is not true. General Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said publicly that napalm is a military necessity. It answers a specific military need in certain

combat situations peculiar to the type of warfare practiced by the Viet Cong.

"General Wheeler has also pointed out that the precautions we take against injury by this weapon to noncombatants are as painstaking as we can make them without hamstringing our military operations," Secretary McNamara continued. "By contrast, the Viet Cong has repeatedly carried on terror and murder campaigns directed against innocent civilians."

Other sources, including combat veterans of Vietnam in their letters to us and in conversations with our people, add further confirmation to what General Wheeler has said.

DOW WILL DIRECT ITS EFFORTS TOWARD A BETTER TOMORROW

But what of the argument that we are no different from the German industrialists who "just followed orders"?

We reject this argument on several points. First we reject the validity of comparing our present form of government with Hitler's Nazi Germany. In our mind our government is still representative of and responsive to the will of the people.

Further, we as a company have made a moral judgment on the long-range goals of our government and we support these. We may not agree as individuals with every decision of every military or governmental leader but we regard these leaders as men trying honestly and relentlessly to find the best possible solutions to very, very complex international problems. As long as we so regard them, we would find it impossible not to support them. This is not saying as the critics imply that we will follow blindly and without fail no matter where our government leads us. While I think it highly improbable under our form of government, should despotic leaders attempt to lead our nation away from its historic national purposes, we would cease to support the government. But I can foresee this happening only if through resort to anarchy we prevent the functioning of democratic processes.

Our critics ask if we are willing to stand judgment for our choice to support our government if history should prove this wrong. Our answer is yes.

On the related issue of campus recruiting we feel that we have the right and the responsibility to meet on campus with students who want to discuss job opportunities with our company representatives. This is no sinister activity but rather a routine function, provided at most colleges for the mutual benefit of students and business, which allows large and small businesses an equal chance to make themselves available to interested students.

When college officials request us to postpone or cancel recruiting visits, of course, we do so. We have found, however, that college officials in general have been extremely helpful and cooperative despite the problems which have arisen on various campuses.

WE ARE WILLING TO STAND JUDGMENT

Has Dow been hurt by the various kinds of protests? This is difficult to answer without qualification. We can detect no effect on our sales, for example. And early in the recruiting season our number of interviews was up sharply. These are still running ahead of a year ago. We can detect no decline in the quality of students with whom we conduct interviews. And while we have had some stockholders sell their Dow stock in protest to our stand on this issue, we can't really gauge the effect in this area.

Yet in the minds of some people we are becoming the company that produces napalm rather than a highly diversified company producing more than 800 products basic to all other industries and ranging from measles vaccine to brake fluids and antifreezes. There may be outstanding businessmen or scientists of the future who have been lost to Dow because of deep personal

feelings on this matter or simply because somehow they were deprived of the chance to talk to our representative. From a long-range viewpoint we could be hurt in many ways.

We point this out not in a plea for sympathy but as a simple fact. Certainly no problem we face now and in the future can compare to those faced by the men who are fighting this war and by their families.

But there may also be in this situation both for Dow and for business in general some very real opportunities. One of these may be a start toward more meaningful dialogue between business and the campus and other groups who have joined in this protest.

WE MUST FOCUS ATTENTION ON PEACE

Basically the debate over Vietnam, as long as it remains peaceful and honest debate, is a healthy thing. And many of the questions being asked are pertinent questions which business must ask itself. Business should and must be willing to discuss some of these questions with the campus and intellectual community which has raised them—discuss them not in the emotional atmosphere of demonstrations and confrontations but under conditions which will allow a true dialogue. The issue of business making moral judgments, the issue of duty to country deserve thoughtful discussion. This is not to say that business can or should debate specific U.S. foreign policy decisions.

Equally important, however, is the challenge to Dow and to the business world to focus attention and action on an issue far more vital than Vietnam. That issue is peace itself, the lasting peace that man has sought throughout history. Such a lasting peace can be achieved only when we find solutions to such basic world problems as hunger and disease and lack of economic opportunity.

We need to change wild jungles to productive croplands, to increase crop yields and find better ways to process and preserve the crops that are abundant, to increase meat production efficiency, to improve our recovery of natural mineral or petroleum resources, to bring industry to undeveloped lands and thus provide an economic base for sound growth, to help clean up and protect valuable water resources threatened by pollution, to bring the rest of the world's standard of living closer to our own.

These are things that Dow is working on right now—things on which we spend far more time and money and effort than we spend on the production of napalm. We intend to continue making napalm because we feel that so long as the United States is sending men to war it is unthinkable that we would not supply the materials they need. But we also intend to continue to direct our talents and efforts toward that better tomorrow for all mankind that can build lasting peace.

This we feel is the real challenge of business that calls for the kind of dedication and zeal and concern for mankind that is being manifested in much of this campus protest. We firmly believe that the young men and women truly concerned about doing something to build a better world rather than just talking about it are in the vast majority. We intend to make every effort to convince them that the business world offers one of the best opportunities to do that job effectively.

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 38th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

House Concurrent Resolution 661

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I joined with my good friend from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] on February 27 in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 661. My paramount concern in this area was evidenced by the first bill I introduced last session, H.R. 1982. That bill would create a bipartisan joint committee to supervise the reorganization of the executive branch. Then last July, I joined with a number of other Congressmen in cosponsoring H.R. 11385, the so-called war on waste which also included a close look at the legislative branch. It is my understanding that passage of this legislation would bring us further down the path toward those two goals.

Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1967, I, along with Congressmen BROTZMAN and HUNT, introduced a legislative package consisting of House Resolution 476 and H.R. 9966. This proposal has achieved some measure of nationwide publicity under the title "Truth in Legislation." In fact, a poll conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business of its 240,000 membership indicated that 82 percent were in favor of the proposal. Briefly, this approach would require a price tag on every bill which would necessitate the expenditure of Federal funds. Second, the House Clerk would be required to report semimonthly the estimated total cost of all legislation passed up to that time, plus the proposed cost of all bills still pending. It would also require the Bureau of the Budget to furnish to the Congress on a monthly basis a current estimate of receipts and expenditures of the Federal Government.

In an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal last December, that newspaper suggested the possibility of incorporating the truth-in-legislation package with a bill to set up a Government Program Evaluation Commission to review spending programs, to weigh their justification and to set priorities. Shortly after the beginning of the second session, I was privileged to meet with the distinguished Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS], who has introduced such a bill. It is my understanding that Congressman BROWN has also been a leader in pushing for the establishment of such a Commission. Mr. MILLS and I came to the conclusion that such a combination would be possible and desirable.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that early hearings could be scheduled on House Concurrent Resolution 661. Perhaps the hearings on this resolution could also be used as a vehicle for focusing a spotlight on the imperative need for a program evaluation commission and truth in legislation. All of my colleagues are aware of the current financial crisis faced by the Federal Government. It is time to restore some semblance of fiscal sanity to the operation of the Federal Government and improve

the fiscal responsibility of the legislative process.

What's Wrong With Success?

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., on February 22, 1968, made many presentations and awards. Mr. Richard Capen, Jr., La Jolla, Calif., was the recipient of a George Washington Honor Medal for an address he made at the recent meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Washington, D.C.

"What's Wrong With Success?" is a most thought-provoking speech which sets forth many of the problems which we face at this time. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit this address:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH SUCCESS?

(Opening address by Richard G. Capen, Jr., director of public affairs, Copley Newspapers, La Jolla, Calif., at the sixth annual U.S. Chamber of Commerce Association Public Affairs Conference, Sheraton Hall, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

Today, America is obsessed with a seemingly endless concern for the chronic criminal, the drifter, the dope addict, the misfit—in general, the loser.

We have focused so much attention upon our weaknesses that our critics happily believe that the riots and the anti-war demonstrations are typical of life in America today.

We have become so tolerant of the mediocre and the irresponsible that some people are deliberately unclean and unproductive. They strive to be unsuccessful. Others have adopted failure as a goal, with time in jail admired as a badge of honor.

We are so reluctant to infringe upon the rights of others that we tolerate lawlessness in the name of free speech. We overlook injuries to innocent people just because the hopes of all the poor and prejudiced have not been fulfilled.

Until recently, some of our nation's top leaders generated a national guilt complex, claiming we must expect riots. A few legislators even proclaimed, "We shall overcome" in their own speeches.

They told us so often that we had to expect disorders that I cannot help but believe they encouraged riots to occur.

With such a permissive society, it is no wonder that crime in America has risen seven times as fast as our population.

Some place more emphasis on the conduct of the policeman than on the conduct of the criminal. The Supreme Court takes months to debate issues that we expect our policemen to decide on a split-second basis. Criminals are freed on technicalities despite the fact that many of them become repeat offenders. Regrettably, some courts are re-writing the law rather than interpreting it.

In 1967, more than 100,000 rounds of ammunition were fired by Americans, at Americans, in America.

While crime rates grow, morality declines. Outright filth is permitted under a phony label of creative culture. Proposals are made to legalize the use of dope, free love is openly supported, and more than 300,000 illegitimate children are born in America each year.

Self-proclaimed do-gooders demand a better world, but what is their contribution to it? Usually, nothing more than four-letter words, LSD, and some second-rate art!

They enjoy criticizing America, but sel-

dom assume any meaningful responsibility to improve it. Many are provocateurs, striving to undermine America rather than to strengthen it.

With so much attention given to the ne'er-do-well, I feel we have lost sight of America's greatness. We've lost faith in ourselves and in our own country. Never before have so many Americans been so disturbed or so worried about our country's future.

Frankly, I think it's time we had a little less pity for those who refuse to help themselves and a little more respect for the doer, for the achiever.

Too much attention is given to the strife on our campuses and too little emphasis is placed on the work of the campus leader. Too much is reported on the draft card burner and not enough on the combat hero.

It's time we stopped apologizing for America's success just because we have a few shortcomings. Let's be proud of the person who sets out to do something and does it. Let's also be proud of the person who is constantly looking for more to do, and who isn't always rationalizing why he can't do it.

After all, this pursuit of excellence in America has created the highest standard of living ever known to man. And yet, we are willing to share our success by working to bring peace and prosperity to those less fortunate than ourselves.

Today, Americans are the best fed, best paid, and best educated people in the world. By our example, we have proved that things could be done, that dreams could be embodied in action, that a better life could be achieved through hard work and ingenuity.

Many of our critics come from middle-class homes where they were brought up by indulgent parents, where they took economic security for granted, and where they expected instant gratification of personal desires. Regrettably, some think they have a right to consume more than they produce.

It is my personal opinion that much of today's unrest can be attributed to the frustrations of those who have expected immediate results from the promises of others. As a result, many have come to believe—in fact, to expect—that poverty and prejudice can be conquered overnight. They believe that Congress can recognize a problem, pass a law, fund a program, and all our problems will fade away.

Now you and I know the solutions will never be that simple, and many of our nation's leaders have performed a great disservice by implying that the answers could be found easily. It will never be possible to legislate morality, nor can we guarantee prosperity.

Certainly, no one objects to the goal of conquering poverty, but our leaders can be criticized for implying that this objective could be achieved quickly and easily.

No matter how serious our problems of poverty and prejudice might be, there can be no excuse for rioting. Law and order is not an academic platitude to be respected only when convenient. It is a fundamental basis of the American Way of Life.

Therefore, the question becomes one of whether the responsible majority will allow an angry, but well organized, minority to overshadow the rest of us.

During this program, you will hear several members of Congress express opinions on the issues of 1968. Personally, I think the message to them is quite clear. We have lost our patience for overpermissiveness and fiscal irresponsibility. Most Americans are tired of overpromising and underdelivering. They plead for a sense of national purpose, for a priority on resources.

A short time ago, we heard the State of the Union address. Frankly, this speech fell far short of coming to grips with the problems of priorities and crime. In some respects, it was a restatement of worn-out Great Society

programs. Even more serious was the lack of emphasis placed upon the serious crisis in our nation's economy.

For many years, liberal economists have assumed that, if only enough money were available, all of man's problems could be overcome. They put their faith in the principle that government could achieve almost any goal society wanted. Today, even the liberal spenders are deeply concerned about America's inflationary binge.

It seems tragically unfair and inadequate for Washington to consider wage, price or travel controls when government itself is either unwilling or unable to control its own spending spree. I believe the harsh realities of deficit spending caught up with us some time ago.

The fate of the British pound should be a clear warning that no nation, no matter how rich or powerful, can go on year after year living beyond its means. No nation, no matter how prosperous, can tolerate indefinitely wage settlements in excess of productivity.

This year, our federal deficit may exceed \$30 billion. Yet we blindly move on, assuming that we can both fight a war abroad and achieve miracles in the slums at home.

It is pure delusion to imply that our deficits and tax surcharge proposal are solely the result of the war in Vietnam. The statistics prove to the contrary.

There are very few companies in the United States that do not have more capital needs than can be afforded at any one time. Therefore, they plan. They set priorities. They select alternatives and develop financial strategy. Why shouldn't government take the same approach? Why can't it set priorities that will contribute to sound economic policy?

Equally as essential as priorities are the commitments of our country to other free nations around the globe. Whether we like it or not, the United States serves today as a global policeman, particularly since Britain has withdrawn as a world military power.

We make a serious mistake when we look upon the crises in Southeast Asia, the Middle East or Korea as isolated or unrelated developments. Each is a challenge to America. Each has Russia's blessing, if not her direct support. Each is a test to determine if we are overcommitted and underprepared to act.

You can be sure that Russia has taken considerable pleasure in the confiscation of the U.S.S. Pueblo right out from under our own noses. You also can be sure that they take great pride in their fleet, which now is a maritime power in the Mediterranean—a Russian goal for more than 100 years.

We also know that her supplies flow regularly into Hanoi. I join many others who happen to believe that the security of South Vietnam is just as important to the United States as it is to Southeast Asia.

Because we have drawn the line in Vietnam, we have given some 200 million people of other Southeast Asia nations valuable time to strengthen their governments and economies against the threats of Communism.

If the Communists succeed in their overt aggression there, it appears certain that they then will continue with "wars of liberation" elsewhere—at a far greater cost to the United States.

It serves no useful purpose to carry on an academic debate at this point as to whether or not we should be in Vietnam in the first place. The fact is that we are there—525,000 GI's strong, with more than 16,000 Americans killed and 100,000 wounded.

Personally, I don't believe there would be nearly as much dissension either at home or abroad if, from the very outset, the Administration had clearly defined our goals in Vietnam and fully supported the advice of our military in achieving these objectives.

Too often our military commanders have been overruled.

Today they advise that bombing halts would only prolong the war rather than bring peace closer. Yet, some continue to press for bombing stops without any reciprocal withdrawal by the enemy—and just when the pressure is beginning to hurt.

We also hear of new peace feelers. On this issue, the experts again warn of pitfalls. It is a well known fact that the Communists use the conference table as another war front, particularly when they have lost on the battlefield. Let's not forget that more than two-thirds of all Americans killed in Korea died after peace talks began. Past experience should tell us that there is little assurance that negotiations mean either peace or a satisfactory solution to the war.

Regrettably, we have not communicated a true image of our country to the rest of the world. Naturally, the enemy delights in contrasting our weaknesses with their selected propaganda.

We need to remember that the Communists have their internal problems too, but they purposely refuse to report them. Perhaps the best evidence that we are failing to sell America overseas is the fact that Russia isn't even bothering to jam our news broadcasts anymore.

However, our critics should know that the rioters, the military deserters and the demonstrators in no way speak for America today!

We ourselves tend to judge America incorrectly. For example, take a look at the impression we have of young people. We all know that a great many of our troublemakers include youths. However, too many judge the entire younger generation by the irresponsible acts of a few. We should know that the vast majority of young people today do not take dope, nor do they grow beards, nor stage riots.

Most would not think of carrying a sign, or of impeding the draft, or of wrecking the institution that is giving them the privilege of an education. Most refuse to believe that the world owes them a living. While some have crime records, most are responsible citizens seeking the challenge of opportunity rather than some false hope of security.

As a group, they are better informed and more articulate than any other generation of the past. They also represent the majority of our population, since half our nation today is under 25 years of age.

It is significant to public affairs executives that 42 percent of those in their early and mid twenties have not yet made their choice as to party affiliation. Such factors of youth and non-commitment to a political philosophy offer important challenges to business and professional leaders.

We know that life for these young people is incredibly complex, particularly with knowledge expanding faster than any of us can possibly absorb it.

To illustrate the latter point, technology has advanced more rapidly in the past 50 years than in the previous 5,000, with scientific knowledge doubling every ten years. Currently there is approximately a hundred times as much to know as there was in 1900, and by the year 2000, there will be a thousand times as much to be learned as today.

No other nation has applied scientific discovery as fast as America has. However, business and professional men should be concerned that young people do not readily attribute this technological progress to America's competitive economy. In fact, many take our affluence for granted because they have seen so much accomplished in so short a span of time.

Student polls relate that businessmen cannot be trusted, that they are too concerned about profits, that business careers are not

intellectually stimulating. Only 30 percent of all college students today are even considering careers in business . . . only 12 percent make it their first choice.

Businessmen need to combat such attitudes, because our future economic growth is directly dependent upon attracting intelligent and imaginative young leadership into business and industry.

Certainly, we have every reason to be concerned about how we can meet the challenges which all these trends and problems imply. Therefore, let me make a few suggestions.

In the first place, let's respect the impressive progress already made to insure equality in America. Let's remember that industry itself has reduced poverty dramatically by creating more than ten million new jobs in the past six years.

Let's use business leadership to build a close working relationship with all levels of government. We have no right to abdicate our social responsibilities to others.

We also have an important task ahead in selling young people on the benefits of business careers. Let's remind others that business has already performed remarkably in fighting the war on poverty by creating new jobs, by offering job retraining, and by bringing new industries to slum areas.

As to our own public affairs responsibilities, we must work together to develop common goals. I think there is little that private enterprise could not accomplish in Washington if we presented a united front.

We also have a responsibility to express our values on the issues to our employees as well. A recent Purdue University survey found that workers believe what their employers say nine to one over that which they are told by their union leaders.

As another essential suggestion, government must establish national priorities and fiscal integrity. This includes placing the welfare of our country ahead of the expedience of partisan politics or narrow business interests.

We must demand law and order, realizing that law enforcement is essential to the very survival of our nation. In America good laws are made by appropriate action in our courts and legislatures, not by breaking the bad ones in the street. Certainly, we must preserve the right to dissent, but that does not include any special right to ignore the law.

During such critical times, we must give full support to our nation's leaders. May they demonstrate to our enemy that America will not tolerate overt aggression against free men, nor will we tolerate piracy on the high seas. Let's also give the same loyalty to our troops abroad—after all, that is the least we can do while they risk their lives in our behalf.

Perhaps our most important public affairs task is to sell America to Americans. Sure, we have problems, but let's keep them in perspective. Much to our credit, America has never been satisfied with the status quo. It is a measure of strength that we openly admit we have problems.

In conclusion, let's remember this. Americans can be proud of our concern for the underdog, but let's remember that such generosity is available only because someone else achieved it. For the most part, this success was possible not because of what anyone else did for us, but rather because of what we did for ourselves.

In short, this striving to get ahead has been the American dream. It has been the spark behind the unsurpassed success of private enterprise.

This striving to achieve was the same dream that a man named Lincoln cherished, too. He had that important will to win. But let's remember that Lincoln's name is immortal not because he lived in that log cabin but because he got out of it.

His determination is typical of the success that has built America, and we should

challenge our critics to tell us what's wrong with success?

What Freedom Means to Young People

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Columbus, Ind., High School each year sponsors Freedom Appreciation Day. Part of this observance involves writing an essay on the subject of "What Freedom Means to Me."

The following three essays and poem were written by students in the U.S. history class in connection with the observance of the day on February 12.

The four authors are Columbus High School juniors and are:

Damian Salinas, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jose M. Salinas; Janis Schnell, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. M. H. Schnell; Mark Sabatino, son of Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Sabatino; and David Mohler, son of Dr. and Mrs. Floyd W. Mohler.

These young people are to be commended for their perceptive and penetrating observations on freedom. The above-mentioned items follow:

IT IS MY LIFE

(By Janis Schnell)

The worth of freedom can be determined by evaluating the important fundamentals that it adds to or subtracts from my life. A basic question is whether the privileges I am granted by freedom are more important than possible actions that I am denied so that freedom may be shared.

The most important privilege freedom grants me is the right to worship as I desire. This privilege is most important to me, because freedom of religion is freedom of life; a person's life is lived according to his religion. Freedom in this context provides for an abundant life.

Freedom to enjoy home, family, friends, and education is the element that makes life meaningful and complete. I, as a free American, have this freedom and many more. I have the freedom of opportunity to gain whatever I am willing to work for. I have the freedom to express my individual opinions and make decisions. I do not have to conform. My individuality is important to me.

Freedom is a gift of God that relatively few people in the world enjoy; therefore, I should cherish and protect it rather than take advantage of it for only selfish personal gains.

Freedom is so often misused. Freedom is more than merely the right to protest. We should protect and extend freedom as well as make use of it. We should be grateful to the people who are fighting to preserve freedom. The boys who are fighting and dying in Vietnam are offering their lives to protect a way of life that I love so much. What a debt I owe!

Freedom is the very essence of a life worth living. We often do not realize the value of a possession until we lose it. I want to safeguard freedom while I have it, because freedom is life to me.

FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Mark Sabatino)

The concept of freedom has possibly been the most controversial issue in the formation of governmental policies. Freedom through the ages has meant a variety of things to different classes of men. Kings,

philosophers, intellectuals, presidents, dictators, and the great masses of people have all questioned freedom in either its abundance or its restraint.

The question that must be answered is what freedom should mean to an average American citizen. I realize that I cannot speak for all as I express my views, but if the contents of this editorial are able to stir a small portion of the American public to some serious thinking about their God-given rights, then I have accomplished what I have set out to do.

The freedoms that a government should impart to its people in order to maintain a prosperous country and a society in which one can feel like a man instead of a machine are those outlined in the Constitution of the United States.

I believe that the Constitution is perfection itself in government. The types of freedom guaranteed in it can hardly be added to or subtracted from without having a resultant adverse effect on any society.

It is true that many could handle a considerably greater amount of freedom than that with which they are presently entrusted, yet there are those people in large numbers who have proven themselves unable to manage the presently prescribed amount.

Certain fears concerning freedom as envisaged in the Constitution are readily aroused today; Americans have slowly been losing their rights. The standards of morality, justice, and truth, which I believe are synonymous with freedom, have been slowly decaying.

Government officials have not hindered this alarming decadence, as certain recent Supreme Court decisions and the many laws and actions of the Congress acknowledge. Freedom in this country should mean that a man is able to advance himself to the highest state to which his ability will take him. Does our present situation allow this? The government is apparently getting too strong, the very thing which the Founding Fathers feared.

In the near future, there is a possibility that I will have to defend, at the cost of my life, the ideals expressed in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Many men have thought these principles worth their time and lives and I, too, consider them worth mine.

I am concerned, however, with the diminishing number of these individual rights which will remain in existence to be defended. I strongly desire our government to exist for the benefit of the people and not the people for the government.

American citizens must not think about freedom one day out of the year, but every day. The forces that work against our rights never rest.

DEVOTION IS VITAL

(By David Mohler)

Freedom, being an intangible quantity, is extremely difficult to interpret, but can perhaps best be defined as the ability to live and function according to one's own standards, coupled with the responsibility of preserving and assuring this right for others.

Our country, the United States of America, is one of the few countries in today's world that grants freedom of this nature to each of its citizens.

We in America have unbounded freedom of thought. We are free to think, and decide for ourselves the stand we wish to take on any issue we wish to consider. We are free to establish our own philosophies, moral codes, religious beliefs, and our own political beliefs with some restrictions of individual sovereignty. We feel free to speak our minds, and are guaranteed the right to do so in our Constitution. We are also free to print the truth as we see it, to assemble if we wish, and to do so with whomever we wish. Our most unique freedom is our power to deter-

mine the functions of our own government through voting, petition, active reform, and dissent.

Generally, we are free to live our lives as we choose. No one but the individual decides whether he will be a farmer, teacher, engineer or a politician. No one but the individual decides whether he will live in New York, Seattle, or Miami. There is no one who forces him to get up in the morning, or tells him what brand of peanut butter he must use, or where he should go on his vacation. No one will make him go to church on Sunday or read a book instead of going to bed. He is free to support his government, be apathetic about it, or protest against its alleged wrongs. In all of these matters he is free to make his own decision.

Part of freedom is the responsibility that accompanies it in exercising our freedoms. We must take care not to infringe upon the rights of others. We cannot, in honesty, exercise a freedom while simultaneously denying it to others, or injuring others in the process of our use of it. We must refrain from abusing our freedoms by using them correctly. If we use our freedom of speech to defame a person through slander and lies, we are then encroaching on his freedom. The greatest responsibility accompanying freedom is the responsibility of perpetuating it.

This can be accomplished only through the proper exercise of that freedom and total devotion to the ideals behind it. This devotion may necessitate the extreme of fighting for and, perhaps, of dying for those principles.

IN THE MIND

(By Damian Salinas)

Sometimes because of life's great speed, we seem to take for granted what we need.

Sometimes we criticize the things we want, and that we are being wronged by our government.

But think too, of the liberties we get, and weigh them against any other country's set. Then you will find that thanks we should give, for having freedom, such a precious gift.

And think of all the men who died, some of which today could still be alive.

What is this that men die for? And why are men willing to fight the more?

This answer you will find, not in the Scriptures, but in the mind.

Of people who are grateful for this and willing to practice and protect our gift—freedom.

Wheat Prices Today and 50 Years Ago

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Mrs. Paul Prochaska of Ross, N. Dak., for bringing to my attention the following news item which appeared 50 years ago—February 15, 1918—in a Mountrail County newspaper:

Senator McCumber, Republican from North Dakota, has introduced a bill in the U.S. Congress to increase the price of wheat from \$2.00 per bushel to \$2.75. He says price of material and labor has become so high that something must be done to increase the profits of farmers.

Now, 50 years and three wars later, the price of wheat in western North Dakota is around \$1.32 per bushel.

Wheat would have to bring about \$6 a bushel today to give the farmer the same purchasing power that \$2.75 wheat provided in 1918.

As an historical footnote, it might be added that the price of wheat moved well above the level suggested by Senator McCumber. In 1919 the Minneapolis price of Hard Spring wheat averaged out at \$3 per bushel. With the removal of price controls following World War II, wheat again rose above the \$3 level for a brief period.

Today, with farm operating costs at a record level and moving higher by the day, wheat producers are marketing their grain at depression-level prices.

A Memorial of the New Mexico Legislature Requesting the Cooperation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Establishing a Water System in an Area of the Sandia Mountains in Eastern Bernalillo County, N. Mex.

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial of the New Mexico Legislature:

HOUSE MEMORIAL 8

A memorial requesting the cooperation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in establishing a water system in an area of the Sandia Mountains in eastern Bernalillo County, N. Mex.

Whereas, the foothills of the Sandia Mountains in Eastern Bernalillo County, New Mexico, is an accessible suburban area of the city of Albuquerque with great natural beauty and with growth potential; and

Whereas, the high rate of population growth has caused a serious health hazard, arising from the use of individual water supply systems, so as to necessitate the installation of a public water supply system to ensure a potable water supply; and

Whereas, such a public water supply system would be self-supporting and is entitled to a long term loan under the community facilities program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as a community facility necessary for the protection of public health and for the efficient and orderly growth of a community; and

Whereas, there has been established the Sandia Utilities Cooperative, Inc., a non-profit corporation, for the purpose of submitting a loan application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

Whereas, the Sandia Utilities Cooperative, Inc., with the assistance and the encouragement of the state planning officer, has made application for a long term loan to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to construct a public water supply system in this area of Bernalillo County;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico that the Department of Housing and Urban Development of the United States is requested to assist the Sandia Utilities Cooperative, Inc., and the Middle Rio Grande Council of Governments of New Mexico in arranging the financing and the establishment of a public water supply in the foothills of the Sandia Mountains located in Eastern Bernalillo County; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and to the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

Signed and sealed at the Capitol, in the City of Santa Fe.

BRUCE KING,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

ALBERT ROMERO,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

OEO Legal Services Program

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Kiwanis magazine of February 1968, contains an excellent article on the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The author, Leonard Baker, has given readers a very informative glimpse into the ways in which antipoverty lawyers are helping put an end to practices which have been victimizing the poor.

I am proud of the fact that the Kiwanis, of which I am a member, has brought information of such timeliness to its readership. Because I know the article will be of very great general interest, I include it in full following my remarks:

OEO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Ramon, 20 years old, wanted to borrow \$300 to start his own business. Because he was a product of one of the worst slum areas in the United States, the Cardozo area of Washington, D.C., regular lending agencies were closed to him. So he crossed over to Maryland and borrowed the money.

His interest charges were \$9 or 3 per cent a month—36 per cent a year. Though seven months later Ramon defaulted on the loan, the Maryland lending agency waited a year before bringing suit. "After all," explained the youth's lawyer later, "where else could the lending agency invest its money at 36 per cent interest?"

As many who deal regularly with the poor have discovered, there is a great deal of money to be made from other people's poverty. The chief profiteers are the slumlords and the "easy credit" lending agencies that—backed by the law—mult those who for reasons of economics or race cannot find decent homes or obtain credit from reputable establishments.

This situation has existed for years. The legal rights of the poor in civil proceedings have been neglected primarily because poor people have not been able to afford legal aid to fight their battles in the courtrooms and because privately financed legal aid societies have been understaffed and underbudgeted.

Changes began to come about in 1965, however, when the Office of Economic Opportunity developed the Neighborhood Legal Services program. The purpose of the new program was to take the profit out of poverty through legal action.

Today there are approximately two hundred Legal Services programs in communities across the nation. Through them law offices have been set up in slum areas, on Indian reservations, and in depressed rural areas. The more than 1200 lawyers working for these programs represent the poor without charge in civil cases. The government establishes some general guidelines and provides the funds to operate the programs, but on the

local level they are organized and watched over by private citizens.

Earl Johnson, head of the Neighborhood Legal Services program, explains his agency's job this way: "The most important goal is to accomplish changes in the law to make a fairer law for the poor." This is done in three ways: by developing a history of abuses to use as a basis for legislative action; by exploiting the bargaining power of large groups of poor people, as in rent strikes; and by using test cases to advance new legal theories.

But changing the law is the real objective of the program. "I believe," says Johnson, "that the Legal Services program fails if it only helps a few hundred thousand or, for that matter, even millions of poor people to negotiate the present legal system. The Legal Services program does not fulfill its mission unless it achieves fundamental change in the present legal system to make that system more responsive to the needs of the poor."

A number of young lawyers are answering Johnson's call for a crusade. They are turning away from the plushy paneled offices of successful law firms to take up the fight for fairer laws in dingy rooms and the slums. "I was going nuts sitting at a desk," says Paul F. Cohen, a lawyer for the Legal Services program in Washington who left a better paying job at the Department of the Interior to represent the poor. "While it certainly was important," he says of his work at Interior, "it was too abstract, dealing with a national park 3000 miles away. I really felt I wanted to do something for people I could see."

An American Bar Association official explains why the Legal Services program is having such success in recruiting bright and aggressive lawyers. "We're running with the tide today," he says. "Young people out of schools want to go into public service. You know, the big corporations and law firms are having difficulty filling jobs."

Although the tide is strong, it is crashing against a rocky shore of archaic civil law, handed down from the feudal days when landowner and creditor held almost life-and-death power over tenant and debtor. Today, for example, in landlord-tenant disputes the laws of U.S. cities and towns almost universally favor the landlord. The tenant's obligation to pay him rent is absolute, but he is not equally obligated to provide the tenant with a habitable dwelling, with enough heat and adequate plumbing.

About the only recourse a tenant has is to complain to the municipal government and have the landlord charged with a housing violation. But usually this does not resolve the tenant's plight because fines, if levied at all, are often too small to be much of a deterrent. One Legal Services lawyer tells of a landlord charged with 110 housing code violations. "The judge gave him a thirty-day continuance," he says. "That didn't do the tenants any good." Also, if a tenant complains too much he will usually be evicted, for most slum dwellings are rented on a month-to-month basis.

Landlords, of course, do not like to be labeled "slumlords." "You always hear about the toilets not working," says one lawyer, who represents a number of landlords. "But you never hear that the reason the toilet isn't working is because someone threw something down it." And many apartment house owners insist that they are providing a service in offering dwellings on a monthly-lease basis to people who are too transient to want a longer lease.

But it is difficult to accept such arguments. Julian H. Levi, professor of urban studies at the University of Chicago, has his own opinion of slumlords. "Few heroes exist," he says. "Substantial profits are realized in operation of substandard housing. If the tenement is old and in bad condition, allowable depreciation under the Internal Revenue Code will be high, while poor condition and depreciation will be recognized by the real estate assessor

as the occasion for reducing appraisal values." In other words, the worse condition a landlord's building is in, the less in taxes, both income and property, he has to pay.

And the rents charged for slum dwellings are not low. A Chicago study has shown that the slum landlord realizes a return of between 10 and 20 per cent. "The rents here are unbelievable," one Legal Services lawyer who lives in a middle-class neighborhood says of rents in the slum where he works. "Ninety-five per cent of my clients pay more than I do." These people also have trouble obtaining receipts for the rent they pay, and often find that they are being evicted without ever knowing that a suit has been brought against them.

The problem of usurious contracts is more complicated than that of landlord-tenant relations. First, problems arise in defining "usurious." The credit unions operated by agencies of the Office of Economic Opportunity charge an effective interest rate of about 9 per cent a year. A person financing a car through a bank or other reputable lender pays interest of between 10 and 12 per cent. Financing an appliance such as a washing machine through a department store usually costs 16 per cent, and department stores with "revolving" charge accounts collect between 12 and 18 per cent in interest.

On the other hand, a lending company charges a poor credit risk 36 per cent. Is this usurious? The answer obviously depends on whether one is the borrower or the lender. When Maryland early in 1967 was considering legislation to reduce the 36 per cent maximum rate to 24 per cent, the proposal was attacked by the Maryland Consumer Finance Association as "completely destructive" to its member companies. It argued that the legislation would force these companies to cut off credit to people unable to secure it elsewhere.

Creditors offer other arguments too. "They overbuy," says one store operator of the poor. "When they come in they only care about the weekly payments." A lawyer who represents collection agencies scoffs at the idea of poor people as victims of unscrupulous lenders. "They make so little money that even if the creditors get a judgment against them it can't be collected," he said. "They know that."

Judges too are often unsympathetic to borrowers. When Judge Edward A. Beard was sitting on Washington's small claims court in spring 1967, a defendant appearing before him complained about a collection agency "playing rough." The Judge shot back: "Sure these people play rough—I admit it. But people play rough with them too. They lie, they cheat. They give false names. It's a two-way street." He then closed the case by telling the man, "You can expect your salary to be attached."

Although borrowing from a lending agency is certainly a "two-way street," the traffic lights seem to be green only for the creditor. Stores and collection agencies don't hesitate to take advantage of the ignorance of the poor. They may have a man sign contracts stipulating that the total price of an item is, say \$200 and later fill in blank spaces bringing the figure up to \$400. If one payment lapses, a suit is instituted immediately.

Poor borrowers are often quite docile about responding to suits. In one case a man being sued for \$80 allegedly incurred by his wife sought the aid of a Legal Services lawyer. Asked if he owed the money, the man replied, "I'll pay it." The lawyer asked a few more questions and discovered that the man never had been married. It turned out that the creditor was so anxious to bring suit that he sued the wrong man, who was afraid he would go to jail if he didn't pay without protest.

A favorite device of stores and collection agencies in dealing with the poor is the "addon" system. For example, a person who has bought a sofa and paid for it within a year may then buy a dining room set at the same

store and pay for it the second year. But if the person returns to the store to buy a color television set and later misses one payment, the store can immediately repossess and resell not only the television set, but also the sofa and dining room set, even though fully paid for.

Those who lend money and sell merchandise on credit in the slums usually do not bother to collect the money themselves, but instead sell the note to a collection agency for about 50 per cent of its face value. If the consumer later has any complaint about the merchandise, he is out of luck; the collection agency assumes no responsibility.

Most communities have small claims courts to handle minor suits involving the poor. Although these were originally set up to allow poor people to protect their rights without incurring heavy expense, the courts have become more the tools of the creditors. Stores and collection agencies now use them to voice their claims. In most cases they seek a court order attaching a man's salary or taking possession of his property.

The courts operate with machinegun rapidity. Even before a defendant can walk from the spectators' section to the judge's bench, a bored judge may call out, "Do you owe this money?" If the defendant nods, the judge turns to an equally bored clerk and directs that the order be granted. Case closed.

Often, however, just the fact that a Legal Services lawyer is representing a poor person in small claims court is sufficient to bring the matter to a fair solution. So many of the cases brought against the poor are so insubstantial that they collapse as soon as a challenge is presented.

In one case a woman who bought an intercom system from a salesman who had been hounding her for a year suddenly found that the bank had a deed of trust against her home for \$2500. Although the signature on the deed had been notarized, she insisted to her Legal Services lawyer that she had not signed anything in front of a notary. As a result, the notary who swore to the signature and the salesman both were indicted.

Judge Tim Murphy of the District of Columbia's Court of General Sessions recently pointed up the value of legal representation for the poor. Of the small claims court he said, "It is primarily the court of the skilled lawyer representing large debt collection companies, credit stores, corporate defendants, and insurance companies. Further, these lawyers and their organizations are almost without exception litigating against *pro se* parties [persons representing themselves]. In spite of the court's informal practices, the *pro se* party is at a definite disadvantage when he appears in court."

Concerning settlements out of court, Judge Murphy continued: "In the conference room the *pro se* party must bargain with a trained specialist attorney. Although compromise is frequently reached for an amount below the claim, it is frequently only a token reduction. On the other hand, in the rare cases where both parties are represented by counsel and compromise is effected, the claim is normally reduced 50 per cent or more or dismissed altogether."

But Neighborhood Legal Services attorneys are trying to do more than just save their clients a few dollars. In landlord-tenant cases they argue that even though a tenant has only a month-to-month lease, he should not be evicted merely for filing complaints for housing code violations. They maintain that these "retaliatory evictions" hamper a tenant's constitutional right to petition his government.

In a landlord-tenant court, which ordinarily disposes of around four hundred cases a day, an argument over such a novel point is considered by some judges and lawyers more as a harassment than a legal discussion. Nevertheless, the Legal Services lawyers continue to hammer at that point; eventually

they hope to make it stick. Either a Supreme Court decision will uphold them, they believe, or their efforts will bring about a change in the law.

In another attack, Legal Services lawyers are charging that usurious contracts are unconscionable and therefore should not be upheld in the courts. This is a murky point of law because there are so many ways of evaluating goods and services. Nevertheless, the theory behind the play is that unscrupulous merchants and creditors will withdraw from business rather than try to defend each sale in court. "Enough of such defenses asserted at random in a particular community against particular sellers," one lawyer has advised, "would, in my opinion, contribute more to raising the standards and practices in supplying credit to the poor than any other approach."

The greatest contribution of the Neighborhood Legal Services program, however, may be in educating the poor as to their legal rights and responsibilities. "Everytime someone comes into my office with one of these contracts," says one Legal Services lawyer, "I ask him what he did wrong. When he leaves I ask him what he's going to do the next time. These people must learn to appreciate the value of their signature."

Many Legal Services offices use skits and discussions to present both the legal rights and the obligations. "I don't care how many laws we pass," remarked one lawyer, "they won't do any good until the people are educated to deal with the American economic system. It's a beautiful system, but no one teaches how to live in it."

Although the Neighborhood Legal Services program has the full support of the American Bar Association and of most local bar groups where it operates, it has run into some criticism. This comes primarily from the attorneys who represent the landlords, the collection agencies, and the merchants who deal with the poor. Quite unexpectedly they find themselves having to argue cases in court that earlier they would have won without challenge. They are disputed on points of law they have long ago forgotten.

"These NLS lawyers," charges one such attorney, "are using dilatory tactics. They are making jury demands where they should not be made. I had a case a few weeks ago that involved just \$7 and the NLS lawyer asked for a jury trial." A Washington, D.C., judge, Charles W. Halleck, has lodged a similar criticism, arguing that the NLS lawyers should put more effort into advising their clients on how to stay out of trouble instead of playing "crusading knights on white chargers trying to take every 15-cent case all the way up to the Supreme Court."

NLS's Earl Johnson has this to say regarding such criticism: "The first measure of a program's success is if you start to get complaints like that. You can't have good representation of the poor without disrupting the lower courts."

"These lower courts depend on most cases not being contested, otherwise they couldn't handle four hundred cases a day. The only way they can handle that many cases is to say 'Judgment!' 'Judgment!' What some lower court judges perceive as dilatory issues are often valid issues, but they've never been raised before. Because they've never been raised before doesn't mean they're frivolous."

Whatever else the Neighborhood Legal Services program may do in the future to revamp the law, it has already contributed to a discussion on reform. Law school journals such as those of Harvard and Notre Dame have devoted considerable space to examining the problem of the civil law and the poor. Across the nation lawyers are holding symposiums and law schools are introducing new courses on civil law. Judges are having to decide on new points of law.

Many lawyers believe that the question of poor people and the law is at the stage where the question of civil rights and the law was

a decade or more ago, that it is the beginning of a process that will in time bring about a change in American life. As with civil rights, however, the exact nature of that change will remain obscure for many years to come.

The Housing Problem in New Orleans

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last when we had a relatively light program because of the birthday of our first great President, President Washington, President Johnson sent to the Congress one of the most comprehensive housing messages that any President has ever submitted. The whole thrust of that message was the employment of the resources in all of our communities, especially the resources of private enterprise by tax concessions, and other devices, to rehabilitate and rebuild the inner cities throughout our country.

There is not a Member of this body, nor, I think, a citizen of this country, who is unaffected by the decay of our towns and cities. The growing problems of urban blight and substandard housing touch us all and threaten our way of life.

In my home city of New Orleans, 65,000 dwellings are classified as substandard. Twenty-six percent of the city's population lives in those dwellings; 40 to 50 percent of the city's major crimes originate there; 50 percent of its major infectious diseases are found there; and 45 percent of New Orleans' total city services go into the area.

These statistics record the measurable loss. The immeasurable loss is in human happiness, dignity, and hope. Slums are not merely eyesores; they are the breeding places of social, economic, and human ills of the worst kind.

Recently, the New Orleans States-Item published a series of articles by a very perceptive reporter, David Snyder. The articles are a chronicle of several days Mr. Snyder spent in the company of one of New Orleans' housing inspectors. I believe they merit the attention and concern of every Member, and indeed, every American, and I include them in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, Feb. 20, 1968]

NEW ORLEANS FACES SLUM GROWTH: SICKENING "RATHOLE" HOME ONLY ONE OF MANY HERE

(By David Snyder)

"This is where I threw up."

The man making the admission spends most of his working hours steeped in the sights, the miseries and the sometimes overpowering smells of the city's burgeoning slums.

He is one of the city's 19 housing inspectors. It is a job you don't pursue for very long on a nervous stomach.

But two weeks ago Inspector Jim Capraro opened the door to a hovel four blocks from the steps of City Hall, sniffed the air, and promptly regurgitated on the floor.

The "dwelling" is still there and it is still occupied. You can see the entrance to the windowless, dangerous cell at 1107 Lafayette

St. The number is painted haphazardly in black on the brick wall.

The place is occupied by one and sometimes two persons. The walls of the airless box are papered with cardboard cartons. The source of heat and light is a single gas burner set on the concrete floor dangerously close to the cardboard wall and to a coal black mattress, also on the floor.

There are no toilet facilities and no running water. Waste material, garbage or otherwise, is thrown on the sidewalk and into the gutter immediately in front of the front door.

In an adjoining cubicle that might at one time have housed a toilet, there is nothing but a four-inch waste line that, the inspectors point out, leaks poisonous sewer gas.

On that day that inspectors Jim Capraro and Fred Evans first saw the room, its Negro occupant had been sick on the floor. There were also rat droppings and food scattered around.

The rent at 1107 Lafayette is \$8 a week. The Housing Improvement Division has asked the owner, Peter Foto, to have the dwelling at the rear of 549 S. Rampart vacated immediately. So far, nothing has happened.

This particular property near the heart of "America's Most Interesting City" has flunked inspection. Foto has been given until March 29 to make a decision as to whether he will rehabilitate the housing unit (there is a large apartment on the second floor of the building) or close it up.

These are only two of about 200 living units undergoing close scrutiny in a seriously blighted area bounded by Howard Ave., Perdido, Loyola Ave. and O'Keefe.

There are better kept slums than those at 1107 Lafayette, but there are also worse. We'll see what the inspectors are seeing in the next installment.

Evans and his partner predict that as much as 90 per cent of the property in the area will not be rehabilitated by the owners. It will be closed.

The area, measuring roughly 15 square blocks, is a microcosm of virtually every problem that adds up to the word "slum."

A tour with Capraro and Evans raises a whole string of tough questions and very few good answers.

For instance, Christopher Bellone, head of the Housing Improvement Division, estimates that there are now about 65,000 substandard housing units in the city of New Orleans.

The figure represents a substantial increase over the number of units reported in the last U.S. Census taken in 1960.

If the Housing Improvement Division should miraculously succeed in clearing the city of its slums, where will the people who live in them find housing?

Will it be a case of a successful operation followed by the patient's death?

Bellone rates this consideration number one.

"The big problem is finding enough housing within the income of these people—income which is about nil," he said.

Traditionally, said Bellone, of the low income group, "progress is their enemy."

"Every time you build an expressway or a cultural center you reduce the area where these people can live."

Inevitably, the area chosen for the big "uplift" project is also home, dilapidated though it may be, for the slum dweller.

One answer is public low cost housing, but New Orleans has proven that such housing isn't an answer at all.

Bellone said studies have shown that New Orleans could use 60,000 more housing units.

The city of New Orleans has the third largest public housing program in the country, behind Boston and Philadelphia, with 12,270 units. But the housing available obviously falls far short.

Even after 2,800 more units have been finished by the Housing Authority of New

Orleans, there will be almost as great a backlog.

The sparsely-manned Housing Improvement Division at City Hall is up against some staggering problems.

During 1967 the inspectors made a total of 3,216 dwelling unit inspections on 388 premises. One interesting fact that these figures point up is this: there is an average of 10 housing units in every substandard dwelling.

In the 1960 census, 62,000 substandard dwelling units were discovered. Of this number, 14,223 units were classified as dilapidated; 36,631 as deteriorating, and 11,687 as units that were sound but lacking in some or all plumbing facilities.

Despite the stepped up efforts of the Housing Improvement Division, the housing situation has deteriorated further during the intervening years.

Compliance with a new housing code approved by the City Council in January of 1967 has been good, according to Bellone.

For instance, the housing division obtained owner compliance in cases involving 2,236 units. In addition, 196 units were demolished and 350 were vacated.

At the end of the year another 1,843 housing units were brought up to minimum standards.

The number of housing units being vacated and demolished particularly worries Bellone. He doesn't know where the people who are losing their slum homes will find even comparable housing.

Crowded conditions now could result in an intolerable situation later as even extremely low cost housing becomes scarce.

Slum housing is the result of a seemingly hopeless cycle of circumstances. The poorly educated slum tenant can get only a marginal job or no job at all, resulting in financial chaos. His money buys only the worst housing.

Those who provide the housing make no repairs until they are forced to do so by the Housing Improvement Division. By that time the cost of the repairs are too high. If they do rehabilitate the property, rents go up and, in either case the old tenant is out on the street.

Tomorrow we'll visit housing so bad that there is a serious question as to whether a person is better off living in one of the slum warrens or getting evicted.

[From the New Orleans (La.) State-Item, Feb. 21, 1968]

POCKET OF MISERY: TOUR POINTS UP DESPERATE SLUM PROBLEM OF NEW ORLEANS

(By David Snyder)

Nothing drives home the desperation of New Orleans slums like a walking tour with city housing inspectors Jim Capraro and Fred Evans.

They are just winding up a long, sickening (sometimes literally nauseating) investigation of a 15-square block area on either side of S. Rampart st. from Howard ave. to Perdido st. and from Loyola ave. to O'Keefe st.

Their boss, Christopher Bellone, calls the area "the worst pocket of human misery I think we've seen."

The area along S. Rampart is symbolic of a slum housing crisis that has been in the making for 20 or 30 years. It is, however, but a pocket in a slum problem so large that 25 per cent of the city is made up of substandard housing that directly affects 26 per cent of the population.

Rampart st. was not always in the present disreputable condition. There was a time some years ago when the street vibrated with commercial activity and many of the owners and operators of small businesses along the street lived in comfortable quarters above their stores.

For the most part this is the housing, above and behind the now shabby, often

vacant store fronts that has been divided into the cubicles. The cubicles have become slums.

One piece of property ruled unfit for human habitation is at 708 S. Rampart. An attorney for the owners, the Slipman estate, has been given until April 1 to tell the city's Housing Improvement Division whether the property will be rehabilitated or closed.

A weathered sign hanging over the sidewalk on S. Rampart advertises, "For Rent, One and Two Room Apartments, Furnished and Unfurnished."

Behind and above an abandoned recording studio are 10 units in varying states of disrepair. None of these units has toilet or bath facilities and there is no hot water. The rent on one-room units ranges from \$24 to \$28 a month. Upstairs, a couple of two-room apartments bring in \$40 a month.

Evans and Capraro led the way from the street down a long passage smelling of urine to the back of the store where the downstairs units are located.

As in the case of most of the units along S. Rampart, there is an unheated common toilet at the back of a row of cubicles on both the first and the second floors.

When this particular inspection was being made, a chill breeze whistled through a broken window at the side of the filthy toilet room.

An unheated shower room next to the common toilet facility had been closed with slats nailed at intervals across the doorless entrance.

Another shower room had been boarded up on the other side of the unit.

The railing on the stairs leading to the second floor apartment units was rickety. Hand rails supports were missing, leaving large gaps of unprotected area.

Upstairs in an apartment overlooking Rampart, an elderly Negro couple is ready to move out, they are anticipating, as do most residents of the area, that the building will be closed.

Some food and cooking utensils are packed in a wash tub on the floor. The old man is sick, lying in a bed near a window overlooking the street.

Until you look at a representative number of slum dwellings, you take windows for granted. But after you've been in and out of these hovels for a while, there is a realization that at the bottom level of existence in New Orleans, a window in a room or in an entire apartment is a luxury.

If this particular apartment has windows, it also has big health problems. Evans points to the ceiling over the cooking area of the kitchen-dining-living room area. It is covered with a black substance.

At first the blackness on the high ceiling looks like dirt or soot. As you step forward and look more closely, you realize that the black is a blanket of roaches. And they are alive.

Evans warns against walking too close. Sometimes they drop from the ceiling when the room becomes warm.

The inspectors apparently had the roaches in mind when they wrote in a detailed report on the apartment units that "food is prepared under deplorable conditions, contributing to health hazards."

The elderly Negro woman cannot remember when any work was done on the apartment. She thinks that she remembers some painting being done in 1963, but is not sure.

The inspectors have recommended that the whole place be vacated and boarded up, which is probably what will happen.

Bellone, director of the city's Housing Improvement Division, is well aware of the problems existing with the property at 708 S. Rampart.

He predicts that it will not be rehabilitated because of the cost—\$20,000 to \$25,000—just to meet the minimum standards. The financial return just wouldn't warrant that kind

of expenditure. The bathrooms required for each of the 10 apartment units would cost a total of \$10,000.

If a decision has not been made by the property owners by April 1, his housing division will take the matter to court.

Evans asks the man under the patchwork quilt in the S. Rampart st. apartment if he is feeling any better. He inquires of the woman if they have found another place to live. So far, they have not.

The inspectors assure them that there is still time. The couple seems to be defeated by the problem. The apartment has been their home for 15 years.

Just down the street at 754 S. Rampart is another unique housing complex. It has also been found unfit for human habitation, and the reasons are readily apparent.

Aside from the filth, which could be cleaned up, there are the obvious shortcomings—no toilets, no baths and no hot water.

As a matter of fact, this particular building does have a bath, and that's one of the things that makes it different from other slum dwellings.

It is located in a small unheated room at the top of the open stairway leading to the second floor.

This bathroom is so centrally located, that it is impossible to get to two of the apartments in the building without walking through it.

The inspectors asked a tenant how they could use a bathroom which is also a passageway.

Evans and Capraro estimate that it would cost at least \$13,000 to make the building meet minimum housing standards. They are betting it will not be done.

They did find one change made between inspections.

On the first visit they were astounded to find that most of the second floor gallery outside the apartment units had no railing. Now a wide, rough board has been nailed across the opening.

There are still large holes in the stairs and gallery floors where boards have rotted out and not been replaced.

Some tenants have already moved out, anticipating the future. But others are still hanging on.

"As long as they have time," said Evans, "they won't leave."

By now, the two inspectors are well known up and down S. Rampart and on the side streets that make up their "territory." They've been working in the area for weeks.

Evans and Capraro have tried hard to make the tenants who occupy the slum buildings understand that what they are doing will eventually be beneficial.

But in a conversation a few days ago prior to another inspection of the moldering area, Evans was candid about the attitude of those who live there.

"They don't look upon us as a friend," he said. "When are we going to go? That's what they're going to ask us today. When are we going to go?"

He was right. All up and down the street, that was the question.

They are not looking with either anticipation or excitement to the probability of being uprooted. Bad as the housing has been, S. Rampart street and its environs is a neighborhood where there are friendships of long standing.

Explaining the benefits of closing down a slum to the tenant who has no place to go "is like explaining Providence to a hungry man," said Capraro.

The "good government" benefits of slum clearance escape the man about to be put on the street.

For instance, Mr. and Mrs. Willis Alleman, an elderly Negro couple, live in one of the two room apartments at the rear of 756 S. Rampart. Their dwelling has neither windows, toilet nor bath. There is no yard and none of the refinements generally associated

with a home. In other years, the apartment was part of a warehouse.

But it is spotlessly clean and they do not want to leave. Most of all, they do not want to be moved into a housing project. Alleman is adamant on this point.

"I don't have any special place to go unless it's the project, and I don't want to go there." He has heard stories of older people being mugged and robbed.

Capnaro found Mrs. Alleman sitting in a chair against a storefront at the S. Rampart address and asked her if she would like to move out of the blighted area.

"You know I'd rather stay," she said. "I've been in these three blocks since 1928."

Again, there seems little reason to believe that this particular building will be brought up to standard.

Other things are in the wind for the S. Rampart st. area and the biggest possibility is the domed stadium.

The super sports palace is now scheduled for construction just across Loyola ave., a hop, skip and a jump from the blight of S. Rampart.

Housing experts are guessing that most owners will simply oust the tenants, board up the buildings and wait for the value of their property to increase.

[From the New Orleans (La.) States Item, Feb. 22, 1968]

MAY CHARGE 200: SLUM LANDLORDS FACE DOUBLE RISK
(By David Snyder)

Owners of slum housing in 1968 face double the risk of being prosecuted by the city for failure to comply with minimum standards.

Christopher Bellone, director of the Housing Improvement Division of the city, expects to file about 200 cases in the Municipal Court of Judge W. Blair Lancaster seeking prosecution of property owners who have consistently refused to rehabilitate housing found unfit for human habitation.

Only 78 cases were brought into Judge Lancaster's court last year.

The pressure is on. It rests heavily on the shoulders of Judge Lancaster from housing improvement critics who contend that he has not been tough enough on the owners of slum property.

It is on Assistant City Atty. A. M. Trudeau because, the critics say, he has not prosecuted minimum housing cases vigorously enough.

Most of all, the pressure is on Bellone. He is being urged to move faster on slum eradication by those laymen who have been most active in the fight.

Bellone, who has been bucking public apathy to New Orleans slum conditions for years, is more than willing to push harder.

He is convinced in his own mind that the time for endless heart-to-heart talks with landlords after interminable reinspections of slum property over a period of as much as two years is past.

Part of the reason for the Housing Improvement Division's new determination is the kind of misery that inspectors have kicked open beneath the rubble that serves as housing for hundreds of tenants in the 15-block area bounded by Howard ave., Perdido st., Loyola ave., and O'Keefe st.

A total lack of basic facilities, such as toilets and bathtubs, is the rule rather than the exception in this rat-infested area almost on the doorstep of City Hall.

Every new story of tenant abuse uncovered by the Housing Improvement Division's inspectors strengthens the determination of Bellone and those who back him to do something about it.

There is the case, for instance, of the housing at 528-32 S. Rampart.

Inspectors Jim Capnaro and Fred Evans reported that the owner of the property, identified as Carl Nalhaus, had ordered re-

moval of the gas meters from the building, cutting off the heat to all nine units during a period of freezing weather.

"We recommend that the substandard units be vacated unless immediate rehabilitation is started," they concluded. "Owner has removed gas meter (11-2-68) and service for all units and tenants who paid their rent for this service are now without heat in freezing weather. We have reported relocations problems of units 1, 2 and 3 occupants to Mr. (Arthur) Simon."

Simon is the housing improvement division's single, harried case worker. His job is to find housing and help for the people affected by the eradication of slums.

One of those, referred to Simon was a blind woman living in an apartment on the first floor.

Since being driven out of the old dwelling, she has been "taken in" just down the street by the owner of another substandard building.

Other individuals and families that occupied the nine units (rent \$25 a month) are scattered throughout the inspection area, mostly living in other substandard housing.

Meanwhile, the improvement division has given the owner until April 1 to rehabilitate the property. Since the tenants are already out, there is no reason to think that the thousands of dollars worth of required improvements will be made.

The area is a desperate mixture of unbelievably bad housing, still occupied, and rotting structures now used by nearby tenants for garbage containers, as in the 700 block of Rampart.

Rodent control inspectors at City Hall report a steadily worsening rat invasion of the area. No special expertise is needed to see this. Rat droppings are evident in virtually every apartment occupied or abandoned.

Well, that's no skin off the nose of the average comfort-loving New Orleanian. Or is it?

Between 40 and 50 per cent of all crime originates in slum areas.

Fifty per cent of all communicable diseases are traced from these areas.

More specifically: Inspectors found that a dishwasher in one of the better restaurants in town (you would recognize the name) was living in a slum dwelling in the 500 block of S. Rampart.

His apartment had neither toilet facilities nor water. The building has been found by inspectors from the Housing Improvement Division to be unfit for human habitation.

Consider the woman who lived in a rear yard slum in the same area. Her apartment included a broken sewer pipe and no water, hot or cold, for washing. She worked in a French Quarter restaurant.

Those who come from the slums occupy positions of service—positions in such institutions as restaurants or hospitals.

Almost all of the housing so near the city's commercial hub and equally close to the proposed domed stadium site across Loyola avenue is a cinch to be boarded up.

"The majority of the property owners will close up, sit and wait for the stadium."

This is the prediction of Bellone.

The division tackled the rundown S. Rampart street area at the suggestion of the Community Relations Council.

Bellone considered the fact that the property might be affected by the stadium. This factor was weighed against the probability that the stadium will not become a reality for another four years.

After a preliminary inspection that turned up a surprising number of "monsters" (the inspectors' term for big complexes of substandard cubicle apartments), it was decided that the area was too critical to be ignored for that period of time.

Not only are those interested in housing improvement worried about the health and welfare of those persons directly affected by life in the slums. They are concerned with

the indirect effect on the balance of the community.

It's no secret that Bellone's department and lay people in the housing improvement fight are unhappy with last year's results.

"We're going to test the law again," said Bellone. "We have got the law here. It's either going to work or it isn't."

What really makes the Housing Improvement Division inspectors burn is the number of continuances given property owners in Judge Lancaster's court. Records show that some property owners brought into court received five and even eight continuances.

It is the position of the Housing Improvement Division and the Citizens Housing Improvement Committee working alongside the division that there should be no continuances once the case gets to court.

Bellone points out that in the 79 cases that finally wound up in court last year, "these people refused to do anything. These cases are taken to court only after the department has exhausted every effort to get that man to take care of his property."

In most cases, the forerunner to court action is a long (sometimes two years), tedious series of inspections and reinspections, followed by more than one hearing by the division.

Bellone contends that excuses such as inability to find workmen have already been considered many times when a case reaches Lancaster's court.

"When the judge says the man should be given a continuance—this just doesn't make sense. The man has had every chance."

Critics of the court believe that by the time a landlord gets to court, he should be judged guilty or not guilty. If he is guilty, he should be subject to a fine or imprisonment.

Nobody has ever gone to jail for a housing code violation and last year only two small fines were handed out.

Judge Lancaster replies that he has only had a chance to fine two people. The rest have complied or their cases are still pending. But the housing authorities contend that most of the compliances come after a number of continuances and after the matter has dragged on for months.

"I have never had an opportunity to put a man in jail for non-compliance," said Judge Lancaster. "I only had two people who did not comply in the whole year . . . Both of them were fined."

Would he put a person in jail for a housing code violation?

"I would put a person in jail if he was a multiple offender," said the judge. "I've put thousands of persons in jail."

But he makes it clear that nobody is going to tell him how to run his court.

"I'm not going to abdicate the discretion of the court to please anyone," he said.

The basic difference between the Housing Improvement Division and the judge is over the interpretation of the law.

Judge Lancaster believes that "the object of the law is to put the housing back in circulation."

The Housing Improvement Division contends that the landlord has been given every possible opportunity to comply with minimum standards by the time his case reaches court and that he should be subject to fine or imprisonment.

Judge Lancaster explains the court procedure this way:

The landlord is arraigned on the day he is brought into court and pleads guilty or not guilty. A date is then set for the trial. It is also the deadline given by the court for repair of the property. Judge Lancaster said the court acts "if he doesn't come in with a reasonable excuse . . ."

Judge Lancaster also contends that the "slumlords" do not wind up in his court.

"The big 'slumlord' doesn't come to court," said Lancaster. "He cannot stand the exposure. When they are threatened with court action, they go ahead and comply."

Bellone agrees with this to some extent. Most of the big operators do either close up or begin repairs when it becomes obvious that the Housing Improvement Division has run out of patience.

But Bellone also cites a couple of big property owners who have several cases each pending in court. He said one of the operators is buying up substandard rental property much faster than he has any hopes of being able to repair it. More of his property will be referred to Judge Lancaster as the year progresses.

And Bellone added this:

"Suppose the man isn't big. If he has 14 units on Rampart street with no baths or toilets, is he any less guilty than the big landlord?"

"As far as I'm concerned, I think there ought to be a little more stringent action."

Bellone has heard all of the arguments that slum owners can muster in defense of their property. He does not agree with the big one—the new housing ordinance is so strong that tenants are being forced out into the street.

For one thing, Bellone's housing inspectors are often more knowledgeable about the property in question than are the landlords who leave the rent collecting and management to others.

Those persons being taken out of the Rampart slums are getting public housing priorities and other special attention, if they will accept it.

Bellone is so familiar with the filth in which these forgotten thousands of persons have been living that he long ago came to a conclusion that quietly any doubts he might have about closing slum property.

Very simply it is this:

"I don't see how they could be any worse off."

Looking Back

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Columbus Ledger's Lisa Battle has an insight into people which distinguishes her writing and makes her well loved. She projects the soul and depth of her subjects, and in each seemingly ordinary mortal she discerns that which is not ordinary; that which is profound.

In tribute to her and in tribute to Mr. Luther Cosby of the Muscogee County Nursing Home, I wish to share with my colleagues the following excellent lesson on life:

LOOKING BACK

(By Lisa Battle)

At 87, Luther Cosby is a thin, wiry man who moves slowly but without help.

His deepset blue eyes usually hold a twinkle as though he might be enjoying a private joke. A friendly man, Cosby is also reserved.

As he puts it, "It's not a very good idea to say too much."

Asked recently to share a few memories, he told a reporter:

"I can tell you a whole lot of things but I will just tell you what I want to. What I don't want to tell I'll let go by."

"I was born in Dadesville, Ala., over there in Tallapoosa County. It was a pretty good-sized town, had several stores."

"We kept warm with fires. We chopped wood every evening and morning."

"I went to the Methodist Church. I liked to go because my father and mother belonged. Afterwards, the children would run in the woods and play around the house."

"There weren't anything such as moving pictures back in my day. The first time I saw a picture was when I was 21. I couldn't tell you what it was. I don't think I liked it."

"Women dressed differently. They wore dresses down near their ankles. I liked it a lot better then. I think it's better for a lady to go like that than go half naked. I may be wrong but I think I'm right."

"I never saw a woman smoke cigarettes back in my day. I've never seen a woman drunk in my life. You see how it is now, don't you?"

"I met my wife at church. She was a good looking woman and I liked her. She had light color hair and blue eyes."

"I went courting just like anybody else would, I reckon. I'd take her to church and singings and all like that. In a horse and buggy. It took about five or six months before I asked her to marry me."

"We were married about 50 years. We got along because I liked her and she liked me. I ended arguments by just quitting and going on."

"My wife was a good woman and I tried to be a good man."

"We had four children, two boys and two girls. I sent them to school and church and all like that. They always minded me and they minded their mother. I always treated them all right and they treated me all right."

"I never worried about them. I knew they'd be fairly good citizens from the way I raised them."

"I was ordinarily strict, not mean or cross with them. It was just business when I told them to do something. I didn't spank them in the way of controlling them. I don't believe in it. I'd just tell them, 'Don't you do that anymore.' They respected me and I respected them."

"I was a farmer. Cotton and corn. Plowing and hoeing."

"Then we moved to Columbus and I did carpentry. I worked for other folks and myself too. I worked nine years for Barlow (the former Barlow-Gordy Contracting Co.) I helped build the Bradley house, what is now the museum. It took us about a year. I helped build the porch. I helped build five houses."

"I did a whole lot of work but I didn't make so much money in my life. Sometimes I made 50 cents an hour. I just stretched it."

"I took a trip to Akron, Ohio. Worked at a rubber plant helping build automobile tires. I went because I could make more money than I could here."

"I made pretty good out of life, I reckon. I've had a lot of things make me happy and a whole lots of things made me sorry. I couldn't tell you all these things. It wouldn't be necessary for anybody to read."

"I don't have any advice for anybody. To my way of thinking, I do what I think is right and let other people do the same."

Tribute to a Fallen Marine

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 in the battle at Hue, Pfc. William L. Draper, a 19-year-old marine from Hopewell, Va., lost his life in defense of his country. Like many young men, who have left homes and loved ones all across this land, Private Draper had many friends in his home community.

One of these is his former teacher at Hopewell High School, who has written a moving tribute to this former pupil.

The Hopewell News, in its edition of Monday, February 26, saw fit to print the tribute in its editorial column and I insert this at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Hopewell (Va.) News, Feb. 26, 1968]

TRIBUTE TO A FALLEN MARINE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Today, The Hopewell News relinquishes its editorial space for the following tribute to a Hopewell Marine, 19, who was killed in battle at Hue, South Vietnam February 17, written by one of his former teachers at Hopewell High School, Jerrill Sober.)

TO MY FRIEND BUTCH DRAPER: Well, Butch . . . you said that you wouldn't be coming back. I suppose it is possible that people do have premonitions about things like that. But I want to tell you that you never really left. Oh yes, physically you left the U.S.A. . . . but there was so much of Butch Draper that stayed behind . . . characteristics that we can recall so vividly whenever the loneliness becomes acute.

We will remember with joy that spontaneous laughter . . . the sly foolishness that made teachers scowl at you, while they mentally wanted to hug you because it was never malicious . . . just playful. And that rangy physique of yours that proved that you took care of yourself . . . no fat . . . just muscle.

Exactly the kind of a physique that one thinks of as looking just like a Marine should look. And you were a Marine, Butch, in the true heritage of that fighting organization . . . you had what it took and we (and they) were so proud of you!

We know you wouldn't want us to brood over the sacrifice that you gave so willingly for your country. You said yourself that it was "your job." But forgive us the anger we feel at a world that cannot settle its disagreements and maintain itself in peace. . . . Forgive us the anger we feel at a world that gathers its young men as one carefully chooses the finest apples from the basket, then carefully polishes them to a brilliance of perfect beauty. And then, with the joys of living and youth surging through their bodies, tosses them recklessly (the glories of their half-dreamed dreams just beginning to take shape) into the battles that prove man's inability to govern his own will.

Oh God, why not old men? Their lives are used . . . and some are wasted. . . . It would give them a chance to die for something. Maybe to recoup their losses. Toss the used-up lives into the insatiable maw of death. But no, all that death wants of the aged is the freshets of tears with which he waters his constantly growing garden of broken hearts and shattered dreams. What a waste! What a terrible waste!

But forgive us, Butch, for even suggesting that you wasted your young life when you gave it for something so great and valuable as your country.

A Marine wouldn't like that. But you have sacrificed on the altar of man's failure the only hope for man's success. You were our promise of a brighter future, our hope for a cure for the ills that plague mankind, our philosopher, our teacher, our doctor, our brother and our hope.

Yes, Butch, you will come back . . . that part of you which left . . . the Marine with the broad proud shoulders will return to lie couched tenderly in the soil for which his brave life was given. And winter snows will fall this year, and tears, and summer rain will fall this year, and tears, and tears, and the leaves of autumn will fall, and tears . . .

And then, Butch, God being merciful, the healing balm of memory will soothe away the hurt that now, so fresh, brings only tears . . . but not entirely.

Because, dear Butch, when the Hopewell High School Choir which you loved so much, sings "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," or some other favorite of yours, there will be

a renewed tearing at the heart strings that will remind us again of a young boy who became a man in Marine-green, who feared that he would never come home again . . . but who never really left.

Mr. Sober adds a prayer:

Oh God, hasten the day when the price of peace will not be quite so dear. We sometimes lack the sight to see in these inconsolable losses. Your inscrutable will . . . because our eyes are clouded with tears. We pray that You will mend the hearts so torn by this great loss, and help us to be ever mindful of the promise that "For as in Adam all die, even so, in Christ shall all be made alive." For indeed, Lord, without that promise, our lives are as useless as our tears. Please don't let Butch have died in vain. Preserve this great land for which his life was given. Amen.

Christening of the U.S.S. "Bergall"

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 17, I had the pleasure and privilege to attend the launching of the U.S.S. *Bergall*, the 31st nuclear submarine to be launched at Groton, Conn. The principal speaker at the christening of the U.S.S. *Bergall* was our distinguished and respected colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable DONALD J. IRWIN.

I was most impressed with Congressman IRWIN's poignant reminder—in fact his challenge—to all Americans that as we progress in the technological fields and develop more sophisticated defensive weaponry, we must be prepared to back up this machinery with intelligence, courage, and decisiveness.

At this time under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD Congressman IRWIN's remarks of February 17, as follows:

I'm grateful to have this opportunity to participate in the launching of the *Bergall*, the thirty-first nuclear submarine to be launched here at Electric Boat and the seventy-fourth nuclear submarine to join our great Fleet. I of course want to pay tribute to the fine minds that have created and designed this magnificent and fantastically sophisticated vessel. And never should we forget the debt we all owe Admiral Rickover—for his intellect and his courage. Nor would I fail to acknowledge the devotion of your 14,000 employees whose skills have built thirty-one vessels; vessels whose reliability have been proven by the more than 350 patrols completed without failure.

I believe this is a good time for all Americans to take stock of our efforts and success since the previous *Bergall* limped into Portsmouth, New Hampshire on August 5, 1945.

A few days later the Japanese capitulated and all Americans joyously celebrated the end of World War II. Our joy was not unmixed and we have been aware of the constant risk of World War III ever since. In 1945 we went to the aid of Greece with General Van Fleet and military advisors. West Berlin has been maintained free thanks to our unflinching courage and determination. In 1950, the Challenge of Korea taught us that the price of carelessness is high and today in Vietnam challenges every fibre of our society.

This vessel, those built before it, the others yet to be built attest to our performance.

We've done well—but we have a long way to go.

The great danger of our time—it seems to me—is that having performed well—having the technical and physical skill to build the *Bergall*, we Americans might forget that freedom cannot be preserved by technology and skill alone. The earlier *Bergall* (SSN320) was also launched here at Electric Boat on February 16, 1944. Americans should know that her crew knew Cam Ranh Bay—which today is a great supply base for our effort in Vietnam, but in 1945 served the cause of Japan. Those men served on a vessel that was primitive compared to this magnificent submarine and yet they prevailed thanks to their will and determination.

Now, I don't doubt the skill, intelligence and courage of Commander B. F. Tally and the one hundred seamen who will man the *Bergall*. I am sure they will perform well. But what about all of us Americans here at home participating in the exciting process of hopelessly expanding the freedom of the individual in America and in the world? Do we have the skill, do we have the intelligence, do we have the courage to recognize and carry the burden of our times?

Democracy has not always proved itself effective and yet we have survived. In 1940 a young American earned senior honors at Harvard by writing the following: "We may be able to survive because of our national geographic position and our great national wealth. Our way of life has allowed us to develop ourselves tremendously under this advantage, but we shall have to be prepared to make long sustained sacrifices if we are to preserve this way of life in the future."

The writer was John F. Kennedy on the eve of our involvement in World War II in his first book, "Why England Slept."

In the last pages of this magnificent work the man who was to become our President wrote: "We must always keep our armaments equal to our commitments. Munich should teach us that; we must realize that any bluff will be called. We cannot tell anyone to keep out of our hemisphere unless our armaments and the people behind these armaments are prepared to back up the command even to the ultimate point of going to war . . ."

"To say that democracy has been awakened by the events of the last few weeks is not enough. Any person will awaken when the house is burning down . . ."

"Any system of government will work when everything is going well. It's the system that functions in the pinches that survives." And these are the closing words of our young President's first book. I'm sure many of you would like to read all of this book. It is available in a 1962 Dolphin books edition, "Why England Slept."

In closing I pray that we who have been nurtured into healthy freedom by our gifted democracy shall not fall her.

Federal Aid to the Poor

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I had occasion to make reference to the forthcoming report of the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, commonly referred to as the Riot Commission, which is, I believe, expected sometime this weekend. I should like to supplement those remarks with some selected statistics as to what the Federal Government has been doing through various

programs in aids to the poor and certain other pertinent information.

Mr. Speaker, in presenting these statistics on increased Federal spending in various aids to the poor over the past several years, I do not mean to suggest that I voted for or supported all of the programs or items of increase that make up the figures. The information is based not on my views or votes, or on the views or votes of any other individual Member of Congress, but rather on the basis of funds available under laws enacted—except, of course, as to the forthcoming fiscal year 1969, as to which the amounts are pending here in Congress in the fiscal 1969 budget.

In fiscal year 1960, the last full fiscal year of President Eisenhower's administration, the Federal Government provided aid to the poor of some \$9.5 billion.

In fiscal year 1963, the last full fiscal year of President Kennedy's administration, the Federal Government provided some \$12.5 billion in aid to the poor.

For the current fiscal year 1968, we have already provided, in aids to the poor, some \$24.6 billion, and the President, in his budget for fiscal year 1969, has requested funds for various aids to the poor totaling about \$27,700,000,000.

These totals rather dramatically show, in capsule form, the rapid growth of Federal aids to the poor in rural areas and in the cities alike. These are only Federal funds; there would be billions additional in State and local funds.

Mr. Speaker, I renew my plea that we adjust ourselves to the necessity of fixing priorities, reducing Federal outlays wherever reasonably possible, and being willing to seriously consider raising the necessary revenues to pay for the programs which Congress continues to support.

If Congress supports these various programs, and if Congress votes for the programs, it would seem to me that, especially at this time of relatively high national prosperity, Congress should undertake to raise the revenues necessary to pay for the programs.

In further elaboration of the totals representing Federal aids to the poor in various programs, and other pertinent figures, I am including selected tabulations listing various amounts on the basis presented in the President's budget message of last month:

SUMMARY OF SELECTED DATA ON FEDERAL AIDS TO THE POOR AND OTHER DATA

(In billions of dollars)

	1960	1963	1968	1969
1. Federal aid to the poor (all agencies).....	9.5	12.5	24.6	27.7
2. Federal outlays for health (all agencies).....	4.1	5.1	13.9	15.6
3. Education, training, and related programs (all agencies).....	3.3	4.7	11.6	12.3
4. Federal aids to urban areas (all agencies).....	7.5	9.9	19.2	22.2

Note: These items cannot be added to a total because there is duplication involved; for example, the education, health, and training programs which aid the poor are included in their respective categories and in the poverty category; some of the education funds go for educating doctors, and these expenditures are included also in health.

SUMMARY OF SELECTED DATA ON FEDERAL AIDS TO THE POOR AND OTHER DATA—Continued

FISCAL YEAR 1969 AS A PERCENT OF PRIOR YEARS

	1969 over 1968	1969 over 1964	1969 over 1961
1. Federal aid to the poor.....	+113	+220	+290
2. Federal outlay for health.....	+112	+305	+380
3. Education, training, and related programs.....	+106	+260	+370
4. Federal aids to urban areas.....	+115	+224	+296

¹ 1969 over 1963.² 1969 over 1960.

The tables following contain supporting details for each of these four selected categories:

1. FEDERAL AID TO THE POOR (ALL AGENCIES)¹

[New obligational authority for Federal funds; expenditures for trust funds]

[In billions of dollars]

	1960	1963	1968	1969
Education.....	0.1	0.1	2.3	2.5
Work and training.....	(²)	(²)	1.2	1.6
Health.....	.6	.9	4.1	4.7
Social insurance trust funds (OASDI).....	4.0	5.3	7.9	8.9
Other cash benefit payments.....	4.3	5.1	6.7	7.0
Other social welfare and economic services.....	.5	1.0	2.4	2.9
Total.....	9.5	12.5	24.6	27.7

¹ From p. 36 of the 1969 budget. Figures for fiscal years 1961 and 1964 are not immediately available, but in process of compilation.

² Less than \$50,000,000.2. FEDERAL OUTLAYS FOR HEALTH (ALL AGENCIES)¹

[In billions of dollars]

	1961	1964	1968	1969
A. Development of health resources.....	1.1	1.8	2.8	3.2
Health research.....	.7	1.1	1.4	1.5
Construction and medical education.....	.4	.7	1.4	1.7
B. Provision of hospital and medical services.....	2.7	2.9	10.4	11.7
Medicare.....			5.1	5.8
Medical assistance (including Medicaid).....	.3	.5	1.8	2.1
Other services (mainly VA and DOD).....	2.4	2.4	3.5	3.8
C. Prevention and control of health problems.....	.3	.4	.7	.7
Total, all health programs.....	4.1	5.1	13.9	15.6

¹ Expenditures for both Federal funds and trust funds. (See special budget analysis of Federal health programs for further detail.)

3. FEDERAL FUNDS FOR EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS (ALL AGENCIES)¹ (BUDGET AUTHORITY)

[In billions of dollars]

	1961	1964	1968	1969
Preschool, elementary, and secondary.....	0.6	0.7	2.9	3.0
Higher education.....	1.4	2.1	4.4	4.5
Vocational education, work training, and other adult or continuing education.....	.1	.3	1.6	2.0
Training of Federal Government personnel.....	.9	1.2	1.7	1.7
Other.....	.3	.4	1.0	1.1
Total, all programs.....	3.3	4.7	11.6	12.3

¹ Source: The special budget analysis of Federal education, training, and related programs; 1961 and 1964 figures are obligations.

4. FEDERAL AIDS TO URBAN AREAS: GRANTS-IN-AID AND DIRECT PROGRAMS (ALL AGENCIES)¹

[In billions of dollars]

Agency	1961	1964	1968	1969
Department of Health, Education and Welfare.....	2.2	3.1	8.2	8.9
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	.3	.6	1.7	2.7
Department of Transportation.....	1.6	2.0	2.4	2.9
Veterans' Administration.....	1.8	1.7	2.4	2.6
Office of Economic Opportunity.....			1.3	1.6
Other agencies.....	1.6	2.5	3.2	3.5
Total, all agencies.....	7.5	9.9	19.2	22.2

¹ Source: Department of Housing and Urban Development. Urban areas are defined to include communities of 2,500 or more.

Fourth District Produces Culinary Artist

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have always been proud of the accomplishments of the people of the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey—the fine milk produced by its dairy farmers, the splendid chinaware produced by the great Lenox Co., its fine industrial workers, its excellent craftsmen, and of course, due to the fact that it includes Princeton University, its great contribution to the intellectual life of the Nation.

I now have learned that one of those whom I have the privilege to represent and who, incidentally, is an employee of the Committee on Education and Labor, is a great culinary artist, as well as obviously having gourmet tastes and excellent discrimination when it comes to the choice of feminine companionship.

I refer, of course, to Austin Patrick Sullivan, Jr., of Georgetown and Princeton, N.J., whose culinary artistry was praised by the distinguished food editor of the Washington Post, Mrs. Elinor Lee, in an article published on Leap Year Day, February 29. I have not had the pleasure of tasting Mr. Sullivan's famous cheesecake, although I have heard about it, mostly from him. However, I must say that the menu selected by Austin's betrothed, Miss Judy Raab, appeared to be most excellent. My only criticism was that part of the menu, in addition to the cheesecake, which was selected by Mr. Sullivan, the Chateau Latour 1959. This is great wine, but inappropriate, as every true connoisseur knows, for the type of menu prepared by Miss Raab. To have absolutely fully complemented Miss Raab's menu, a Latache 1959 or a Rosé, preferably Tavel, would have been just the proper accompaniment.

I include Mrs. Lee's article describing the Leap Year Day dinner:

LEAP YEAR DINNER MAY POSE QUESTION

(By Elinor Lee)

Leap Year Day, Sadie Hawkins, Bachelors' Day—call it what you will, today's the day. If the man in your life hasn't popped the question, it's your privilege to do the proposing.

But if you'd rather be subtle about it, take a tip from Judy Raab and hook him with cooking.

Judy claims the way to a man's heart is via the kitchen. Her best beau, Austin Sullivan, agrees. Together they planned the Leap Year dinner for two shown in the picture.

"Austin chose the menu—his favorite," said blond, brown-eyed Judy, who works for the Office of Economic Opportunity and shares a Georgetown house with two other girls.

Austin, legislative specialist with the House Education and Labor Committee, has a house nearby. He and Judy share an interest in ice hockey (he plays left defense for the Washington Chiefs) as well as in gourmet food.

Judy likes to cook. Austin likes to eat. For their Leap Year dinner (served a few days early, at my request), he chose rack of lamb with mint jelly, fonds d'artichauts au naturel with petits pois, braised celery, cranberry rings, new potatoes and tossed salad with anchovy dressing.

Judy prepared everything except the dessert, an Austin specialty called Cheesecake Windyknowe ("Windyknowe" is the name of his family home in Princeton, N.J.). Austin also brought a bottle of his cherished wine—Chateau Latour '59.

Judy set the table in front of the fireplace in living room of her home while dinner was cooking. Austin lighted the candles and took care of the serving.

Did she pop the question during the evening? She didn't have to. Austin did—three weeks ago.

CHEESECAKE WINDYKNOWE

Crust: 1 tablespoon cinnamon, 2 tablespoons sugar, 2 cups crushed graham crackers, 4 tablespoons melted butter.

Mix cinnamon and sugar and add to crushed graham crackers. Add melted butter and mix. Press into a 9" buttered, spring-form pan. Put in refrigerator to cool.

Filler: 3 eggs, beaten, 1 cup sugar, 3 (8 oz.) packages of cream cheese, 1½ pints sour cream, 1 teaspoon lemon juice, Rind of one lemon, grated, 1 tablespoon vanilla, 1 tablespoon melted butter.

Beat sugar into the eggs. Stir in cream cheese, sour cream and lemon juice. Add lemon rind to mixture. Add vanilla and beat until smooth. Fold in melted butter. Pour filling into prepared, refrigerated graham cracker crust. Bake in a moderate oven (350 degrees) for 45 minutes. Let cool and refrigerate for several hours.

Critics of General Westmoreland Aren't Aware of Viet Realities

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the February 24 issue of the Washington Post, sage columnist Roscoe Drummond's editorial brings out some of the hidden and not often deliberated aspects of the basic U.S. military strategy in Vietnam.

The success and failure of American military operations will not be decided in the American press or on the American campus. They will ultimately be decided by America's fighting men in the field, led by General Westmoreland and our dedicated professional military. To read only one side of the story so continuously

does disservice to our military leaders and their men.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

CRITICS OF GENERAL WESTMORELAND ARE NOT AWARE OF VIET REALITIES

SAIGON.—One good way to measure the tide of battle in Vietnam is to compare the scapegoat criticism of Gen. William Westmoreland from home with the realities here.

There is quite a difference.

John Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard professor and head of the ADA, can look at Saigon from 10,000 miles away and confidently predict that the government of South Vietnam will fall in three weeks.

There are voices in Washington already calling for Gen. Westmoreland to quit or else be fired on the grounds that he can't devise a winning strategy.

Those who have long assumed Communist conquest of South Vietnam would be a trivial event of no real concern to the United States are eager to pounce on the display of hidden VC power that proves that all is lost, and that we should get out as soon as possible.

Let's not minimize in the least the power and potential of Hanoi's winter-spring offensive. It has produced a military and large psychological dividend.

But the end returns are not in yet. It is much too soon to conclude that it is going to succeed—or fail.

The VC are guilty of the most grotesque overclaims of what they have been accomplishing. These overclaims should be printed; they are news. But we don't have to believe them.

At the height of the fighting in Saigon, for example, a European reporter made contact with a Vietcong spokesman who told him: "It's clear that the people are with us. That's why we'll conquer the capital and the country."

That statement was news—but it wasn't true. They didn't capture the capital. They haven't captured the country and there was virtually no evidence anywhere in South Vietnam that the people wanted to be liberated from anything but the Vietcong.

I have just read a transcript of a typical tape recording which the Vietcong had prepared for use in each city as they captured the radio station. It was in the kit of a captured Communist cadre leader.

"The people are rising like a storm," proclaimed the Communist broadcast that was never delivered. "Many units of the armed forces of the Thieu-Ky puppet regime have joined in an uprising throughout the South." It didn't happen.

And what of the panic-suggestion that the United States ought to get Gen. Westmoreland out because he hasn't devised "a winning strategy?"

Why did Hanoi turn from its strategy of protracted guerrilla war to gamble with the strategy of frontal confrontation with the U.S. and South Vietnamese forces? Why did Hanoi stop fighting the war on its own terms and start fighting the war on our terms?

Certainly not because its strategy of protracted war was winning. It was the Westmoreland strategy of search and destroy, clear and hold, and the air pounding in the North which was winning.

The fact is that until mid-1966, when the U.S. aid and ground forces became formidable, Hanoi was fighting a relatively easy, painless war in the South. It wasn't being hurt much at home and the VC already in the South were doing the fighting and they were winning hands down.

But from mid-1966 Hanoi was finding itself fighting a costly, painful war. The bombing was beginning to bite deep. The manpower pinch was hurting—175,000 men were needed to man the air defense, 600,000 were needed for constant repair from bombing.

And the crucial fact which reveals how things have changed for Hanoi is that in 1965 only 5 per cent of the main and local Communist forces in the South were North Vietnamese regulars. By late 1967, 60 per cent were North Vietnamese regulars.

North Vietnam was really having to fight the war in South Vietnam and when Hanoi began the present offensive it had little to show for it.

It was Westmoreland's strategy which was winning, not Hanoi's strategy which was winning.

Public Law 480 Helps United States as Well as Needy

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 480 food aid program not only is helping to win the world's war on hunger but it also is helping our balance of payments and laying the foundation for future commercial exports.

The aid provided through concessional sales arrangements to the victims of famine, earthquakes, and other calamities in the form of outright donations, has been well publicized. This has truly been a remarkable, unprecedented, generous use of our agricultural resources.

But less publicized and perhaps less understood by many people in the United States is what Public Law 480 has meant to this country, in its contribution to our export program, its significant balance-of-payments help, its market-building attributes.

We in the wheat State of Colorado certainly know what Public Law 480 has meant to us. Exports absorb over half of U.S. wheat production. Half or more of this wheat is moving under Public Law 480. Better than 4 billion bushels of wheat have been shipped under the program. Wheat or wheat flour accounts for approximately \$7 billion worth, almost half of the market value of all Public Law 480 shipments.

Wheat continues to be the major commodity exported under Public Law 480. Of the \$89 million worth of commodities programed to date in 1968, wheat represents \$29 million—about one-third of the total.

Almost one-fourth of U.S. agricultural exports are Public Law 480 exports. More than \$17 billion worth of our farm products have moved under the program. They have represented a substantial part of our favorable agricultural trade balance, now in excess of \$2 billion annually.

Our overall economy in benefiting from the balance-of-payments help we are getting from our agricultural exports under Public Law 480. Since 1960 \$1.4 billion in foreign currencies generated under the program have been used instead of dollars to pay embassy expenses, defray costs of market development, and pay for other U.S. Government outlays abroad. Also, in addition to adding to the income of our farmers, the program adds to the profits and

wages of people in such export-related industries as transporting, handling, processing, packaging, forwarding, insuring. And by helping needy countries buy the time required for economic development, Public Law 480 is laying the foundation for future commercial sales of U.S. farm products.

So while we are helping others we are also helping ourselves. It is a program the whole Nation can well support.

CITE Helps Negro Worker Find a Job—Stick to It

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, much attention of late has been given to the need for jobs for the unemployed and underprivileged. It is an appropriate concern for the country, because effective programs aimed at finding the right man for the right job are essential.

This is particularly true for many minority group individuals for whom intensive interest has been shown. The President's recently announced jobs program is such an effort.

Wisconsin has had a longstanding tradition in its efforts to insure equal opportunity as well as the pioneering programs it has instituted in many fields.

The Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations has begun a program in Wisconsin designed to meet the critical needs of the disadvantaged. It is called CITE and its approach once again shows Wisconsin's leadership.

As a part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an article from the Milwaukee Sentinel by Steve Tatarsky which describes this program:

CITE HELPS NEGRO WORKER FIND A JOB—STICK TO IT

(By Steve Tatarsky)

The first Negro ever hired by one suburban industrial plant had a lot of trouble with his new job.

He worked steadily for three weeks, then failed to show up one day because he was afraid his past legal problems would catch up with him.

The worker's history of problems was a challenge to the Community Involvement Toward Employability (CITE) project from which he had graduated.

CITE aide Keith Scott had his own lawyer go to bat for the troubled worker and encouraged him to go back to the job. Problems solved, the patient employer took the man back. He still is on the job.

"The company is opening a new plant and they plan to hire more Negroes," Scott said.

CITE is a program of the state department of industry, labor and human relations. Men and women spend two weeks in CITE classes at the state office building and then are referred to jobs in industry and business.

CITE helps only persons with deep personal problems and spotty employment records.

So far at least 19 industries, businesses and institutions in Wauwatosa, West Allis, Glendale, Brookfield, Butler, West Milwaukee, and Brown Deer have hired CITE graduates. An-

other 80 employers in the city also have taken part.

"I'd say that 100% of our enrollees have had some problems they would like to forget," said CITE director Earl A. Heise. Heise also is supervisor of staff training and industry services of the Wisconsin state employment service.

Persons who go into CITE do not have the education or skills often needed to get jobs. But CITE finds the enrollees with potential to learn and go to work, Heise said.

CITE is similar to many antipoverty programs. The aides who work with the jobless themselves have had employment problems in the past. "They understand and relate to the CITE trainee," Heise said. Individualized instruction and counseling so far has produced happier people as well as a good record of steering people into jobs, he said.

The program, like most projects aimed at helping the long-term unemployed and disadvantaged, also has had its failures. Two CITE graduates now have disappeared from Milwaukee and are being sought by police. Others have not been able to stay on the job.

But the latest program statistics show that of the first 248 graduates in eight classes, 47% now are employed.

Of the 117 persons employed, 17 also are going to vocational school at night to try to improve themselves even more. Heise said. Another CITE class graduated last Dec. 29, but because of the holiday and the cold weather, the employment records of that class are not representative, Heise said. The 10th class of 30 now is in training.

Heise pointed out that jobs were not the only goal of the program. CITE also helps people with educational and emotional problems. Twenty-one persons are back in school. Twenty-three are taking in-depth counseling and 8 are in vocational rehabilitation programs.

Another three are in the job corps or in military service.

This leaves 76 who have gone into the eight CITE classes and are not employed or in other training. Of these, 13 dropped out before graduation.

Besides the two who are being sought by police, four others are in jail. Fourteen persons quit or were laid off jobs but are seeking other work. Thirteen moved out of the Milwaukee area, 7 said they had other plans, 18 said they still were trying to find jobs and 5 were not working because of pregnancy, illness or injury.

The project is operating the first 10 classes on a budget of \$50,000. Approval has been granted for another 10 classes and a \$56,000 budget. Joseph C. Fagan, director of the state department, is seeking funds from the \$1 million approved by the legislature for Milwaukee core area problems to expand CITE.

Heise said efforts also were underway to obtain some federal funds under a department of labor program.

CITE trainees are taught money management, how to take interviews and tests, how to travel in the community and other basics.

Most of the trainees are in the 20 to 35 age bracket. The oldest trainee was 65, the youngest 18. Most have been in their middle and upper twenties.

Trainees are referred to CITE from various welfare, antipoverty and social agencies throughout the area. Most CITE trainees are Negro, with some Spanish-Americans, Heise said.

"We have found that the education most of our people have is rather meaningless, particularly if they received it in the south," Heise said.

CITE's efforts do not end when a man is placed in the job. There often are problems—like those of the first Negro ever placed in the one suburban plant.

Some persons are faced with garnishments, demands for alimony and other demands as soon as others find out they are working. "We have to help these people face

these problems, solve them and encourage them to stay on the job," Heise said.

The types of jobs CITE graduates are getting range from clerical and sales to service, trades and construction jobs. Pay has been ranging from \$1.25 to \$3.60 an hour.

Heise said employers in both the suburbs and the city had made great efforts to help CITE graduates when they start work.

Persons referred to CITE often have given up on other agencies and programs. "When they walk in the door, the first thing we do is let them know that someone is interested in them," Heise said.

Many of these people come in with great hostilities. "We had one man who came to class one day, called everyone dirty names, and stalked out. We never thought he would come back . . . but he did and, most important, the class accepted what he had done. This acceptance helped in his rehabilitation," Heise said. Informal group sessions are used to emphasize this acceptance feeling.

CITE trainees spend two or three days just getting some of their feelings off their chest. But this therapy continues throughout the two weeks and into the job itself.

Part of the problem of training the jobless is that the "so-called middle class" does not understand that some people have no knowledge of basic needs for getting and holding a job, Heise said.

"We had a man placed in a job who one day took off to visit his sick child in the south without telling his boss. When he came back he remembered that he learned in class that he was not supposed to do this.

"When he went back to work and apologized, the employer recognized that the man had the strength of character to admit his mistake and took him back on the job," Heise related.

"We have had people who were afraid to go to the doctor so it has taken them days to keep appointments."

Now aides work with these people.

"We feel that industry as well as the public in general has to help people learn conventional behavior," Heise said.

"I do not believe in a subculture of people. The disadvantaged aspire to reach the attitudes and economic position of the middle class. All this means is acceptance. The disadvantaged strive to be like others, to do things and have things like others. What is needed most is understanding and acceptance by their peers and by society," he said.

"As for the past records of the people, it really is not important what happened in the past. What is important is what the person can do now and in the future," he said.

"Sure there have been exploiters in our program. The pay is not much, only \$50 a week for persons with dependents and only \$20 for ones without dependents. . . . One man went through two weeks and then told us he was just trying to pick up ideas for his own project," Heise said.

Under the chairmanship of Joseph Fagan, the Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations and the Wisconsin State Employment Service has, I believe, begun a program worthy of our attention.

In addition to CITE, the Department has also initiated a Supervisory Sensitivity Training Program which is another facet of their reasoned and viable attack on the problems of minority groups. These two programs together represent a creative and effective approach to a problem that we in Congress and employers and employees throughout the country face.

I include as a part of my remarks a brief description of the Supervisory Training Program:

SUPERVISORY SENSITIVITY TRAINING—A MILWAUKEE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

A series of sensitivity seminars for executives of business and industry is being conducted in Milwaukee to help employers improve procedures for inducting work recruits from minority groups into successful, continued employment.

Co-sponsored by the Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce, the University of Wisconsin Extension Division, the Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations, and the Milwaukee Voluntary Equal Employment Opportunity Council, the program is a community project for sensitizing management to the limitations of "disadvantaged" work candidates.

The first seminar, which began October 3 and continued through October 19, 1967 enrolled 22 personnel managers and training directors from 17 of Milwaukee's major companies. The participants, in turn, are conducting or developing comparable programs for first line supervisors in their own companies.

The program is based on the premise that the supervisory function is one of the most dynamic forces in management and that one of the most important attributes possessed by today's supervisor is skill in interpersonal relations. While company training programs are increasingly meeting this need, skill in handling inter-racial relationships has been almost entirely neglected. The Milwaukee supervisory sensitivity seminars are attempting to provide this by:

1. Developing in selected members of company management an increased sensitivity to the life reality, expectations, and behavior of a company's work force drawn from Milwaukee's minority groups.

2. Developing a cadre of trainers in Milwaukee area companies which can implement programs on their own premises relevant to this type of training.

3. Developing a methodology so that this teaching can be done by the companies themselves or through an organization selected by the sponsoring groups.

Two companies which participated in the first seminar have already begun supervisory sensitivity programs, and other companies have programs in the planning stage. A second sensitivity seminar for top-level industrial personnel is now scheduled to begin March 11, based upon the successful first series which included 30 hours devoted to learning about the living conditions, family customs, problem situations and psychological background of Milwaukee's minority group residents including the Spanish speaking.

The sponsor groups believe that the modern executive, to be truly efficient, must understand as much about feelings as he does about facts, and that this attitude and concern can be taught to all levels of personnel with incalculable benefits to everyone concerned.

Congressman Gilbert Protests Arms to Jordan

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked at the announcement of the resumption of American arms shipments to the Kingdom of Jordan. I am not impressed by the blackmail implicit in the argument that if the United States does not supply arms to Jordan, then that country will fall into the Soviet orbit. The United States has no business fur-

nishing arms to Arab states until they consent to negotiate a peace settlement with Israel. As long as Jordan maintains that it will not make peace with Israel, we must not fuel the fires of war with our guns and bullets. Jordan needs our encouragement to make peace. Our arms assistance instead offers encouragement to resume the war. I do not think that this decision by our Government contributes in any way to stability in the Middle East. I do not believe it serves the national interest of the United States. I regard it as a mistake and I believe that experience will show that our best policy lies in contributing to tranquillity and not to the explosive potential of the Middle East.

More Attention Needed For War on Hunger

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert M. Koch, executive director of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, made an outstanding statement yesterday before the Agriculture Committee, which is holding hearings on Public Law 480, food for peace.

American agriculture has been extremely successful in feeding our own population and can play a vital role in helping our fellow nations in solving hunger problems and promoting self-help programs. It is my feeling that if we do not apply ourselves to this problem, the continuing population increases and resulting masses of undernourished people will be easy victims for exploitation.

I am pleased to commend my colleagues' attention to this very fine statement which presents strong arguments for our serious consideration of the war on hunger.

Mr. Koch's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. KOCH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMITTEE ON THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, FEBRUARY 28, 1968

Mr. Chairman, and Members of this Committee, it is a real privilege for me to appear before you in my capacity as Executive Director of the Committee On The World Food Crisis to support extension of the Food For Peace Act of 1966—commonly known as Public Law 480—for 3 years or more.

First, I want to say that the entire membership of our Committee, as well as the more than 700 delegates to the Second International Conference on War On Hunger which we called last Tuesday here in Washington, are appreciative of your participation, Mr. Chairman, and that of Congressman Dole. Your contributions to our Legislative Panel were invaluable.

Participants who came from all around the globe, as well as from nearly every State were almost unanimous as to the reasons for and the scope of the problems facing the World.

They certainly were unanimous in feeling that there can be no effective program to establish Peace in the World which does not encompass plans to adequately solve our

population and food crisis. As Ambassador Sol Linowitz said at our final Banquet Session, "Rarely has any international conference—on any subject—had the unanimity that marked yours today."

Before going further, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer to your Committee copies of the prepared papers presented last Tuesday for such use as you would care to make of them.

As you who were there know, and as we have all heard at recent Hearings on this complex subject, practically no one objects to the goals but some differ as to the method of obtaining them. They agree with the President's statement in his Agricultural Message when he said in relation to the world food situation: "The clock continues to tick in the developing nations—as the shadow of hunger threatens to turn into a nightmare of famine . . . This (Food for Freedom) lifeline of hope to the needy of the world cannot be withdrawn."

May I say that most of us were very much encouraged by the passage of the 1966 Act. With its relatively abundant funds—those authorized to be appropriated, plus those carried over—many of us expected quite substantial accomplishments. Frankly, we were quite disturbed at the effect on American agriculture.

Some of us did not realize that there were insufficient safeguards to adequately protect the American farmer from the serious price-depressing effect of permitting production called for to meet these "War on Hunger" requirements to commingle in market channels with the regular commercial supplies.

And, we urge the Congress to pass whatever legislation is necessary to see that he never again is hurt when he responds to his Government's request.

As everyone on your Committee knows, never in the history of our Nation have the farmers failed to perform when asked to do so by their Government. And, all too frequently, temporary benefits have not only been lost but they have suffered for decades afterward from "surplus supply" as measured against "effective demand."

This War on Hunger, or Fight for Peace, or whatever you want to call it, is the concern of all the people and the cost should come out of the Federal Treasury and be borne by all taxpayers just as we finance our Military Wars.

Our Committee was organized just a little over two years ago by a group of us who felt that a "citizens group" without any particular program to emphasize, should be formed to mobilize grass roots support for an all-out War on Hunger.

The overriding goal was—and is—to improve the prospect of Peace. We firmly believe the forces at work can be devastating. We must help the underdeveloped nations find the roads to self-help programs. If we do not, the population explosion and the resulting masses of undernourished, uneducated people will become hordes of hundreds of millions of people easily exploited by leaders who will only have to promise a better life—not actually provide it.

The following statistics seem to me to prove conclusively that Peace in the World is attainable.

In 1958, there were 23 prolonged insurgencies going on in the world; by 1966, there were 40. Furthermore, the total number of outbreaks of violence has increased every year. In 1958, there were 34; in 1965, there were 58.

Most significantly, there is a measurable relationship between the incidents of violence and the economic status of the countries involved. The nations categorized by the World Bank, as per capita income, are: rich, middle income, poor, and very poor.

The "rich" nations are those with a per capita income of \$750 per year and up. The United States level is upwards of \$2700. 75% of the world's wealth is possessed by 27 of

these "rich" nations, although only 25% of the world's population.

However, only one of these "rich" nations has gone through a major internal upheaval since 1958.

On the other hand, the economic scale, however, shows another story. Of the "very poor" nations—those with a per capita income of under \$100 a year—which total 38 nations, no less than 32 have endured significant conflicts. History shows that these nations have undergone an average of two major outbreaks of violence, per country, over an 8-year period. To be sure, this is a significant amount of conflict and predominantly of a prolonged nature.

In the case of the other two categories: "the poor, and the middle income" nations, the trend holds constantly true. The statistics of serious violence for these two categories, since 1958, are: 87% of the "very poor" nations, 69% of the "poor" nations, and 48% of the "middle income" nations.

Therefore, there is no question but that it is a fact that there is an undeniable relationship between violence and economic backwardness. And the trend of such violence is up—not down.

We have all heard the literally staggering statistics about the millions of people that are being added to the World. Most of us really can't think in terms of millions and billions—or maybe I should simply say, I can't. But when I heard Ambassador Linowitz describe the problem on the basis of every 60 seconds, I found I could visualize it better. He said, "During the next 60 seconds, 200 human beings will be born on this earth. 160 of them will be colored—black, brown, yellow, red. About half will be dead before they are a year old. Of those who survive, approximately half will be dead before they reach their sixteenth birthday. The survivors who live past 16, will have a life expectancy of about 30 years. They will be hungry, tired, sick most of their lives. Only a few of them, if that many, will learn to read or write. They will till the soil, working for landlords, living in tents or mud huts. They—as their fathers before them—will lie naked under the open skies of Asia, Africa and Latin America—waiting, watching, hoping—starving."

"These are our fellow human beings, our neighbors, if you will. Is it any wonder that despair and revolt at hunger, envy and, even anger, over the inequality of life, is the most urgent political economic fact of our day?"

Many feel that our Christian heritage demands our concern for our fellow man—and, I yield to no man in the desire to help the underprivileged—yet it seems to me that all we advocate is in our own self-interest.

Nearly everyone will agree we cannot pull back to our shores and attempt to enjoy our affluence. Possibly, all of us in this room could live to enjoy relative freedom from World problems for a few years if we did this. But what a legacy to bequeath our children and future generations!

The more than 10,000 organizations and individuals associated with us share a desire to work together for a better World. Some would emphasize population control, some would increase the teams of trained experts now fanning out through the World under the supervision of our colleges and universities; others would increase the agribusiness projects of new installations, better distribution facilities, etc., etc. But, I would like to stress, ALL would increase our total effort. Furthermore, I must emphasize that all of us who organized this Committee were literally astounded that the grass roots seemed to be 'way ahead of us.

Our first Conference was not only well-attended by experts in every field associated with the problem, but many others who were unable to be present, wrote offering their cooperation. And, as you know, your former Chairman gave this meeting credit for stimulating much of his thinking which went into his War on Hunger Bill.

Before I go any further, let me emphasize that our name seems to give some the wrong impression.

While we firmly believe that the American farmer can play a leading role in this national effort to obtain and maintain Peace, we must not overstress this facet of the many needed to reach the ultimate goal. Population control, in some form, is absolutely essential. And no one on this Committee believes that American agriculture should try to feed the World. But, in the interim of helping developing nations solve their hunger problems, American agriculture can be a most useful tool in promoting self-help programs.

Everyone attending the Conference was most conscious of the dollar drain on this Nation for its many efforts throughout the World—and, of course, particularly now with the Vietnamese War. However, the question was asked over and over, "why can't we send bushels and tons of foodstuffs overseas without hurting our dollar balance?"

If we can protect the American farmer, and if we can send food overseas without hurting the Balance of Payments, then it seems to some of us that we ought to take a real hard look at the alternatives, if we don't wage an all-out War on Hunger.

One of the principal reasons why this Nation is such an outstanding producer of food is because of our Land Grant Colleges and collaborating County Extension Agents. True, we have teams of land grant college experts around the globe now. But, in my opinion, we have only scratched the surface of this "facet."

To those who say that we should have more help from other Nations, we agree.

However, we are not alone and very substantial progress has been made. So much so that the "prophets of gloom" have already been proven wrong. It was my privilege to present a Citation from our Committee to the Philippine Republic and President Ferdinand Marcos through two Filipinos at our Luncheon last Tuesday.

Philippine Under Secretary of Agriculture D. L. Umali, and Andres de la Cruz, a Philippine farmer who has made a remarkable record, accepted the Citation in behalf of President Marcos.

Under Secretary Umali told the dramatic story of this farmer who used the new "miracle" rice developed by the International Rice Research Institute, and financed jointly by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. His income went up from \$63.00 to \$725.00 per crop from 1.8 hectares of land (about 4.5 acres).

This is not just an isolated case history. As Dr. Umali said, "Except for a few years, the Philippines has, since 1910, imported billions of pesos worth of rice." Then he reported they would have a surplus of rice stocks of 475,000 metric tons by June 1968.

Here is a developing Nation that has proved that they can be helped to help themselves. But, listen again to his words: "Mr. de la Cruz's happy story might be said to have started one hot afternoon when an agricultural extension fieldman (one of 780 AID-financed technicians) paid him a visit." He then went on to recount the de la Cruz story.

Again, I refer back to the many "facets" of the total problem. One of the key points in this success story was a good government "climate", as well as a natural one. The government had pegged the price at \$4.00 instead of \$3.00 per bag of 44 kilos of rice. All too frequently there is relatively little incentive in undeveloped nations for the farmers to make the effort to increase production. And then there are problems of credit, fertilizer, distribution, etc.

Our Committee is very conscious of the need and wants to urge that a well-rounded program, including active participation of voluntary agencies, the agribusiness com-

munity, as well as those previously mentioned, is the only way we can be sure of attaining the ultimate goal of Peace we are all seeking.

We firmly believe, by properly mobilizing our American ingenuity, personnel and finances, we can help every Nation attain the basic materials each human being needs to live in dignity. When that point is reached, the hordes which are so susceptible to exploitation when hungry and starving, will be more stable.

This may seem like a dream, at least many years off, but, if we do not make a start, future generations may condemn us for quietly going our affluent way as Nature's bomb—which could be more destructive than man-made atomic ones—goes ticking on.

It is the considered judgment of our Committee that this Nation—whether it is joined by other nations or not (and parenthetically, we believe that they should be urged to share this burden)—cannot afford not to make this effort.

We are now spending between \$3 and \$4 billion a month in Vietnam. Why shouldn't we make a similar "peaceful" effort? While I realize many will scoff at this proposal, if we think about it, there are many of us who not only can afford to, but would pay sizeable amounts if we thought we could rid the World of this terrible threat. And all the experts agree, we could make real progress with only a fraction of what we are currently spending for munitions.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of government and its programs have been of great interest to me for many years. When I left my home in Greenfield, Massachusetts, for an education at the University of Massachusetts. I doubt anyone could have been more conservative. I was frightfully scared of the "large" expenditures during the early '30s and the "staggering" national debt.

Then we went into World War II. If all the dire predictions I had been brought up to believe were going to happen, because the early '30s expenditures were true, it seemed to me we were surely headed for complete national bankruptcy.

But I am continually impressed with the fact that in spite of all the dire predictions that some have continued to make, this Nation is the most affluent on the face of the globe.

Our total gross national product today has crossed the \$800 billion mark and is rapidly heading for a trillion dollars a year. And today our per capita share of the national debt is \$1,642.00. This looks like and is, of course, a substantial figure. But we are making progress and are a lot better off today than we were 20 years ago.

When I left the U.S. Department of Agriculture and took my present position with the National Limestone Institute in 1946, the per capita share of the national debt was \$1,909.00. But the difference between the \$1,909.00 in 1946 and the \$1,642.00 is not the major reason why I said we are better off.

In 1946, our national debt was 129.4% of our Gross National Product. In 1967, the debt is only 41.6% of our G.N.P. While all of us should be concerned about our increasing national debt, it seems to me we should not let things get out of proportion. The greatest factor in our favor is our tremendous growth. Although we should be concerned about our debt, we should not, in my opinion, be so concerned that we lose our perspective.

NATIONAL DEBT COMPARED TO GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

	GNP (billions)	National debt (billions)	Per capita share of national debt	Percent national debt is of GNP
1946-----	\$208	\$270	\$1,909	129.4
1967-----	799	327	1,642	41.6

While I certainly want to advocate a sound and cautious approach, I fail to see why our

Nation cannot afford to spend .005% of its gross national product on what literally everyone says is the most serious problem facing the World. And, that is all \$4 billion a year for Public Law 480 would be—.005% of the gross national product.

Although solving the Vietnamese War has us all concerned and it seems to defy all solution, it will be solved—and in our lifetime. This problem of World Hunger cannot be solved in our lifetime, but we must make a more concerted effort than we are now doing, if we are not going to betray the trust of our children and their children's children.

And, so, our Committee would like to urge the Congress to extend the Food for Peace Act of 1966, without any restrictive amendments and with at least the same funds previously authorized. We also hope that the record at these Hearings can be so unmistakably clear that the Administration will take steps immediately to fully utilize the 1966 Act.

NLRB, Coalition Bargaining, and the Copper Strike

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, few persons are aware of the very close connection between the disastrous copper strike which has been underway since July 15 and the National Labor Relations Board.

Yet, any examination of the facts will prove, I believe, that the NLRB had a lot to do with the inception of the strike and a lot to do also with its prolongation.

One of the chief issues in the copper strike, which has proved to be a tragedy for 60,000 copper workers, and for the Western copper States, is coalition bargaining. An authority on this subject is Guy Farmer, former head of the NLRB, who describes such negotiating as seeking "to coordinate the efforts of several unions representing different bargaining units in a company or group of companies."

Originally, the concept of collective bargaining was quite different from what it has become with the growth of national and international unions and with the pronoun bias of the NLRB. The Wagner Act, enacted in 1935, provided that employees could band together in units, approved by the NLRB, to bargain on wages and other terms of their employment. Ideally, the employees of a particular plant, craft, or department would choose representatives to speak for them in bargaining sessions. The latter would then sit down with representatives of the employers to talk about negotiating a labor contract. But, as a rule, each plant, craft, or department negotiated separately with the employer representatives and did not band together to present joint demands.

This pattern has eroded badly with the passage of time. Unless they are independent unions, few local unions have any significant degree of autonomy. The national and international unions have a high degree of centralized control. With the growth of such powerful unions as the United Automobile Workers, the United Steelworkers Union, and the

United Mine Workers, industrywide bargaining has become commonplace, and the power of union leaders has risen steadily. For example, as the United Automobile Workers Union proved not too long ago, the union leaders can close down a major company, or the entire industry, as it sees fit. Walter Reuther, head of the UAW, began negotiations late last year by closing Ford. After a settlement with Ford at close to 6 percent, a highly inflationary settlement, he then proceeded to other inflationary settlements with the other big automobile companies. In industrywide bargaining, management is at an almost hopeless disadvantage as events over the years have proved. Coalition bargaining is designed to give the leaders of organized labor the power over every major company and industry such as Reuther has where the automobile manufacturers are concerned. To do this plant-by-plant bargaining and unit-by-unit bargaining must be destroyed.

Such bargaining still is highly important. In such instances, a strike can occur at one plant or unit, while other plants or units in the company or industry continue to operate. Thus the impact of the strike is confined primarily to the plant or unit and its overall force is lessened. This the leaders of the big unions do not like at all.

In 1961, the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, which is headed by Walter Reuther, developed coalition bargaining, through which the combined power of a group of unions is thrown against a company or an industry. The idea is to force uniform settlements on as many items as is possible—pensions, insurance, holidays and other fringe benefits. Uniformity in wages also is sought, although, some differences may be permitted in this and other items as coalition bargaining is tested and perfected.

In the last analysis, however, I think we must assume that there will be such uniformity that, to all intents and purposes, collective bargaining as we know it will have disappeared. There will be nothing to bargain about. If anyone thinks my view is extreme, I will quote to them an excerpt to the IUD from its bargaining services section in 1965. The bargaining services section was created to coordinate the activities of the various industry committees which had been established to explore the practicality of coalition bargaining on a countrywide basis.

The report said:

In coordinated bargaining, several locals whose contracts expire over a short period of time band together and jointly prepare a list of major economic demands which each presents to the company. As local negotiations progress, additional meetings are held to discuss strategy and agree on a minimum package which will be acceptable. When one local has secured this minimum pattern, it does not accept it until all locals have secured a similar offer from the company.

In some of the coordinated bargaining committees a steering committee made up of representatives of the coordinated locals is established to participate in all local negotiations . . . the ultimate goal of coordinated bargaining is to force companies to negotiate major economic items on a national level. (Emphasis supplied.)

One tactic employed in coalition bargaining is for the unions involved to seek common expiration dates for their contracts. This almost always involves a strike and many times a lengthy one. There is the strong suspicion that the lengthy copper strike has been prolonged until all the major contracts held by the copper companies have expired. This will enable a speedier and more effective shutdown of the major copper companies and the copper industry when the time comes for another round of wage negotiations.

With coalition bargaining almost every strike which affects a large company or an industry brings about a crisis and Government intervention. Generally speaking, with Government intervention, a settlement is made which is favorable to the union position. So, even if the unions do not attain all their objectives, they benefit greatly. In several strikes in which coalition bargaining was the central issue, the unions have boasted that, although they didn't get all they were after, the tactics used got a good deal more than they would have otherwise.

The question arises. What is the relationship of the NLRB to the calamitous copper strike?

In this instance, as in so many others, NLRB has been pronoun and has dodged the fundamental fact that coalition bargaining plainly is illegal, unless both sides are in agreement on it. I think it is illegal, which is perhaps of no great consequence, but my opinion is buttressed by that of some of the foremost authorities on the subject of labor law. Moreover, a recital of events, on their very face, indicates that the NLRB refuses to recognize reality and that its rulings on this matter are, in essence, subterfuges.

There are probably instances where coalition bargaining would be perfectly legal on a companywide basis, or, for that matter, on an industrywide basis. But the Labor Board, itself, has ruled in the past that coalition bargaining is legal only if both parties agree to it. In the tests thus far the companies have opposed it.

In connection with the legality of coalition bargaining, the recent testimony of David L. Benetar, an attorney for the American Smelting & Refining Co., before a Government panel named to look into the copper strike is very enlightening.

The panel is composed of Dr. George W. Taylor, of the University of Pennsylvania, chairman; the Right Reverend Monsignor George C. Higgins, and George Reedy, former press secretary to President Johnson.

Here are some excerpts from Mr. Benetar's statements:

The form in which it (coalition bargaining) is presented here is a bolder and more naked bid to coerce company-wide bargaining through the use of economic power, bolder than any that have come down the pike thus far.

Company-wide bargaining is consensual. It depends on mutual accord. Unlike a wage increase, which also depends on mutual accord, however, company-wide bargaining, for its persistence as an issue in a bargaining setting, depends on the willingness of both parties to continue to discuss it.

What I have said is that the Labor Board has said that where a group of unions of a single employer wish to consolidate, a single combined unit can be achieved only with the employer's agreement.

A wage increase can be pressed through economic power until it is achieved. But this kind of consolidation or enlargement of the bargaining cannot be achieved against the will of the employer legally.

Chairman TAYLOR: Or against the will of the Union, I take it.

Mr. BENETAR: Or against the will of the Union.

Chairman TAYLOR: There are cases about the employers who would want to do it.

Mr. BENETAR: Precisely. Where the situation is turned around, the law is just the same.

Chairman TAYLOR: In other words, it is not a subject for mandatory bargaining.

Mr. BENETAR: Not at all.

Up until now, the IUD and the coalition unions have started out by asking for company-wide bargaining, or substantially company-wide, and when it was refused they resorted to device of saying, "All right, we give up that demand, but we are going to have observers in from the other Unions."

They sit there and they have participated in the bargaining. For all practical purposes they are an active part of the expanded union.

Since the Labor Board has ruled that management cannot be forced to bargain with a combination of unions against its will, the unions, as Mr. Benetar points out, have pretended in some cases that the representatives of the other unions were simply observers. The NLRB has gone along with this pretense.

In 1966, a combination of unions demanded coalition bargaining from the General Electric Co. All in all, about 150 bargaining units were involved, although approximately 70 of these were represented by locals of the International Union of Electrical Workers. A committee was named to do the actual bargaining with GE. It was composed of the presidents of the international unions representing the company's employees with a couple of exceptions.

The committee asked GE to bargain on a national basis but the company refused. Then the IUE asked for a meeting apparently to bargain as it had in the past. But the IUE confronted GE with its own negotiating committee and also with representatives of each of the other seven unions on the overall steering committee. GE balked at efforts to force coalition bargaining.

Almost immediately, both the IUE and GE filed charges of refusal to bargain in good faith with the NLRB. The Board took up the union charges for consideration but dismissed without any hearing, the GE charge that the unions had refused to bargain in good faith. The matter was taken to the courts and a final decision has not been rendered. But it is evident that the Board, as the sardonic saying goes, was impartial in favor of the unions.

Another and more flagrant case of the Board's pronoun bias is found in a 1965 controversy between the American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., against the Standard Allied Trades Council. The SATA was the bargaining representative for the company employees at the Louisville plant. SATA met with five other unions to draft a set of uniform pro-

posals with regard to the company's pension system. The company balked at meeting with the group. As a result, the NLRB upheld one of its trial examiner's decisions that American Radiator refused to bargain in good faith through its refusal to sit down with the combined union group. In one of its typically far-fetched decisions, the NLRB held the evidence did not support the charge by management that the unions were trying to force it into companywide bargaining.

As Mr. Benetar pointed out in his testimony before the special panel in the copper dispute:

The law is based on the fact that the employees in the Labor Board select the units within which they are to bargain. No one has the power to weld all these units into a single one, which is the practical effect of company-wide bargaining.

The NLRB has twisted the National Labor Relations Act as if the provisions of the statutes were pretzels. If the NLRB in the first cases centering around coalition bargaining had not dodged and evaded in its effort to go along with the unions, the copper strike never would have been called in the first place. The 26 unions involved in the copper strike would have recognized that their primary objective of forcing companywide bargaining on the copper companies had no chance.

As it is, the copper strike has cost around \$1 billion and has been a catastrophe to the 60,000 workers in the industry. Even if they get all their leaders asked for originally, most of the workers will never get back what they have lost. Too many years will be required to do so.

As I have indicated, coalition bargaining is a carefully worked out program by which already powerful union leaders seek to extend their already great power. As Guy Farmer sees it, the end results could be as follows:

Clearly, if the unions can obliterate legal bargaining units by the simple device of establishing a coalition negotiating team and bargaining from unit-to-unit with the same committee pledged to attain common bargaining goals, employers have no practical or legal defense against national bargaining throughout all our industries. This will mean that the pattern of bargaining on a unit-by-unit, plant-by-plant basis will soon disappear and be replaced by a national industry-wide or even multi-industry bargaining pattern. National crisis bargaining will then become the order of the day. This will herald an increase in government intervention almost as a matter of course, and in the end will mean that political factors and considerations of expediency, not the economics of the particular plant or company or industry, will be critical in determining the content of the settlement reached.

I do not have to tell the House that the process of free collective bargaining is imperiled today. Once management held the proverbial whip hand but now it is the labor leaders. Inflationary wage settlements are not only common; they are the rule and the big unions vie with each other in negotiations to up the ante. There is more and more Government intervention, and the end result is higher wages and more inflation. Through favoritism legally and otherwise, we have given union leaders such political power that few dare stand

against them. They have a most effective organization and millions to spend to elect their candidates and this same organization and millions and millions also are on hand to defeat candidates who oppose them.

One of the primary reasons for the state of affairs which confronts us today is the National Labor Relations Board. On October 21, I detailed the undeclared war which has been waged and is being waged against J. P. Stevens by the Textile Workers of America, the AFL-CIO and by the National Labor Relations Board. In the eyes of the NLRB, the Stevens Co., one of the largest textile firms in the country, had been guilty of a cardinal and almost unforgivable sin. The company had dared to tell its employees that it did not believe unionization would benefit them.

The Textile Workers Union held a series of representation elections at the Carolina plants of Stevens and, losing these, filed charges of unfair labor practices against the textile manufacturer. The results of such charges where there is a question of union representation is almost a foregone conclusion. The company loses; the union wins. So it was in the Stevens cases, although to obtain the desired results the NLRB examiners had to decide that all the company witnesses were lying and all the union witnesses were telling the truth.

The unions have millions of dollars to spend in the drive to unionize Stevens and, as I have said and now repeat, the AFL-CIO has all the assistance which the NLRB can give. The Textile Workers Union may lose election after election, as has been the case, but it will win just as many unfair labor practice cases as it files against the company. This is a foregone conclusion. Each case is dutifully reported in the press and the impression goes forth that the textile manufacturer is a willful violator of the labor laws and that the firm is willfully refusing to let its employees unionize.

As a matter of fact, it is evident that the overwhelming majority of the employees of J. P. Stevens feel they are better off unorganized. Otherwise, long ago they would have voted to unionize since the NLRB has seen to it that the Textile Workers of America has all the best of it in its attempt to organize the Stevens plants. The union has the best of it as to the time to hold an election. It has all the best of it in what it may say to the workers. To repeat, it has the best of it in every way. The restrictions upon the rights of employers to give their side of a controversy has been shamefully restricted.

In a 1964 case involving the General Electric Co., the NLRB held that ordinary informative statements made by an employer during the course of bargaining constituted evidence of bad faith and a basis for finding the company guilty of an unfair labor practice. The Board is now in the process of trying to force employers to furnish lists of the employees to the union so that the latter can use them in the effort at unionization. In another 1964 case, the Bernal Foam decision, the Board ruled that a union which had lost an election, could still enforce its bargaining

rights, if prior to the election it had obtained the signatures of a majority of the employees on union authorization cards. With the acquiescence and connivance of the NLRB, the unions have avoided elections and their secret ballots through the use of the authorization cards, even though in many instances a worker signed a card simply to get the union representative off his back.

Robert Stevens, head of the Stevens Co., is a man of great courage and integrity. Otherwise, he would have sought the easy way out and would have let unionization be forced upon his workers. He could have saved a lot of time and probably money too by so doing. But he has a question about the value of unionization insofar as his workers are concerned and he has told them what he thinks. From all accounts, he will continue to tell them what he thinks.

Mr. Stevens is right in raising a question about unionization. There is case after case and instance after instance on the record where workers in a union have been sacrificed to further the ambitions and interests of their leaders.

Not far from the Carolinas is a situation at Kingsport, Tenn., which the employees in the Stevens factories might ponder. A strike was called in 1963 and the controversy goes on and on. The situation is highly involved but, the evidence indicates that the workers at the Kingsport Press, a book printing concern, were called out because the Press was furnishing very keen competition to other and less efficient unionized book plants in localities far removed from Tennessee.

The strike has been long drawn out and a very agonizing affair. It has hurt Kingsport and, undoubtedly, has caused employers to shy away from locating there, since there has been much violence attending the dispute. And the approximately 1,000 workers who went out on strike have been injured most of all, since most of them have lost their jobs and have been replaced by other men. The evidence indicates—as I have stated—that the strike was not called for their benefit at all but for the benefit of concerns in other States which had difficulties in competing with the Kingsport Press. I wonder what the 1,000 former employees of Stevens think about the value of unionization.

I wonder what the 60,000 copper workers, deep down in their hearts, think about it. For, curiously enough, the copper strike is being directed by the leaders of the giant Steelworkers Union, with headquarters in Pittsburgh and steel competes directly with copper. Most of the workers in the aluminum industry belong to the Steelworkers Union and aluminum is a principal competitor of copper. The copper industry in the United States can be put out of business without any great injury to the Steelworkers Union or its leaders. For the giant union has 1,100,000 members, as I have pointed out, only 60,000 of these work in copper.

But, if the NLRB had done its duty and had not evaded the issue posed by

coalition bargaining, I don't think there would have been any copper strike in the first place.

I have cited chapter and verse about NLRB prejudice, intemperance and willfulness on other occasions to this House and no one has come forward with successful challenges or refutation about the facts. These speak for themselves.

The NLRB has been consistent. I will grant that. It has hampered management in every important area of collective bargaining. Twice the Congress has tried to restore balance in labor relations, once in the Taft-Hartley Act and once in the Landrum-Griffith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. The NLRB has so twisted the meaning of these two pieces of legislation that today they are almost unrecognizable.

I regard the NLRB as too far gone for rescue. I see no hope in trying to amend the Act again to force it to restore judicial competence and independence of judgment to its operations. I think the Board must be abolished and the National Labor Relations Act rewritten once again. Perhaps through this drastic step we can yet save genuine collective bargaining in this country. But the time grows short.

Need For New Housing Legislation

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the need for providing more decent housing for the low- and moderate-income families of this Nation has been developing for many years and we have now reached the stage where we must accelerate production of housing to meet this need.

Legislation has been introduced embodying the recommendations of President Johnson which will go a long way toward meeting this critical need.

The new legislation will utilize the programs already in existence and provide additional programs to cope with the growing problem.

Among the provisions of the legislation is an extension of a worthwhile program which provides decent housing for the low-income families. This is the rent supplement program. We have been asked to provide a modest increase in authorization for this program and as one approach to the problem, it merits our support.

The requested \$65 million in additional authority to contract for rent supplement housing will make it possible for private housing developers to create more than 72,000 new housing units.

Rent supplements already has demonstrated its great potential. Some 42,000 housing units have been approved by the Federal Housing Administration under the current authorization. Many are nearing construction. Other units are being built and will be completed in the near future. And still other units are already providing decent shelter for families with incomes at the public housing level.

This program, in addition to the great advantage of providing decent homes, has other advantages. The units are developed, owned, and operated by private sponsors; the financing is by private traditional methods; the property is on the local tax rolls. Tenants have the incentive to improve their lot in life because they are not forced to move as their economic status improves.

The rent supplement program, which represents an innovative approach to meeting the housing needs of the low-income families, has gained considerable momentum and we should do everything possible to increase its benefits.

Another program which needs our support and is provided for in this legislation is providing 300,000 dwelling units for people in the low- and moderate-income economic levels during the next fiscal year.

Of these 300,000 units—which is part of the 6 million units of all kinds President Johnson calls for in the coming decade—an estimated 54,000 would be obtained through the rehabilitation of existing structurally sound dwelling units.

The remainder would be in new construction and would be obtained through a number of existing programs. A third of the proposed 300,000 homes would be designed for homeownership; nearly another third would be rental housing, and the remainder would be included in low-rent public housing and in rent supplements housing.

With the assistance of Federal subsidies, the benefits of homeownership would be extended to low- and middle-income families—people who in the past did not have a chance to enjoy such benefits.

On the low-rent public housing side, the legislation calls for authorizing sufficient homes which would make possible the construction next year of 75,000 new units, which would provide homes for 300,000 low-income families.

In addition, authorization is requested which would enable local housing authorities to modernize some of the older and larger projects.

Both in the new and modernized public housing, there is increasing emphasis on improving the quality of life of the tenants. Local authorities are involving more and more of the tenants in helping to make decisions which affect their lives. Local authorities are providing more community services and assisting the tenants to improve themselves.

During the current year, more of the public housing is being constructed under the turnkey process, which uses the skills and experience of private developers to provide this housing. The turnkey process is bringing in more private enterprise in the construction of public housing and makes it possible to construct more housing faster and at a savings to the taxpayer.

Another portion of the legislation designed to improve the condition of our cities and the people who live in them is that which deals with the model cities program.

The legislation calls for \$1 billion for this program, which became a reality only 2 years ago. The potentialities of this program are enormous.

With the \$1 billion, we will be able to have approximately 130 cities in this Nation working on their individual problems in a concerted, coordinated way. The people in charge of working on these problems will be the people with the problems.

The people living in the slum areas and blighted neighborhoods where model cities techniques are to be created and used will be responsible for the planning and execution of the program dedicated to improving their living conditions.

For 30 years we have been trying one program after another to cure the problems of the slums and the slumdwellers. Many of them worked, but provided only partial solutions.

Now, through model cities, we have a coordinated program which involves the people themselves.

Last November, 63 cities were selected for model cities planning grants. Another 70 will be chosen in a few months. The first group represented almost every kind of urban condition, including the large and the small city. The group encompassed problems of Appalachia, of Southern agricultural centers, of old, worn-out sections of large cities in the East and North, of decaying portions of Midwestern industrial centers, and of pockets in the booming cities of the West and Southwest.

While each of the cities in the first group—and I am sure this will be true of the second group as well—have their own peculiar problems, but a common thread runs through them all. They all have slums and blighted areas, populated by families and individuals carrying a burden of poor housing, poor schools, poor health facilities, unemployment, and underemployment. Each of these areas is beset by apathy, frustration, and hopelessness.

The model cities approach—along with other programs of help—gives these people hope.

We must keep that hope alive; we must see to it that these hopes result in meaningful and beneficial results.

We can do this by passing the legislation geared to helping our cities—the legislation which will pave the way for improved and increased housing and will provide the tools for improvement of neighborhoods and cities.

Estonian Independence

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this month, a small Baltic country gained its natural right to independence for the first time in 2 centuries. As we celebrate the golden anniversary of Estonian independence, we once again reaffirm the principle of self-determination for all peoples and mourn this Baltic republic's loss of nationhood to the insatiable forces of aggression.

First the victim of Nazi infiltration and then the object of Communist russification, the Estonian people have bravely and steadfastly fought to maintain their

own language, customs, and religion despite a yoke of oppression.

The American people join with other freedom-loving peoples in the world in expressing tribute to the Estonians who led their country toward freedom. We hope that someday Estonians will once again be free to celebrate their anniversary of independence on the liberated soil of their homeland.

The A-7D Airplane

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee I have been much disturbed in recent months about the effect of the war effort on the Air Force inventory of tactical airplanes. The older airplanes, such as the F-100, are being ground up by daily attrition, and the newer-type airplanes that are being used in the strikes against North Vietnam are also suffering serious attrition.

One bright spot in the future is the purchase of the A-7D airplane which will soon join the inventory. This airplane is a ground attack airplane, and as such constitutes something of a departure from previous concepts of multi-purpose airplanes capable of accomplishing the air superiority role and the ground attack role as well.

The Air Force Association magazine Air Force and Space Digest has an excellent article on the new airplane in the current issue. Let me quote from it:

The A-7D will provide the Tactical Air Command with:

A greater load-carrying capability than any other single-jet aircraft.

A greater range than any other single-jet aircraft.

An all-weather/day-night attack capability unequalled in a single-seat aircraft.

Probably the best maintenance-to-flight-time ratio of any jet in service.

An outstanding degree of aircraft accessibility for testing, maintenance, fueling, and rearming.

The Air Force Association is to be commended for its thoughtful article, and I know that my colleagues will want to read the article in its entirety. I am introducing it into the Record for that purpose, as follows:

CORSAIRS FOR THE AIR FORCE

(By Norman Palmer, contributing editor, Air Force/Space Digest)

This month the first models of a new Air Force warplane come off the production line. The plane is Ling-Temco-Vought's A-7D Corsair II.

The A-7D will provide the Tactical Air Command with:

A greater load-carrying capability than any other single-jet aircraft.

A greater range than any other single-jet aircraft.

An all-weather/day-night attack capability unequalled in a single-seat aircraft.

Probably the best maintenance-to-flight-time ratio of any jet in service.

An outstanding degree of aircraft accessibility for testing, maintenance, fueling, and rearming.

But there being two sides to every coin, there are those in the Air Force who are not happy with the A-7D. This attitude stems primarily from the plane's being subsonic—in the Mach 0.9 class. Some in USAF would have preferred a supersonic aircraft. Indeed, the A-7D is the first turbojet fighter-type aircraft to enter Air Force service in more than fifteen years which has not been supersonic.

However, in discussing the requirement for ground support aircraft, Gen. John P. McConnell, Air Force Chief of Staff, has stated: "I would rather have them [A-7D Corsairs] than any other airplane that we now have available."

Elaborating further, Dr. Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force, explained: "Looking at the close support mission . . . we looked at the A-6, the A-7, and the F-5, and the Chief [General McConnell] concluded, and I agreed, that the A-7 was the best for that. Now the substitution or change of A-7 versus F-111 versus F-4 is really dependent on the judgment of how much close support you are going to be doing, compared with interdiction and air-to-air combat. There I think is where there was a difference of opinion in the Office of the Secretary of Defense from what the Air Force recommended. They said to do more close support and less of the other things." Thus, the Air Force is buying the A-7D Corsair II.

Current Air Force planning is reported to provide four to five wings of A-7D Corsairs in the Tactical Air Command. In addition, the US Navy is expected to purchase A-7A, A-7B, and A-7E Corsairs to equip some thirty carrier-based attack squadrons (fourteen aircraft each) and about twelve Marine attack squadrons (some twenty aircraft each).

According to W. Paul Thayer, President of LTV's Aerospace Corporation, the A-7 program could run to a total of about 1,600 aircraft of all models on the basis of current plans.

Even this number would probably place the A-7 Corsair second only to the F-4 Phantom as the biggest warplane buy of this period.

In the numbers game, the A-7 is the replacement for the F-100 Supersabre in the Air Force and for the A-4 Skyhawk in the Navy and Marine Corps; nearly 2,300 F-100s were produced by North American, and Douglas has delivered almost 2,000 A-4s.

CORSAIRS FOR USAF

The decision that the Air Force would operate the A-7 Corsair was made at the highest Defense-Air Force levels in 1965. According to General McConnell, "I personally recommended to the Secretary of Defense that we buy a certain number of A-7 aircraft for the purpose of providing close air support to the ground forces in a permissive environment, not only where we are now [South Vietnam], but [also] at a later date."

General McConnell quickly added that he did not mean for the Air Force to "load up" on A-7s to the exclusion of other types of aircraft, but that he wanted some A-7s in the Air Force inventory.

Although the Navy plans to operate the subsonic A-7 over North Vietnam on strike interdiction missions, Air Force philosophy calls for using supersonic fighter-bombers such as the F-105 Thunderchief and F-4 Phantom over the North. In the Air Force inventory the A-7 will replace the venerable F-100 Supersabre, the oldest of the Air Force supersonic fighter-bombers. There are four F-100 wings in South Vietnam, used almost exclusively for "in-country" support missions where Allied air superiority is assured.

In the Air Force weapons spectrum this places the A-7 between the A-1 Skyraider/AX concept and the F-4 Phantom/FX concept:

Operational.....	A-1	F-4	F-111
Planned.....	AX	FX	

The A-7D will differ in four major areas from Navy models, to meet Air Force requirements: (1) powerplant, (2) gun armament, (3) avionics, (4) small-arms protection.

The A-7A/A-7B Corsairs in Navy use are launched on combat missions from aircraft carriers that can accelerate fully loaded aircraft to flying speeds with a 250-foot steam catapult. The TF30 engines in the 11,000- to 12,000-pound-thrust range are considered insufficient for runway takeoffs of combat-loaded aircraft in the Southeast Asian environment. An obvious solution was to add an afterburner, but this would add weight to the aircraft at its after extremity, an unfavorable aerodynamic feature, and would give off "hot" exhaust, making the aircraft more vulnerable to infrared detection and heat-seeking missiles.

Accordingly, the Air Force decided to power its A-7D variant with the TF41-A-1 Spey turbofan engine, being developed and manufactured jointly by Rolls-Royce Ltd., of England, and the Allison Division of General Motors. The A-7D engines are being assembled in the US with some components being produced in Britain.

The TF41 was rated at approximately 14,500 pounds maximum thrust. Tests to date indicate that the engine will develop about 500 pounds more thrust than had been estimated earlier, a very welcome bonus. (The first two A-7Ds off the production line this month will have Navy TF30-P-8 engines; subsequent A-7Ds will have the TF41 Spey.)

Related to the A-7D's powerplant, the Air Force variant will have a fuel receptacle opening behind the cockpit for in-flight refueling by KC-135 tankers equipped with the flying boom. The Navy models are fitted with a swing-out fuel probe on the starboard side of the fuselage. This is compatible with the Navy KA-3B carrier-based tankers, "buddy-pack" fuel tanks carried by other Navy attack planes, and KC-135s equipped with a special drogue attachment.

On the basis of Vietnam experience, the Air Force A-7Ds will mount a single M61 Vulcan "Gatling Gun" in lieu of the twin 20-mm Mk.12 guns in the A-7A/A-7B. The 20-mm M61, made by General Electric, can fire at the rate of 6,000 rounds per minute, a faster rate than the Mk.12s can fire.

In the avionics area, the A-7D will have a highly advanced navigation and weapons delivery capability, equaled only in the F-111A Mark II. The A-7D package will provide the pilot with continuous solutions for day and night attack, for radar bombing in low visibility conditions, and for all-weather navigation and landing.

Changes over the A-7A/A-7B avionics package include an IBM digital computer in place of the CP-741 analog computer. This change will be the key to the aircraft's improved operational capabilities.

In place of an optical sight, the A-7D will have a Head-Up Display (HUD), the first installed in a U.S. warplane. Produced by Elliott Brothers, Ltd., of Britain, the HUD will provide the pilot with continuous attack solutions and navigation data displayed at his eye level. Although Elliott Brothers will fabricate the HUD in Britain, some of the material used in the system will be obtained in the United States.

An improved Doppler radar set will be provided for the A-7D by the General Precision Laboratory and the plane will have Texas Instruments' APQ-126 radar. An ASN-58 inertial platform will be provided for the A-7D by the Kearfott Systems Division of GPL. The navigation roller map in the earlier models has been deleted in the A-7D, and TAC has requested an advanced moving-map display system.

These avionic changes are said to provide most of the capabilities of the Integrated Light Attack Avionics System proposed earlier, at considerably less than the cost of ILAAS, which was planned for the Navy's

B model but has run into development delays.

The fourth major group of changes initiated by the A-7D is for protection against enemy gunfire. The A-7A/A-7B provides some armor protection for the pilot and a self-sealing main sump fuel cell. The other fuselage fuel cells and fuselage controls are protected from ground fire by the avionics bays and engine. The A-7D design provides for additional armor to include protection of certain controls, redundancy in vital controls, and all self-sealing fuel tanks.

The Air Force A-7D will also have larger tires and brakes than the Navy variants because of the different landing surfaces encountered; the A-7D will not have the Navy automatic carrier landing system; and the Air Force is considering use of a different ejection seat (all Corsairs will have some type of zero-zero ejection seat).

FAST DEVELOPMENT

The A-7 Corsair was developed in record time. Its genesis was the Navy's Sea-Based Air Strike Study conducted by the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations in 1963. This study was part of the Navy's efforts to justify the attack carrier program to the Department of Defense. In studying carrier strike capabilities the Navy determined that the Fleet's existing light attack aircraft—the A-4 Skyhawk—could not meet anticipated requirements for range, payload, and mission flexibility in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The A-4 Skyhawk had been developed in the early 1950s as a lightweight, high-performance, day attack plane capable of delivering a nuclear weapon or performing limited interdiction and close-support missions. The plane initially had minimum instrumentation and no radar, relying on a well-trained pilot for navigation and bomb aiming.

Although many modifications had increased the capabilities of the Skyhawk, the plane was still judged inadequate for projected operational requirements.

In June of 1963, a month after the Sea-Based Air Strike Study was completed, the Navy initiated competition for a new light attack aircraft (VAL in Navy symbolism, the "V" indicating fixed-wing aircraft). The study had determined that for bombing accuracy both supersonic and subsonic aircraft must release their bombs at subsonic speeds, hence vulnerability over the target area is essentially the same for both types of aircraft. On the basis of cost, the Navy felt it could purchase two to three subsonic aircraft for the price of one supersonic plane, putting more aircraft over the target for the same cost. Then, by providing sophisticated electronics to enable the plane to fly close to the ground or water, avoiding radar detection, and reducing exposure to antiaircraft fire, the subsonic plane's vulnerability would be reduced. Thus, supersonic speed was not made a requirement for the VAL.

The Navy looked at proposals to adapt existing aircraft designs to the VAL role in an effort to speed introduction of the new aircraft into the Fleet. Modifications of four designs were considered: the small Douglas A-4 Skyhawk; the Grumman A-6 Intruder, a new, subsonic, twin-engine, all-weather attack plane; the North American F-1 Fury, an improved, navalized version of the F-86 Sabre which was used as an attack plane by the Navy; and the Ling-Temco-Vought F-8 Crusader, a carrier-based jet fighter. The winning proposal came from Ling-Temco-Vought.

The F-8 Crusader is a Mach 1.7 fighter used aboard the US Navy's smaller attack carriers and on French carriers. An improved single-engine, single-seat, Mach 2+ Crusader II almost edged out the F-4 Phantom as the Navy's big-carrier fighter.

A month after winning the VAL competition, LTV and the Navy negotiated a fixed-price contract for seven preproduction air-

craft in March of 1964. The company chose the name Corsair II for its design, carrying on the name used for a series of highly successful Navy scout planes in the 1920s and 1930s, and the gull-winged F4U Corsair fighter-bomber of World War II and Korean War fame.

THE A-7 CORSAIR DESIGN

The A-7 Corsair is probably the first subsonic aircraft to be redesigned from a supersonic plane. The major change in aircraft design was the adoption of a fixed wing for the A-7 in place of the variable-incidence wing of the F-8 Crusader fighter. The latter's wing rests flush with the top of the fuselage to provide a low angle of attack for high-speed and cruise flight. For landings and takeoffs the F-8 wing pivots upward to increase its angle of attack, in effect lowering the fuselage to provide the pilot with a good view of the flight deck or runway. The plane's allersons, a section of the flaps, and the wing leading edges all droop simultaneously with the increase in wing incidence to further increase the effective camber to facilitate landing.

Other airframe changes in the redesign of the F-8 to the A-7 configuration included reduction in size (partially made possible by not having an afterburner in the Corsair), a slightly reduced wing sweepback, and the addition of outboard allersons.

These airframe changes have drawn criticism from opponents of the A-7, who claim that the A-7 provides for current avionics, weapons delivery, and powerplant technology to be installed in an airframe reflecting the state of the art in the early 1950s when the F-8 was designed. These critics contend that for a relatively small expenditure, especially in view of the number of aircraft contemplated, an airframe capable of Mach 1+ speeds could be designed—employing pivoting or variable-sweep wings—with all other A-7 capabilities.

The question of cost is subjective, and debate on cost and relative survivability of supersonic versus subsonic light attack aircraft appears to have no end. The Navy wanted the A-7 quickly, and the subsonic F-8/A-7 design appeared to be the fastest and least expensive course to take in 1963-1964. (Initially there was talk of the A-7 being built for just under \$1 million per aircraft; the A-7A/A-7B models run about \$1.5 million, if a large number of planes is purchased, and the more-sophisticated A-7D/A-7E will probably cost about \$1.75 million.)

The Pratt & Whitney TF30 turbofan engine was selected for the A-7. The basic engine design is that of the engines in the Mach 2.5 F-111 series, but without afterburner.

The first Corsair off the production line, the Navy A-7A variant, has the TF30-P-6 engine, rated at 11,200 pounds of thrust. Early catapult tests with the A-7A revealed engines were stalling from steam ingestion as the planes were about to be launched by the superheated steam catapults. (All Navy attack carriers have steam-powered catapults.) The A-7 is pulled down the catapult by its nose wheel, and the engine air inlet, directly in front of the nose wheel, sucks in steam while the plane is being launched.

After extensive tests, the P-6 engines were modified by opening the twelfth stage of the compressor, which bled off air that had been compressed but not yet fed into the turbine to be burned. This caused a reduction in pressure—and thrust—but stopped the compressor from stalling. The loss in thrust was about 1,700 pounds, cutting maximum engine thrust to some 9,500 pounds during the moment of catapult launches. Beginning with the 200th aircraft, the Navy has installed an improved TF30-P-8 engine which is believed to deliver about 12,200 pounds thrust. The Navy planes fitted with this P-8 engine are designated A-7B; the

first came off the production line in January of 1968.

Another major consideration in the A-7 design was aircraft maintenance. The A-7 Corsair was the first aircraft for which a specified number of maintenance man-hours per flight-hour (including avionics) was written into the contract, with LTV having to pay a dollar penalty for failure to meet the specified 11.5-to-1 ratio of maintenance time to flight time. According to an LTV spokesman, it was a "one-way street" because there was no bonus to be gained if the company met or exceeded the guarantee. However, if the ratio exceeded 17-to-1 the company would have to meet all expenses incurred to bring the maintenance requirements down to that figure. Finally, the maintenance personnel would be Navy men and other Navy men would hold the stopwatches.

LTV's engineers took a deep breath and went to work. Traditionally it has been necessary to take off a large section of the after fuselage to remove an engine, with the associated hydraulic lines and electrical wiring being disconnected, then reconnected and checked out when the engine is replaced. In the A-7, the engine can be removed after detaching the tail cone and lowering one panel. The only hydraulic lines and wires disconnected are those going directly to the engine. Only a standard Navy dolly with a lightweight LTV adapter is needed to remove the engine. The engine is taken out with the plane in its normal position on its landing gear. LTV says that the engine can be removed in less than thirty minutes. This writer saw it done in eighteen minutes, admittedly with a four-man LTV demonstration team.

To permit quick access to avionics and other equipment, the A-7 has thirty-five access panels and two avionics equipment bays. Most of the panels—as well as most removable components—can be reached without workstands. These features permit rapid maintenance without awkward, space-taking workstands.

Most items which require checkout after each flight can be tested from the wheel wells, requiring no opening of the panels unless corrective maintenance or replacement is required.

Finally, pressure fueling of the aircraft is accomplished through a wheel-well receptacle, meaning, in theory, one man can refuel the aircraft without electrical power being required. Gravity fueling can be done through wing and fuselage points.

The maintenance goal was an 11.5-to-1 ratio. During 1967 the Navy conducted maintenance and reliability evaluation with six A-7A Corsairs. Navy pilots flew the planes and Navy maintenance men worked on the Corsairs when they were on the ground. Navy men and LTV representatives held the stopwatches.

The A-7A exceeded both maintenance and reliability requirements. According to LTV spokesmen, the maintenance time was between eight and nine man-hours per flight-hour; the Navy has not yet announced its official calculations.

A QUICK LOOK AT THE A-7A

Powerplant: Pratt & Whitney TF30-P-6 turbofan in A-7A (estimated 11,200 pounds of static thrust); Pratt & Whitney TF30-P-8 turbofan in A-7B (estimated 12,200 pounds of static thrust); Rolls-Royce-Allison/GM TF41-A-1 Spey turbofan in A-7D (estimated 15,000 pounds of static thrust).

Performance: Maximum speed clean estimated 680 mph at 5,000 feet (Mach 0.9); tactical radius with internal fuel only and 3,600 pounds of ordnance: 700 miles; ferry range with internal fuel: 3,400 miles; ferry range with four 300-gallon drop tanks: 4,000 miles.

Weapons: Two Mk. 12 20-mm cannon in A-7A/A-7B; one M61 20-mm Vulcan cannon in A-7D; up to 15,000 pounds of bombs, mis-

siles, rockets, and gun pods on two fuselage and six wing pylons.

Weights: 14,657 pounds empty and 32,500 pounds designed catapult weight for A-7A/A-7B; A-7D approximately 1,000 pounds heavier.

Dimensions: Span, 38 feet, 8 3/4 inches; length, 46 feet, 1 1/2 inches (except A-7C, 48 feet, 4 1/4 inches); height, 16 feet, 2 inches; wing area, 375 square feet.

Fuel Capacity: 1,500 gallons internal plus two 300-gallon drop tanks and two 450-gallon drop tanks.

THE A-7 CAPABILITIES

The Navy wanted a light attack aircraft with a good all-weather/day-night capability as well as a significant improvement in payload and combat radius over the A-4 Skyhawk. The A-4E, with an empty weight of 9,853 pounds, can carry up to 8,200 pounds of weapons and has a radius of more than 300 miles with 4,000 pounds of ordnance. The A-7 has a superior avionics package and is credited with twice the load-carrying capability and twice the combat radius of the Skyhawk.

The A-7A radar-navigation package consists of a General Precision Laboratory APN-153 Doppler navigation sensor working with an ASN-41 navigation computer and a Lear Siegler ASN-50 all-altitude reference system. Other navigation equipment includes a Bendix APN-141 altimeter, a Servo-Mechanism air data computer, Applied Science Industry roller map display, and ARN-52 TACAN.

A-7A radar is Texas Instruments' APQ-116 terrain-avoidance and ground-mapping radar, a TPQ-10 tracking radar, and an APN-154 radar beacon. The avionics for weapons delivery includes a CP-741 weapons delivery computer, a television display for the Walleye missile, an ARW-77 Bullpup missile command system, weapon selection-arming controls, and a weapons-release programmer.

To give a Corsair pilot the most assistance possible in weapons delivery, the A-7B model was to have had an integrated Light Attack Avionics System (ILAAS), as mentioned earlier, which was to incorporate a digital central computer, inertial navigation, microcircuitry, and miniaturization.

As a weapons carrier the A-7 Corsair has no single-engine equal. The Navy has generally preferred external store stations to internal bomb bays for carrier-based aircraft. (No Navy aircraft now used in the attack role have internal weapon bays.) The A-7 is fitted with three weapon-carrying pylons under each wing and one on each side of the fuselage for a total of eight pylons. The two fuselage ("cheek") pylons each have a 500-pound capacity and are intended primarily for air-to-air missiles. These missiles plus two Mk. 12 20-mm cannon (with a total of 680 rounds) provide the A-7A and A-7B with a potent air-to-air capability. The Navy periodically uses light attack aircraft of the A-4 series, armed with two 20-mm cannon and two Sidewinder missiles, as fighters aboard antisubmarine carriers deployed to the Western Pacific. The A-7s, when available in sufficient numbers, may similarly be employed in a limited fighter role.

But the A-7's primary missions are strike, interdiction, and ground support. For these roles the two inboard wing pylons each hold up to 2,500 pounds of bombs, rockets, missiles, or gun pods, and the four outboard pylons can each hold up to 3,500 pounds of bombs, rockets, or missiles. (The Navy's A-7 Corsairs are all fitted to deliver nuclear weapons; the Air Force A-7D does not now have these features.)

To supplement the 1,500 gallons (10,200 pounds) of fuel carried internally, the A-7's two inboard wing pylons can be fitted with 300-gallon drop tanks and the two outermost pylons can carry 450-gallon tanks. Combinations of weapons and external fuel tanks can be carried for a total external load of about 15,000 pounds. LTV has published these mission profiles for the A-7A/A-7B:

Hi-Hi-Hi Attack Mission: Takeoff weight of 26,399 pounds with 8,250 pounds of internal fuel and 1,800 pounds of weapons. This would permit a mission radius of 700 miles with the aircraft flying at optimum cruise altitudes with five minutes at sea level over the target and twenty minutes at sea level over base.

Hi-Lo Attack Mission: Takeoff weight of 30,283 pounds with 10,200 pounds (full) internal fuel and 3,600 pounds of weapons. This would permit a mission radius of 700 miles with the aircraft flying at optimum cruise altitude except for a 230-mile run to the target at low level, five minutes over the target, and twenty minutes over base at sea level.

Close-Support Mission: Takeoff weight of 34,511 pounds with 10,200 pounds of internal fuel and 7,500 pounds of weapons. This would permit a mission radius of about 450 miles with sixty minutes loiter over the target at 5,000 feet and twenty minutes over base at sea level.

In all of the above missions the aircraft has its two 20-mm guns and requires no external fuel stores. The use of drop tanks would increase the above mission radii considerably. On a ferry mission with only internal fuel an A-7A/A-7B has a range of some 3,400 miles; with four 300-gallon drop tanks, the plane could travel 4,000 miles (these distances include fuel reserves for twenty minutes loiter at sea level before landing). On paper the A-7's range is virtually unlimited because of its in-flight fueling capability.

THE CORSAIR FLIES

The first flight of an A-7A came on September 27, 1965—nineteen months after LTV won the light attack competition and twenty-five days ahead of schedule. The A-7A proved an easy-to-handle and agile airplane as it went through its paces in the Texas sky.

The Corsair reached a speed of Mach 1.2 in a dive and slowed to almost walking speed with its flaps and large center-line dive brake extended. "Clean," an A-7 can make 4.5-G turns and roll 160 degrees in the first second; with a 7,500-pound payload it can roll ninety degrees in the first second.

A month after the first flights the Navy announced a contract for 157 Corsairs in addition to the forty-two aircraft already on order (three previous contracts having been signed for three, four, and thirty-five aircraft).

Deliveries of A-7A Corsairs to Fleet squadrons began late in 1966 when about thirty aircraft had been produced. Then November carrier trials were conducted aboard the large carrier *America*—the Navy's newest attack carrier testing the Navy's newest warplane.

The Navy decided to show off the Corsair at the Paris Air Show during the summer of 1967. Two A-7A Corsairs piloted by Navy Cmdr. Charles W. Fritz and Marine Capt. Alec Gillespie took off from Patuxent River, Md., at 10:56 a.m. on May 19 (Paris time). Seven hours and one minute later they touched down at Evreux Air Base, near Paris, after a nonrefueled flight of 3,900 statute miles. Their average airspeed was 517.5 mph.

According to Captain Gillespie, "We landed at Evreux without a single discrepancy and with enough fuel on board to fly 500 more miles and still have plenty to spare."

Both aircraft in the transatlantic hop were standard A-7A Corsairs fitted with drop tanks. Captain Gillespie's plane had come off the LTV production line in Dallas, Tex., the day before it took off for France.

Meanwhile, at Lemoore, Calif., Navy Attack Squadrons 147 and 97 were completing qualification with the A-7A Corsair. Late in October of 1967 squadron VA-147, commanded by Cmdr. James C. Hill, embarked in the attack carrier *Ranger* for the first combat deployment of the Corsair. The squadron had its normal complement of fourteen aircraft plus four spares. In addition to its Navy flight and support personnel, VA-147 was as-

signed three Air Force pilots, one maintenance officer, and twenty-one enlisted maintenance technicians for training under combat conditions.

The *Ranger* entered the war zone late in November. Air operations over North Vietnam were hampered by bad weather, but by early December the Corsairs were flying regular strike missions over the North. The *Ranger* and her seventy-odd warplanes are still deployed in Southeast Asian waters and no realistic evaluation of the Corsair's performance was available at press time. It was known, however, that one A-7A was lost to a Communist surface-to-air missile early in the deployment.

PROJECT STATUS

At this writing Ling-Temco-Vought was completing production of the 199 A-7A Corsairs for the Navy and delivering the first of 196 A-7B Corsairs powered by the improved TF30-P-8 engine. By the end of 1967 two Navy combat squadrons, VA-147 and VA-97, were fully operational with the Corsair and several other squadrons were in the process of transition.

The first of seventy-four A-7D Corsairs ordered for the Air Force will be rolled out and begin flying this month. After extensive testing out of LTV's Dallas facility, later in 1968 the planes will begin arriving at Edwards Air Force Base for Category II testing, and TAC squadrons should begin receiving Corsairs late in 1968 or early in 1969.

Side by side with the Air Force A-7Ds on LTV's production lines, a similar A-7E will be produced for the Navy. This variant, expected to become the "standard" Navy Corsair, will include the Air Force avionics package and the M61 "Gatling Gun." At this time the Navy is planning to use the TF30-P-8 engine to power the A-7E, but there is a good possibility that the higher thrust provided by the TF41 Spey will prove sufficiently attractive for the Navy to adopt it too. A 15,000-pound-thrust plus TF30-P-18 is also under development for possible Navy use.

Of course, the Navy's A-7E will have the smaller wheels and brakes, automatic carrier-landing equipment, nuclear weapons capability, and other "naval" features of the A-7A/A-7B. Reportedly, the Navy has now contracted to LTV for 151 A-7Es.

No final decision has been made in regard to which variant the Marine Corps will fly when Corsairs begin to replace A-4 Skyhawks in Marine air wings during the early or mid-1970s. It will probably have the P-18 or TF41 Spey engine because Marine attack planes usually operate from advanced bases, but with the features necessary to permit carrier operation, as all Marine fighter and attack squadrons are equipped and trained to fly from Navy carriers.

Two final Corsair variants being considered are the A-7C and KA-7F. The A-7C is a two-seat aircraft based on the A-7B design. The Navy is interested in the plane for its advanced training squadrons. It would be slightly longer than the standard A-7 and would have the same performance and weapons characteristics. To date no decision has been made to buy the A-7C; however, if the Navy does buy some the Air Force may also obtain some for advanced training.

The designation KA-7F is a proposal for a carrier-based tanker version of the Corsair to replace the aging KA-3B Skywarriors now in service. The KA-7F configuration provides for a fuselage-mounted drogue and hose reel for in-flight refueling of probe-fitted Navy aircraft and some Air Force planes (F-5, B-66, etc.). The plane would carry 18,600 pounds of fuel in its internal tanks and four 450-gallon drop tanks.

The A-7 Corsair II program promises to be a big one in terms of aircraft and capabilities. With maximum anticipated use by the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, the "about 1,600" total suggested by LTV's Paul Thayer could be low. Coupled with US service interest, the West Germans are watching A-7 de-

velopments with keen interest as a possible replacement for the eight squadrons of Fiat G.91s which the Luftwaffe operates as strike fighters. The short-field capability of a Spey-powered A-7 coupled with the plane's maintenance characteristics make a Corsair with simplified avionics of interest to several smaller nations.

Without too much imagination, one can see the jet-propelled Corsair rivaling its propeller-driven predecessor, the gull-winged F4U. The first XF4U-1 Corsair flew in 1940, and the last of the 12,681 aircraft came off the production line on Christmas Eve, 1952. The US Marines flew Corsairs throughout the Korean War, and the French Navy flew them a couple of years ago—when they were replaced by LTV F-8s. It wouldn't be surprising to see A-7s in US markings in 1980 and in Allied insignia into the 1990s.

Private Enterprise and Urban America

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I commend President Johnson for his excellent message on the cities. He has recognized the important role that private enterprise has to play in rebuilding our urban complexes.

Private enterprise has a vital stake in the rebuilding of our cities. By and large, private funds, private firms, and private leadership must bear the brunt of this stepped-up drive to make our communities decent places in which to live.

Local governments must furnish the leadership and creative building efforts necessary to accomplish these goals. This is a major challenge in the face of the pressure now being exerted on city tax dollars and available manpower.

But an even greater challenge faces private enterprise. It must be the actual builder of the renewed city and the new city.

In the long run, it is in the best interest of the business community to move wholeheartedly into the work of rebuilding our cities to preserve those basic conditions on which business' own growth—and profits—depend.

Some critics contend that a commitment to build homes for the poor and to accept public guidance in community development requires shrinking profit margins—and consequently a serious reduction in business enthusiasm.

There are idealists who equate the new business interest with the abandonment of the profit motive—an expectation that crisis produces charity.

Neither position provides the real answer. The real answer is that business can participate and still be in business:

If it looks beyond immediate prospects to longrun returns.

If it recognizes the savings in social costs that prompt and visible results can now provide.

If it acknowledges that private enterprise has objectives that transcend the classic portrayal of material gain—that it has values other than shopkeeper's values.

Today President Johnson recommended that Congress authorize "the formation of private-funded partnerships that will join private capital with business skills to help close the low-income housing gap."

This is a sound proposal. It will direct the energies and resources of private enterprise to solving the problems of our cities. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this proposal.

Case for a Nuclear Navy

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, news stories of world events increasingly make the point of the challenge to America's once great naval supremacy.

As the Los Angeles Times editorialized on February 27, 1968:

This country obviously cannot afford to take future U.S. Naval supremacy for granted.

The case for nuclear surface ships and submarines has been apparent to many for a long time. It rests not only on the superior capabilities which nuclear power affords but also on monetary efficiencies.

The Los Angeles Times editorial points out that if the U.S. Navy is to retain its lead over the Soviet Navy "in this era of tight budgets, we must get the most for our money." And:

That being so, surely the time has come to build nuclear warships instead of arguing over their merits—which have now been amply proven.

I commend to the reading of all the Members the Times editorial, "Case for a Nuclear Navy":

CASE FOR A NUCLEAR NAVY

With Russian shipyards working overtime to build a navy capable of challenging American power anywhere in the world, this country obviously cannot afford to take future U.S. naval supremacy for granted.

Thus, incoming Defense Secretary Clark Clifford should give the most serious consideration to the cries of alarm which are coming from the Pentagon admirals and from the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Soviet Adm. Sergei Gorshkov has been quoted as boasting that "sooner or later, the United States will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."

In testimony released by the joint committee over the weekend, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover warned, in effect, that Gorshkov may be proved right unless the Administration can be nudged into building more nuclear submarines, and setting a faster pace on surface warships.

Other Navy spokesmen are expected to say much the same thing in a hearing today before the House Armed Services Committee.

At present, the U.S. Navy has 78 nuclear-powered warships. These include 74 submarines, the aircraft carrier Enterprise, the guided missile cruiser Long Beach and two guided missile frigates.

Thirty-six more nuclear vessels have been authorized or under construction, all but four of which are attack submarines. The Defense Dept. is asking for a handful of additional surface warships in next year's budget.

Welcome as the latter development is, military affairs experts in Congress are disturbed by outgoing Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's refusal to start construction on some of the ships already authorized, and the decision to build only four more atomic subs before closing out the program.

When McNamara took over the Pentagon in 1961, he quickly accepted the wisdom of using nuclear power for submarines. But nuclear propulsion for surface warships failed to meet his cost-effectiveness tests.

Thus, he blocked nuclear power for the carrier John F. Kennedy, and has been rather unenthusiastic about it for other vessels.

Experience has proved that McNamara was too cautious—that nuclear-powered warships are not only more effective in military terms, because of their long range and much lesser dependence upon logistical support, but are as cheap as or cheaper than oil-fired warships in the long run.

The carrier Enterprise and three smaller nuclear warships have now steamed over 10 million miles without having to cancel a single mission because of reactor plant failure.

If our navy is to keep its lead over the Russians in this era of tight budgets, we must get the most for our money. That being so, surely the time has come to build nuclear warships instead of arguing over their merits—which have now been amply proven.

Resolution on the James Madison Memorial Building

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution by the American Library Association urging the creation of a James Madison Memorial Building, badly needed by the Library of Congress.

This excellent resolution deserves the careful consideration of all persons interested in an adequate facility for the great Library of Congress and for the great services it provides for our people.

RESOLUTION ON THE JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

(Adopted by the Council of the American Library Association, January 11, 1968)

Be it resolved that the American Library Association, a professional organization with a membership of more than 37,000, hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to make appropriations to further the construction of the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building in the interest of economy and efficiency, because, due to escalation in prices, any delay only adds to the cost of the building, which is generally recognized as essential. Funds now necessarily being expended for rental space could be saved; and services vital to the library world, the research community and the public would not be endangered because of lack of appropriate space;

Therefore the American Library Association calls upon the Congress to act swiftly in the national interest on behalf of the Library of Congress, which serves as the national library of the United States and whose services are central and essential to the welfare of the Nation's libraries and all the people they serve.

Guaranteed Student Loan Programs**HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which I feel is essential to the effective operation of the guaranteed student loan programs as provided for under the Higher Education and National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Acts of 1965. This bill would raise by 1 percent the possible interest rate that could be charged for loans guaranteed under those programs.

The additional interest would be paid by the Government while the student was in school. Thereafter, it would be shared by the student and by the Government, each paying one-half.

This bill would make the student loans more accessible to the many students who desire them. At present, they are in search of loans that have been promised but in fact do not exist. They do not exist because the lending institutions cannot afford to offer these loans at the interest ceiling provided by the laws now in existence.

I have received communications from many lending institutions in my district. I have sought the views of many others. All would like to participate in this program. Those who do participate do so as a public service—at a loss.

Almost without exception, the lending institutions indicate that participation is either foreclosed or severely limited because of the loan yield. As one compares net yield on loans offered by 383 banks reporting for a 1965 survey by the American Bankers Association, and yield on student loans, the difference is more than 2 percent. In a survey of the guaranteed student loan programs conducted by the college entrance examination board, it was found that the large commercial banks felt the following with regard to a 6-percent simple interest rate, which is now the interest ceiling for the guaranteed student loan programs: 2 percent considered it profitable, 13 percent considered it a break-even proposition, 85 percent considered it as a loss operation.

The survey found:

The staff of this study is convinced that the lending institutions must secure a reasonable profit on guaranteed loans and that the burden of evidence indicates that six percent simple interest is not yielding a reasonable profit to most lending institutions. It recommends therefore that the return be set to yield a reasonable profit.

The effective operation of the guaranteed student loan programs is a needed investment in the area of education. It provides added incentive to middle-income families who find it a hardship to finance a college education. A multitude of Federal and private programs provide advanced education for those gravely in need of financial assistance. The middle-income persons, who may in fact feel as severe a need, are passed by the wayside.

Very importantly, the program would also apply to the student not wishing to

attend college, who would prefer to pursue vocational education at a high level.

I urge favorable consideration of additions to the guaranteed student loan programs.

Take the Positive Approach on Travel**HON. CLAUDE PEPPER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you know I represent one of the greatest tourist areas in the United States and that I have been greatly concerned by our failure to make the most of our opportunities to attract foreign visitors to the United States. This lack of emphasis upon promoting the United States as a travel destination was impressed upon me when I served as chairman of a special travel subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Although I have left that committee for the Rules Committee, I have continued to be deeply concerned by the lost opportunities inherent in our lack of adequate funding of the U.S. Travel Service and its overseas travel promotion program. To help remedy this situation I introduced H.R. 3934 to provide more adequate funding of this program and to give domestic support to the overseas promotion through improved reception facilities for visitors from overseas. In the more than a year since I introduced this legislation in the House, our balance-of-payments situation has continued to deteriorate. Now we are being asked to support restrictive legislation to retard international travel rather than promote. I cannot support this restrictive course when I know we have not tried the positive course of an adequate travel promotion program. I appeared, therefore, before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 29 to oppose this restrictive legislation. I insert in the RECORD at this point my testimony before that committee in the belief that it will be of interest to my colleagues.

I also am enclosing a copy of my recent letter to the honorable chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], urging hearings on my bill. His most informative and encouraging comments on this legislation, and my letter are also inserted at this point in the RECORD, along with a reprint of my bill, H.R. 3934:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE REGARDING THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROPOSAL, FEBRUARY 29, 1968

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee, I wish to thank the Chairman for this opportunity to express my views on the proposed enactment of a series of measures designed to restrain American travel abroad in order to improve our balance of payments position. At the outset, let me state that I am greatly disturbed by the tax proposals which you have before you for consideration, and that I do not favor their enactment, I say this not because I

do not share the Administration's concern with the balance of payments dilemma in which the United States now finds itself. This is a situation which cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely. But I do not think it is necessary to accept the negative defeatist approach. I do not think we should despair, before we have tried, of finding sound and constructive alternatives.

I wish to stress particularly the alternative of doing more to bring foreign visitors to our country and of doing a better job of making them welcome so that they will serve on their return as an encouragement for their fellow countrymen to visit us. The President's Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel has recommended that we follow the positive course, and there is already before the Congress legislation to expand our travel promotion program.

Over a year ago, on January 26, 1967, I introduced a measure, H.R. 3934, which would be designated as the International and Domestic Travel Act and would amend the International Travel Act of 1961, to strengthen substantially the United States Travel Service and enable it to be far more effective in encouraging many more foreigners to visit the United States. This is the positive route. This is not retrenchment. This is not a reversal of our traditional policy of encouraging the removal of travel restriction throughout the free world.

H.R. 3934 aims at greater stimulation of the friendly contact that promotes understanding and cooperation among the peoples of the world. It would increase the annual authorization for the United States Travel Service from the present \$4.7 million to \$15 million. It would authorize up to \$10 million a year for direct travel promotion to attract foreign visitors to our shores, and it would authorize up to \$5 million for use in improving our domestic reception facilities to help us keep the flow of satisfied foreign tourists rising year after year.

The present Travel Service authorization is \$4.7 million but the actual appropriations were only \$2,975,000 for this fiscal year—1968. This sum is grossly inadequate and I believe the Congress should double the authorization for overseas promotion and triple the actual appropriation. I have talked in the past with the able director of the United States Travel Service and he has consistently indicated to me his confidence in the ability of the Travel Service to do a real job on travel promotion if we give the Service an adequate budget. I am sure he still believes, as he has told me previously, that a \$10 million appropriation would enable his agency to have a significant impact on our travel deficit.

Even with its present and very inadequate appropriation, the United States Travel Service has done a gratifying job of bringing the wonders of the United States and the advantages of visiting our country to the attention of tourist agencies and would-be travellers in many, many foreign countries. This is reflected in the fact that, for the first ten months of 1967, the number of business and pleasure visits to the United States was up over 30 per cent above the first ten months of 1966. Since the Travel Service was created in 1961, the flow of visitors from overseas—where we need to have our greatest impact—has tripled: from a half million in 1961 to one and a half million in 1967.

This has been accomplished despite the fact that the direct promotion aspects of the Travel Service budget are those that have to be cut back most deeply when we fail to provide the full amount authorized. The administrative costs take up a larger share of the money available and we have less, even proportionately, to spend on travel advertising, special promotions, and other essential ingredients of a good travel promotion program.

I would like to point out that the money

we give the United States Travel Service is far less than the amount allotted by most foreign countries for their respective official travel promotion agencies. For example, last year Greece spent \$11 million; the United Kingdom, \$9 million; Ireland over \$13.5 million; Canada over \$8 million.

I feel strongly, therefore, that until the Travel Service has had a chance to demonstrate what it can accomplish with additional funds, we should refrain from taking any action which would not only be a blow to the freedom of Americans to travel but might well have the most unfortunate repercussions and bring retaliation abroad.

I know you have heard many statements of well-founded and cogent opposition to these travel tax proposals and I do not want to add unduly to this record. I do not need to stress the administrative complexity and ease of evasion of the expenditures tax, nor the discriminatory burdens it places on certain classes of Americans who would like to travel abroad.

But I do want to indicate why on principle I think this tax is an appallingly regressive step. Last year, after long drawn out negotiations, we finally completed the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations. As the President said in his Economic Report on February 1 of this year, this was "the most successful multilateral agreement on tariff reduction ever negotiated." With this tax, we are going directly counter to the spirit of the Kennedy Round. Not only will it put a brake on American travel abroad, a step which will have serious implications for the economies of many of our partners abroad, but it will cause many of these countries to curtail their purchases of American goods and services. How can we at one and the same time tell our own people not to travel abroad and burden them with high taxes when they do, and at the same time expect foreign countries to let their nationals travel freely to this country? We cannot single out in tax legislation those countries abroad which seek to exploit our balance of payments difficulties and prohibit travel to those countries, without bringing on retaliation. But our American citizens, if left free to choose, can make their own judgments about who our friends are and can make their travel plans accordingly. Many of them are doing this already, and this can be done to help our balance of payments without involving official coercion and provoking official retaliation.

We cannot expect to enact a travel tax in a vacuum; we cannot expect it to work simply to our advantage and not have far-reaching consequences for our travel and trade policies. A travel tax would be aimed at only a symptom of our balance of payments problem and it could not bring a long-term solution. I am not certain that a travel tax would even be beneficial as far as the payments balance is concerned in the short-run; I know it will not serve our long-run, long-term international interests.

Our balance of payments problem is serious, but it has been serious for a long time, and it has been serious so long because we have tried to rely upon expedients, rather than developing long-term solutions. I think we now should do what we could have been doing for several years to close the travel gap in a positive and constructive way. I think we should take this positive step forward, before we take two steps backward and live to regret our short-sightedness.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to express my views. I am hopeful that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold hearings soon on my bill. The Chairman of that committee has advised me that he hopes to have such hearings in the near future. I urge your committee to give us a chance to pursue this positive approach before this additional tax burden is imposed upon the

American traveller and upon the system of increasingly freer international travel which we have labored so hard and for so many years to build.

Thank you.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1968.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign
Commerce Committee, Rayburn House
Office Building.

DEAR HARLEY: You will recall that my bill, H.R. 3934, to authorize an annual appropriation of \$15 million for the United States Travel Service was referred to your committee on January 26, 1967. At this time, I most respectfully but urgently request that you hold hearings on this measure at the earliest possible opportunity.

We in the Congress face the prospect of imposing burdensome taxes upon Americans who wish to travel abroad as a means of reducing the deficit in our country's international accounts. Yet we have not done anything like all we could do to reduce the "travel deficit" by bringing more foreign visitors to the United States.

All of us agree that the balance of payments situation is serious and that action needs to be taken to bring down the overall deficit. But, before we impose a burdensome and administratively cumbersome tax upon American travelers, I feel we should explore thoroughly the opportunities for taking a positive and constructive approach to this problem. I have been assured by the Director of the U.S. Travel Service, Mr. John W. Black, that in his opinion the amount of money I am requesting in my bill would enable his agency to reduce significantly the travel deficit. I believe we should afford him, and others who would wish to testify, an opportunity to be heard on what could be done to promote additional travel to the U.S., if the program were given adequate support. I am convinced that it would not be enough to increase our investment in the Travel Service from the \$3 million level of recent years to the \$5 million level now authorized. I believe we must double the authorization and triple the appropriations to assure an effective program.

In view of the heightened concern over our balance of payments situation, I urge that you consider appropriate hearings on H.R. 3934 at the earliest possible date.

Warmest personal regards to you and the members of your honorable committee, and Believe me,

Always sincerely,

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1968.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Your letter of February 13 regarding your bill, H.R. 3934, is timely in view of the current discussion of our balance-of-payments problems and the various proposals for seeking a solution through the imposition of some restrictions on American travelers. This is a subject to which our Committee is giving attention and is one to which I trust one of these days we can give an appropriate amount of time.

We have been aware of the operations of the United States Travel Service and the fact that it was our intention in the original enactment of the legislation to have a thorough review after the first few years of its operation to determine its effectiveness and what additional support, if any, should be given to this kind of activity.

It would be my hope that when the reports currently being prepared by the Task Force are completed we should be enabled to

get into this matter, at which time naturally we would be pleased to hear from you as to your own suggestions of what might be done.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and
Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121-2126) is amended—

(1) by striking out the first and second sections and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States (including its possessions for the purposes of this Act).

"Sec. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this Act referred to as the 'Secretary') shall—

"(1) formulate for the United States a comprehensive policy with respect to domestic travel;

"(2) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to and within the United States for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities and as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

"(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of all travelers;

"(4) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States and within the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

"(5) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and facilitation of travel to and within the United States generally;

"(6) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to travel and tourism; and

"(7) establish an office to be known as the Office of Travel Program Coordination, which shall assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act for the purpose of (A) achieving maximum coordination of the programs of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote the purposes of this Act, (B) consulting with appropriate officers and agencies of State and local governments, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (C) achieving the effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and of private organizations and agencies, concerned with such programs."

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of section 3(b) the following: "and shall not otherwise compete with the activities of other public or private agencies";

(3) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 4", and by inserting at the end of such section 4 a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act. Such assistant directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for GS-18 in the Classification Act of 1949."

(4) by redesignating sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary shall establish a National Tourism Resources Review Commission. Such Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who are informed about and concerned with the improvement, development, and promotion of United States tourism resources and opportunities or who are otherwise experienced in tourism research, promotion, or planning. The Secretary shall appoint a chairman from among such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

"(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of—

"(1) determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other lands at the present time and to the year 1980;

"(2) determining the travel resources of the Nation available to satisfy such needs now and to the year 1980;

"(3) determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met;

"(4) determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and

"(5) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Secretary not later than two years after the effective date of this section. The Secretary shall submit such report, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, to the President and the Congress.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be necessary to assist the Commission, the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Commission such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Commerce as the Commission may require to carry out its functions.

"(d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including traveltime; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,500,000 for the purpose of this section."

(5) by striking out "\$4,700,000" in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000"; and

(6) by striking out "International Travel Act of 1961" in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "International and Domestic Travel Act".

National Engineers Week

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week, designated "National

Engineers Week" in recognition of the fact that our first President, George Washington, was a notable civil and military engineer, my attention was called to a local association affiliated with a national engineering society to whom I would like to give recognition.

District of Columbia Association No. 1 is composed of power and plant engineers and operators throughout the Washington metropolitan area. They are affiliated with the National Association of Power Engineers, with more than 12,000 members in 192 chapters throughout the Nation. The organization was founded in 1882, and is one of the oldest engineering societies in this country.

The association is a nonprofit engineering society for the engineer/operator and all men engaged in maintenance and operation of powerplants and building service plants. Its purposes are to advance careers through continuing education programs, to increase public awareness of the responsible role performed by the engineer/operator, to enhance the prestige of careers in plant engineering and maintenance, to advance the competency of engineer/operators to assist them in doing a more efficient job safely and economically, and to promote a sharing of knowledge and exchange of experience among its members.

The association does not interfere in any way between its members and their employers, recognizing the identity of interests between employer and employee, and not countenancing any project or enterprise that will interfere with perfect harmony between them.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to this fine organization and to congratulate its members on the fine job they are doing.

Leftists Running Out of Time

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I trust the Members are aware that the political performances of actress Menila Mercouri are often Hollywood public relations productions and not legitimate spontaneous public gatherings. Therefore, I believe the following article, which appeared in the Greek Press on February 21, and which describes a recent performance by Miss Mercouri in Chicago, merits attention:

LEFTISTS RUNNING OUT OF TIME

Melina Mercouri's appearance in Chicago over the week-end was a very poor opening performance, indeed. As a self-proclaimed heroine of "Democracy" in Greece she failed to convince anyone. Her well publicized rally ended in a room with 50-60 people, mostly the well-known leftists of her entourage. The Greek-American community turned its back to her and no Civic organization could be convinced to sponsor her appearance—except her own leftist "committee."

Melina had no surprises. She continued on her hate campaign ("I hate dictators," "I hate everyone who is not anti-Junta," "Don't go to Greece," "Don't buy Greek products") and announced that she will collect money

for "refugees" and "families of tortured prisoners in Greece."

Actually whatever money will be collected will go to communistic purposes since there are no "refugees" abroad, except the Communists who were chased out of Greece after their defeat in 1949 and there are no prisoners except 2000 hard-core communists who refuse to sign a declaration that they will abstain from subversive activities. And they refuse such a declaration for the simple reason that they are professional communists and they take orders from the international communist conspiracy. Had they signed such a declaration and be set free, Melina would have no stand for her campaign.

Melina said she has evidence of "tortures" of Greeks but she produced none. Even the leader of communist youth of Greece (the Lambrakis organization) the composer Mikis Theodorakis, who was recently released after signing the declaration, denied in his interview to foreign correspondents that he was ever mistreated.

"Greece needs a period of peace to settle political passions of the past," Theodorakis said.

Another denial of mistreatment came from Andreas Papandreou who, after receiving an amnesty from the present Government of Greece, for crimes for which he was indicted by the previous government, he was released and free to travel anywhere.

Melina cannot receive any support from the Greek-American community for two reasons:

First, because her campaign is purely anti-Greek and she proclaims she will even take up arms against the Greeks, and, second, because her leftist background and associations are well-known. Her father was a deputy of the communist-front party of EDA of Greece and her movie-producer husband Jules Dassin was investigated and exposed for his communist activities by the House Un-American Activities Committee and banned from Hollywood. He since makes his pictures in Europe.

On the other hand, Greek-Americans have their own firsthand information about conditions in Greece and cannot be fooled so easily by Melina's lies. Thousands are continually going to Greece and coming back only to praise unanimously the present Government for its constructive work for the welfare of the people of Greece.

The sentiments of the Greeks are sentiments of satisfaction and happiness—with the exception of professional communists and politicians who lost their jobs. And even they admit that can only blame themselves for the Army take-over, a take-over forced upon the Greek military "in order to prevent a new Viet Nam in Greece" (to use the words of none other than Gen. James Van Fleet himself).

The Greek government has already announced the timetable of a plebiscite on the new Constitution to be followed by elections and return of Greece to the parliamentary form of government, under the provisions set by the new Constitution.

This plebiscite and these elections will prove a final mortal blow to the communists. Because democracy will not only be 100% restored to Greece. It'll be also protected.

That is why communists cannot wait. They know they are running out of time. And so is Melina.

Congressional Questionnaire Results

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 90th Con-

gress the people of my Third Congressional District in Arkansas received my

first questionnaire. Of the 168,000 mailed, 27,213 were returned. Below is a report

on the feelings of my constituents, which may be of interest to my colleagues:

Questions	Yes	No	No opinion	Percent		
				Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor:						
(a) A 6-percent surtax on the income tax as proposed by President Johnson to provide an additional \$5,000,000,000 for the war?	3,227	21,218	2,768	11.9	77.9	10.2
(b) Would you rather cut back domestic spending \$5,000,000,000 regardless of how popular or worthwhile the programs?	17,148	6,572	3,493	63.0	24.1	12.9
2. Do you approve of the President's handling of the Vietnam war?	2,704	20,914	3,595	9.9	76.8	13.3
3. Do you favor:						
(a) A 20-percent increase in social security benefits with an accompanying increase in payroll taxes as proposed by the President?	6,525	16,483	4,205	23.9	60.5	15.6
(b) An 8-percent average increase, tied to the cost of living index, in social security benefits without an increase in payroll taxes?	14,608	7,575	5,030	53.6	27.8	18.6
4. Do you favor extending medicare, at an increased tax cost, to an additional 1,500,000 people under age 65 who are disabled?	7,700	16,309	3,204	28.3	59.9	11.8
Questions	Yes	No	No opinion	Percent		
				Yes	No	No opinion
5. Do you favor Federal regulation of the right to buy or own a gun?	6,802	18,206	2,205	25.0	66.9	8.1
6. Would you favor a plan whereby a substantial portion of Federal taxes would be returned to the States to spend as they see fit?	19,193	5,119	2,901	70.5	18.8	10.7
7. Would you favor reducing the voting age to 18?	11,945	13,418	1,850	43.9	49.3	6.8
8. Do you think the poverty program is reaching the people in need?	1,480	21,716	4,017	5.4	79.8	14.8
				Number	Percent	
9. Do you feel the Buffalo River would serve the people better:						
(a) By being dammed for flood control and hydroelectric power?				3,456	12.7	
(b) By being protected in its natural state with the creation of a national river or park?				9,497	34.9	
(c) By being left alone?				7,293	26.8	
(d) No interest one way or the other.				6,967	25.6	

Vietnam and Patriotism

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Alexandria Gazette in Alexandria, Va., America's oldest daily newspaper, carried an editorial on George Washington's Birthday which I believe merits the attention of all Members of this House.

The editorial reads as follows:

VIETNAM AND PATRIOTISM

We are at war in Vietnam. This is the truth and this is the reality. Why we are there is of little consequence today. What is important is that being there the American people must begin to grow up in their thinking. Our first thoughts should be to raise our voices in support of our men who must fight this bloody war. To call this war immoral, implying that any war could be moral, shows plain unadulterated childish stupidity. It does only the Viet Cong good when the mouthings of the supposed intellectuals and social misfits are given unlimited valuable newspaper space.

When influential newspapers, news media and their analysts report half truths or their perverted views instead of the truth the Viet Cong knows that he has an unwitting dupe. He knows that many who read the story will be easy prey for his propaganda. He knows he has a helper who will slowly in the name of Freedom of the Press erode the unwary Americans feelings of patriotism.

It is time that we here in the United States begin to have a large dose of patriotism. It is time that we began to remember that living under the red, white and blue of the American flag makes any other life pale by comparison. It is time that we shout "hurrah" for the flag and sing the Star Spangled Banner with real fervor not just in a hurry to get on with a ball game or some other happy pastime.

It is time that we began to show respect for the sacrifice of men such as the President, Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State. We will no longer be the land of the Free or the Home of the Brave the day men of such stature feel that it is not worth the slings and arrows of humiliation to serve our country. It is revolting to see and hear that one of these men has had to hurry into a

public gathering by a back door because the dirty, unkempt rabble are allowed to barricade the front door and streets in the name of Free Speech and Assembly.

It is unthinkable that a man of General Westmoreland's training and intelligence must be defended for doing his duty. That some of the American elected officials and politicians are so blinded by their fears and political ambitions at this time of grave national danger as to join in this criticism is unbelievable. How the world wide Communist leaders must see our country, they have every right to feel that these officials and politicians care only for self and not for this the greatest nation on earth.

Let us drive out the hippies and the misguided intellectuals who foul the air and building walls with filthy mouthings. These are the ones who last fall caused over one million of our tax dollars to be spent for their few days of turmoil, and completely wasted the energies of those who had better things to do to help our men in Vietnam.

It is time for all real red blooded Americans to rise and drive out these immoral, psychotic and neurotic dregs of our society. Let us return them to their proper place in America, the bottom of our social structure. Let us return to responsible journalism and the true meaning of freedom of the press. Let us back and respect our men in high places. Let us back our men in Vietnam in all they must do to win the war.

In summation we believe the words of General Bruce C. Clarke (USA-retired) upon his return from an inspection trip to Vietnam are wise indeed. "Our troops in Vietnam represent the best of dedicated American manhood. They deserve our wholehearted support. To add to their casualties by statements or actions is both immoral and unjustified by any U.S. citizen. They have unity and morale on a high order. If the same were true at home the outcome of their efforts would not be in any doubt and the war might soon be over."

God grant us a swift return to peace.

Resolution on Estonian Independence

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, after decades of struggle,

Estonia proclaimed its independence as a democratic republic. To commemorate this anniversary, the City Council of Baltimore, adopted a resolution on February 19, which I include in the RECORD at this time:

RESOLUTION—CITY COUNCIL 137

(Introduced by Mr. Gallagher at the request of the Baltimore Estonian Society, Inc., Kaljo Popp, President, 1932 Belair Road, Baltimore, February 19, 1968)

Read and adopted.

City Council Resolution on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

Estonia is a country of about 1,100,000 inhabitants, surrounded in the West and North by the Baltic Sea and the Gulf of Finland. Its people are fiercely devoted to liberty and freedom and in defense of this ideal, the nation has, throughout its history, been at arms to repel aggressors.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century after a long struggle lasting nearly three decades, the southern part of Estonia was conquered by German crusaders and the northern part by Danish King Valdemar II. As a pawn in power politics, Estonia was in the sixteenth century to become a Swedish province, and in the eighteenth century Sweden ceded this people to Imperial Russia.

Following World War I, on February 24, 1918, Estonia achieved the goal of her long fight and proclaimed herself independent as a democratic republic, and was so subsequently recognized by the Allies as well as other countries. However, this small democracy was under constant harassment and attack by Soviet Russia and in 1940 under an ultimatum from the Soviet Union, a puppet government completely servient to the Soviet Union was imposed on Estonia and the land was renamed Estonia "a Soviet Republic" and she became one of the Soviet Union Republics.

The enslavement of this people has continued on to the present time, with a short interruption when the land was occupied by the Germans from 1941 to 1944. This small land suffering from oppression and exploitation will never reconcile herself to the status of a Soviet colony.

On Saturday, the 24th of February, 1968, Estonian people and their brethren throughout the world are commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. Their struggle for freedom continues unabated and they look forward to the day

when the invader will be gone and when again they will be able to "proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof"; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the City Council of Baltimore, That the wishes of our City are extended to the people of Estonia that they may again enjoy peace in their land, with liberty and freedom for all of their people; and that they may in the near future achieve self-determination for their land, free of the oppressive yoke of a conqueror; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Estonian Ambassador to the United States, to the Members of the House of Representatives from Maryland, and to the Baltimore Estonian Society, Inc.

A Specific Recommendation for Ending the War in Vietnam

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1967, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the American Security Council concerning six different ways of blocking the port of Haiphong in North Vietnam. Last fall Defense Secretary McNamara admitted before a Senate committee that 80 percent of North Vietnam's imports were received through Haiphong, yet this port still remains operative as a prime source of supply.

The American Security Council, in its Washington Report of February 19, has provided yet another possibility for bringing Ho Chi Minh to his knees, thus terminating eventually the unbelievable program of terror which has been visited upon the people of South Vietnam. Entitled, "Carrying the War to North Vietnam: Time to Strike the Red River Dike System," the report was authored by Norborne T. N. Robinson III, who is editor of the locally based Congressional Digest. In October, 1967, Mr. Robinson submitted to the President and congressional leaders of both parties a memorandum on this subject. The pro and con Digest takes no editorial positions, therefore the author's views are advanced as an individual vitally interested in this issue.

The author contends, along with many of us, that "the ultimate in humaneness, once a war has started, is to use every practical means to conclude it." Specifically, it is recommended that consideration should be given to an attack, or threat of attack, on the man-made earthen dikes, canals and irrigation works in North Vietnam which both produce and distribute that country's vital rice supply:

North Vietnam's rice production, concentrated in a relatively small area along the Red River, is dependent upon a water system of man-made earthen dikes, canals and irrigation works, very vulnerable to U.S. air strikes. Attack or even the threat of an attack on these water system could measure the

war's duration in months instead of years, since it would simultaneously limit internal distribution of the now vital food imports from Red China and the Soviet Union.

The report points out that the Korean War offers a precedent for this type of attack:

Eisenhower, as part of a pressure campaign necessary to conclude the Korean War, bombed in May, 1953, North Korean irrigation dams, flooding rice crops by the square mile.

This strategy, in my opinion, should be given serious thought in view of recent events in South Vietnam and the apparent willingness of the Communist forces to continue their planned carnage against their brothers in South Vietnam. I agree with the author that—

As a bloodless, humane method of attaining a solution to the problem of shortening the war, a plan of selective cuts in the Red River water system accompanied by the safeguards to the civilians, would seem to be worthy of consideration.

I include the Washington Report of February 19, 1968, in the RECORD at this point:

CARRYING THE WAR TO NORTH VIETNAM: TIME TO STRIKE THE RED RIVER DIKE SYSTEM

(By Norborne T. N. Robinson III, guest editor)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Guest editor, Norborne T. N. Robinson III, is editor of Congressional Digest. In October, 1967, he submitted to the President and congressional leaders of both parties a memorandum on this subject. The pro and con Digest takes no editorial positions. Mr. Robinson writes on this matter as an individual.)

North Vietnam not only has a serious food shortage, but both production and distribution are heavily dependent upon the turbulent Red River and the dikes that contain it.

The ultimate in humaneness, once a war has started, is to use every practical means to conclude it. Based on this precept, part of the strategy employed by effective U.S. peace-makers has been systematic attack on enemy food resources. Lincoln sent Sherman to the sea. Wilson reinforced the Allied blockade of Germany. Roosevelt pressed a submarine and air campaign to cut vital Japanese food imports. Eisenhower, as part of a pressure campaign necessary to conclude the Korean War, bombed, in May, 1953, North Korean irrigation dams, flooding rice crops by the square mile.

North Vietnam's rice production, concentrated in a relatively small area along the Red River, is dependent upon a water system of man-made earthen dikes, canals and irrigation works, very vulnerable to U.S. air strikes. Attack or even the threat of an attack on these water systems could measure the war's duration in months instead of years, since it would simultaneously limit internal distribution of the now vital food imports from Red China and the Soviet Union.

Moreover, targeting the food would be the opposite of waging war against people by "carpet-bombing" population centers, for the strategy would involve conserving a rice-eating population while curtailing the rice. Leaflet drops could warn civilians to evacuate selected floodable areas. There need be no famine. The Allies have ample food supplies and the means to distribute it easily. After the war, if the North Vietnamese people had a less hostile regime and desired U.S. technical help, the earthen water systems could be rebuilt at a fraction of a year's war cost. The extent of the damage would, of course, be

up to the North Vietnamese. They can call off their war at any time.

Adding water systems to the prime target list would not entail risking a "flash point" bringing in greater Soviet and Red Chinese intervention because the same geographical and technological factors that now establish a perimeter to the war would still prevail.

The "inner-directed" Soviets have never even intimated committing nuclear suicide over Vietnam any more than they did after the recent defeat of their Near East clients. Unable to support an expeditionary force over a lengthy line of sea communication, vulnerable to conventional interdiction by U.S. surface forces, their response capability is effectively limited to war materiel shipped to the Northeast coast.

On the north is Red China, where the maxim of judging a potential enemy by his "capabilities not his probabilities" is particularly applicable. Unlike in Korea, Red China now knows in advance that any massive intervention risks interdiction by U.S. tactical nuclear weapons. Red China physically cannot now break through this nuclear shield even if disposed to try. The western geographical dimension to the war, Laos and Cambodia, is fundamentally a position of sanctuary, not strength. Aside from limited supplies via the Sihanouk Trail and from rice raids in Laos, the Main Force units which sortie from there are reinforced from North Vietnam. Closing the geographical ring around the war are the Allied positions on the south and southeast.

Operating within this general perimeter to the war, the strategic objective of the Allies is pacification. U.S. forces, however, cannot be free to help hold and pacify to their maximum effectiveness so long as they must contend with Main Force units constantly reinforced and supplied from the North. Substantially slow the rhythm of this infiltration and U.S. ground forces could rapidly accelerate pacification. Cut-off enemy units in Cambodia and Laos would face a modified "withering on the vine" fate similar to that of the Japanese on by-passed Pacific Islands in World War II. ARVN forces could gain military supremacy throughout South Vietnam and the U.S. phase-out could begin.

The fastest and surest way to stop the major infiltration is to cause its collapse from the rear by removing North Vietnam as an effective belligerent. The key to this objective may lie in a combination of its food shortage and certain unique geographical factors.

THE VULNERABLE RED RIVER DIKE SYSTEM

North Vietnam, agriculturally, is even smaller than it appears on a map. The bulk of the population is concentrated in a 100-mile coastal triangle growing rice in the low-lying Red River delta, most of the rest of the country being unsuitable for major cultivation. The unique characteristic of this rice production is its dependence on the Red River which is hemmed in by gigantic dikes, rising in places 40 feet above sea level, 60 feet wide at the base and 20 feet wide at the top. The delta area is laced with a subsidiary system of major dikes, dams and irrigation canals to prevent crop flooding during high water periods and parching during dry spells.

Although the delta water system is a structural labyrinth, certain fundamentals illustrate the situation. The Red River, after absorbing two main tributaries where the delta area begins, some thirty miles above Hanoi, carries an average of 140,000 cubic feet of water per second for a hundred miles through the delta to the sea. Moreover its irregular flow can vary from 20,000 to a potent 850,000 cfs (twice the discharge of the Nile), depending on the weather. The Red River flow, if unchecked, is sufficient to turn

the entire 5,000 square mile delta into a lake and swamp blending into the sea. In places the delta is also vulnerable to tidal inundation, and a related system of sea dikes exists.

The objective of targeting this water system would not, however, be to create such a lake, but to use selective cuts to curb food production and distribution and to create internal political problems for the Hanoi regime. The intricate pattern of the water system lends itself naturally to such selective targeting.

With its heavy military operation in the south, North Vietnam cannot feed itself. The food shipments from Red China and the Soviet Union that attempt to meet the deficit come in via ports in the northeast (shoal waters along the lower coast require lighterage which is very vulnerable to interdiction) and down overland through the "northeast corridor" from Red China.

Since the Red River bisects North Vietnam, these shipments go to the populated areas of the delta or through it to the south. Internal distribution is by rail, highway and the transportation network created by the water system itself: canals and roads on top of the dikes. Since the level of the Red River seasonally fluctuates by at least 25 feet, certain representative heights above sea level illustrate the vulnerability of the transportation. The main road directly south from Haiphong passes through country only seven feet above sea level. Kien An, the air base outside the port, is 16 feet. Yen Vien, the rail yard for the lines coming in from Red China, located seven miles northeast and across the river from Hanoi, is also 16 feet, although 60 air-line miles inland.

TARGETING THE DIKES

Should U.S. air strikes begin by making only a few modest dike cuts and leaflet drops when the good flying weather resumes in March a morale-cracking tremor would run throughout North Vietnam. There isn't a delta peasant who doesn't live with the significance of the dikes. Hanoi's total war mobilization requires tight organization, as does the very existence of the regime itself. It would be difficult to retain this organization intact if thousands of peasants started walking to high ground. There would be adequate time for evacuation. The center of the delta is no more than 35 miles from high ground. For most of the people it would be a day or two's easy walk. All the people could evacuate before the high water period of June-October. Hanoi's problem, however, would be that there are some 8-10 million people in the delta.

A short air campaign having the potential of causing a major population relocation, without attacking the population, would in itself place an intolerable strain on the internal distribution. By June, if the war continued, the air campaign could concentrate on rice crops proper. Serious attacks would not only cost one crop by inundation but next winter's crop as well. Much of the November-March monsoon consists of drizzle, providing enough humidity for rice but not enough water without irrigation from an impounded supply.

The winter monsoon, inhibiting pin-point bombing by its cloud cover, has been taken advantage of by Hanoi to distribute imports of war materiel, including food. With much of Hanoi's organized transportation in disarray from selected flooding, precision targets, such as rolling stock and bridges would be of less importance. Fewer routes would mean greater transport congestion, increasing interdiction impact. By establishing, with leaflet drops to warn the populace, aerial "free fire zones" similar to those employed for allied artillery near the DMZ, radar bombing through the cloud cover could be continued against remaining lines of communication until the weather cleared.

With transportation across the delta severely hampered, the regime would be forced to rely more on routes crossing the river upstream from Hanoi. Not only would this add some 200 miles to the route south, an important factor for primitive transportation, but the delta evacuees north of the river could present a problem. They would be athwart the import supply line. This hill and forest terrain is ideal for guerrilla warfare. Delta evacuees to the south would have the river between them and the imports. They might also decide to take action against bicyclists and foot porters moving food for the war in the south.

It is doubtful that the regime would wish to see such a food war scenario played to the end, for it would risk being overthrown. Even should it elect to try, the regime could not fight effectively in the south at the same time. Enormous manpower resources are already being diverted to repair of existing communications, under impact of the air war. The only remaining military manpower pool left to contend with dike repair supervision and an uneasy populace is the regular army earmarked for the war in the south. In a "two front war" the regime could afford to lose on the southern front, but never on the new front in their heartland.

In a relatively short time Red China will have the nuclear ICBM capability to reach downtown urban America in 30 minutes, quicker than most commuters. The U.S. needs the "short punch" capability of forward Asian positions to assist in maintaining maximum deterrence. Corollary to this is the desirability of removing a half million U.S. ground forces as potential nuclear hostages to early-phase limited range Chinese nuclear weapons.

The surest way to prevent a major escalation of the war may well lie in accelerating it. On humanitarian grounds alone, acceleration is superior to attrition for the end of the war would be in sight.

As a bloodless, humane method of attaining a solution to the problem of shortening the war, a plan of selective cuts in the Red River water system, accompanied by the safeguards to the civilians, would seem to be worthy of consideration.

The San Rafael Wilderness Bill: Let's Have the Whole Loaf

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report on the San Rafael Wilderness bill, S. 889, will shortly come before the House for its consideration. S. 889 omits from legal wilderness designation 2,000 acres of natural wilderness along the Sierra Madre Ridge. The House included this 2,000 acres in its bill as passed in October 1967, because the area fully qualifies as wilderness under the definition of the Wilderness Act and because the people at the official public hearing required by the Wilderness Act strongly expressed themselves as wanting this 2,000 acres placed within the national wilderness preservation system.

The argument advanced by the administering Federal agency, our excellent Forest Service, for omitting this 2,000 acres was based on old plans for heavy public use of this area, including intro-

duction of a new public automobile road, which it was claimed would necessitate special and extensive fire prevention measures inconsistent with the Wilderness Act. With the abandonment of these plans by the Forest Service itself a number of years ago, special fire-prevention treatment would not be needed and the argument does not apply.

The prime point at issue now in connection with the San Rafael Wilderness bill is whether the wishes of the citizens as expressed at the public hearings required by the Wilderness Act are going to be given full weight as the Congress considers each bill proposing an addition to the national wilderness system. These hearings were provided for under the Wilderness Act to assure the people of an effective opportunity to be heard. How effective this opportunity proves to be depends upon how faithfully the Congress is prepared to listen.

On the San Rafael Wilderness the official hearing record is strong and clear that the people want the 2,000 acres along the Sierra Madre Ridge made a part of the national wilderness system. Acknowledging the wishes of the people, I will vote to return to conference the committee report endorsing S. 889, and I urge my distinguished colleagues in the House to do likewise.

Fabulous Fourth Questionnaire

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent, I submit the fifth annual Fabulous Fourth Questionnaire for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

ASSIST YOUR CONGRESSMAN, JOHN W. WYDLER, WITH YOUR ADVICE AND OPINION

WHY A QUESTIONNAIRE?

DEAR FRIEND: As has been my custom since you first sent me to Washington, I am asking your views on a number of matters. The tremendous response to my four previous questionnaires indicates a great and intelligent interest in Federal affairs. Your comments were interesting and informative and further cement the necessary communications between a Congressman and his constituents.

I realize the questions are general in nature and that the issues I vote on are more specific. Your answers, however, will act as guidelines by which you can help shape my votes. Often my vote is on a program which I do not prefer. I must then choose to support that program or none at all. I try to make the choice that you would prefer.

When you have completed this questionnaire, to return it, refold the mailer so that my name appears on the outside. I will be glad to send you a report on the results, and to reply to questions and comments. This will take time because of the limitations of my staff.

I want to thank every one of you for the time and thought given to answering this questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. WYDLER,
Member of Congress.

[Please check your choice]

	His	Her	For tabulation only		His	Her	For tabulation only
A. FOREIGN POLICY				B. DOMESTIC POLICY—Continued			
1. The war in Vietnam should be—				5. The urban crisis should be dealt with by—			
(a) Prosecuted more vigorously than it is at present to produce military victory.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)	(d) Increasing State and Federal expenditures for public housing, jobs, slum clearance, and welfare aid.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)
(b) Conducted at the present level.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)	(e) Undecided or no opinion.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(0)
(c) Brought to an end by gradual, negotiated withdrawal.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)	6. Excessive outflow of the American dollar should be dealt with by one of the following, primarily—			
(d) Ended by U.S. withdrawal now.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)	(a) Restriction of American investments abroad.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)
(e) Undecided or no opinion.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(0)	(b) Restrictions of foreign travel of Americans.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)
2. The admission of Communist China to the United Nations should be—				(c) Reduction of military budgets.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)
(a) prevented absolutely.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)	(d) Reduction in nonmilitary foreign aid.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)
(b) Postponed for now.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)	(e) Undecided or no opinion.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(0)
(c) Favorably considered.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)	C. INDEX OF IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC ISSUES			
(d) Arranged as soon as possible.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)	7. Listed below you will find a number of issues currently being debated widely. You can help me evaluate their significance by telling me how important they are to you. In the space next to each item please place a number indicating the seriousness of the questions to you:			
(e) Undecided or no opinion.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(0)	(5)—If extremely critical; (4)—If serious; (3)—If important but not serious; (2)—If significant but not important; (1)—If noteworthy but not significant; (0)—If of no concern			
3. American military commitment in Europe should be—				(a) Taxes.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)
(a) Increased.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)	(b) Vietnam war.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)
(b) Maintained at present levels.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)	(c) Urban crisis.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)
(c) Reduced without being abandoned.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)	(d) Civil rights struggle.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)
(d) Eliminated completely.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)	(e) Public education.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)
(e) Undecided or no opinion.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(0)	(f) Crime prevention and control.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(6)
B. DOMESTIC POLICY				(g) Inflation.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(7)
4. The anticipated deficit in the Federal budget should be—				(h) Aid to foreign nations.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(8)
(a) Eliminated by reducing Government expenditures in civilian but not in military functions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)	(i) Public or low rent housing.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(9)
(b) Eliminated by reduction in military expenditures primarily or exclusively.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)	(j) Care for the aged.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(10)
(c) Eliminated by cutting military and civilian functions of the Federal Government.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)	(k) Congressional reform.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(11)
(d) Eliminated by adding the surtax of 10 percent as desired by President Johnson.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)	(l) Federal-State revenue sharing.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(12)
(e) Left standing as a debt against the future.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)	(m) Tax deduction for political contributions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(13)
(f) Undecided or no opinion.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(0)	(n) Tax deduction for college tuition.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(14)
5. The urban crisis should be dealt with by—				(o) Use of drugs.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(15)
(a) Increasing the number and power of the police.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)				
(b) Letting private enterprise provide jobs, housing, etc., through business activities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)				
(c) Reducing the role of government generally.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)				

Pinned by Girl Scout Brownie Patrice Alfonso of Westbury, Congressman Wylder promises to do all he can to further annual cookie drive. [Photograph, not printed in RECORD.]

Mrs. Marie Chichester of Hempstead asked Congressman Wylder's advice on what to do with priceless 1777 thirteen star American Flag. She is shown presenting it to Curator Edward Smitts of Nassau County Historical Museum. [Photograph, not printed in RECORD.]

IMPORTANT: If you wish to receive a reply to your comments in regard to the questions asked or a tabulation of the results, please be sure to include your name and address in the space below.

Comments.....

Name.....

Address.....

LEGISLATIVE BOX SCORE

In the first session of the 90th Congress I supported the following proposals which I think were good legislation:

S. 780 (Public Law 90-148)—Air Quality Act—Broadens and extends the Clean Air Act. Expands the authority to conduct and assist in research relating to fuels and vehicles to eliminate pollution of air by preventing and controlling the discharge into the air by various types of pollutants.

H.R. 10783 (Public Law 90-226)—The Anti-Crime Law—Revises various aspects of criminal procedure in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12144 (Public Law 90-201)—Wholesome Meat Act—Clarifies, strengthens, and extends the Federal laws pertaining to the inspection and marking of meat used as human food.

H.J. Res. 888 (Public Law 90-218)—Makes continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968—Republican proposal to cut \$5 billion in spending.

H.R. 12080 (Public Law 90-248)—Social Security Amendments—Increases social security and medicare benefits.

WYDLER EXAMINES PROSPECTS OF PRESENT CONGRESS

The President renewed his call for increased taxes in his State of the Union message. Last year, a coalition of Republicans and Democrats managed to forestall a similar demand. Economists are divided on the matter, but I do not see how transferring the spending of your money from your hands to those of the Government is going to defer inflation. The President's budget is still very much in the red with or without the tax increase.

I oppose the President's proposal for a special tax on travel, or even the prohibition of foreign travel. Any amount saved would be unsubstantial. The President must come up with something more basic and far reaching before I could approve it. The balance of payments deficit is the result of the Administration's fiscal mismanagement.

The President also proposed another program to train the "hard core unemployable." That is admirable and I applaud it, but we already have expensive programs under way to do just that. Adding another program would only add millions in administrative costs and duplication of duties and efforts. The most effective way to get quick results would be to expand and improve our present manpower retraining programs.

This can be a busy and productive session. I believe last year's session was a most productive one, possibly not for the production of new legislation, but for voting down many bills which would have proved tremendously expensive, and by forcing some cut-back in Federal spending.

CONSUMER PROTECTION A MUST

This session can also continue the important work of protecting the American consumer. Last year we passed a Clean Meat Act and a Flammable Fabrics Act. This year we will pass the Truth-in-Lending legislation. All these matters have my full support. I am leading a fight to see that viewers are protected from dangerous X-rays emitted from some color television sets.

FABULOUS FOURTH FORUM: SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE BENEFITS INCREASED

I am making available, for free, information on the new Social Security and Medicare benefits, passed by the 90th Congress. I supported the improvements in the Social Security and Medicare laws which provided these increased benefits.

If you are interested in obtaining a brochure which will explain the benefits to you, please write me for a copy.

SENIOR CITIZENS FORUM

A Senior Citizen Forum will be held at Roosevelt Field, Friday, March 29 at 2 p.m. Refreshments will be served and a drawing conducted. All senior citizens are welcome.

TOURIST TIME

As spring approaches, I look forward to seeing many "Fabulous Fourthers" in Washington. Let my office know of your plans several weeks in advance and tours and passes will be arranged.

JACK WYDLER.

Vietnam Claims Ex-Art Student**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Alexander S. Chin, a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

VIETNAM CLAIMS EX-ART STUDENT—PRIVATE FIRST CLASS CHIN, 23, WAS DUE FOR DISCHARGE IN MARCH

Pfc. Alexander S. Chin, a 23-year-old marine who had attended the Maryland In-

stitute of Art on a scholarship, was killed last week in South Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Private Chin, who enlisted in the Marine Corps in March, 1966, was killed February 22 when a fragmentation bomb exploded near him while he was on an infantry operation at Quang Tri, his family was told.

A 1963 graduate of Douglass High School, Private Chin had been in Vietnam since February, 1967. He was scheduled to return to Baltimore on March 8 and, shortly thereafter, to be discharged from the Marines.

IN 3D MARINES

He was assigned to the 3d Marine Division and, after completing his training at Parris Island, S.C., and Camp Lejeune, N.C., had been stationed at Camp Pendleton, Cal., from May, 1966, until he was sent to Vietnam.

Private Chin attended the Maryland Institute for three years before leaving school and working briefly for the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency.

An artist whose work ranged from realism to surrealism to abstract paintings, Private Chin had exhibited paintings at the Druid Hill Park art show, the Johns Hopkins University Hospital and at the Institute.

Also a sculptor, he intended to complete his studies at the Institute after his discharge from the Marines.

Private Chin, who lived in the 2100 block Koko lane, was "dissatisfied with the war in Vietnam," a family friend said yesterday.

He is survived by his mother, Mrs. Betty Chin; two sisters, Mrs. Lottie Green and Yvette Chin; and three brothers, Levi, John R. and Tyrone Chin, all of Baltimore.

Russia's Navy

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there have been many articles and editorials concerning the dramatic growth and surging activity of the Soviet Navy. This broad attention reflects a basic change in the Soviet strategy which is sure to have a most profound influence on the world in years to come.

Because of the potential impact of these developments on our national security, I include three recent articles devoted to the new Soviet Navy in the *Extensions of Remarks* portion of the *Record*. They are: "Russia's Navy," from *Time* magazine, February 23, 1968; "The View From Grosvenor Square," by Holmes Alexander, in the *American Security Council's Washington Report*, dated February 5, 1968; and "Ivan Hugs the Shores of Tripoli," by John Maffre, published in the *Washington Post* of February 26, 1968:

RUSSIA: POWER PLAY ON THE OCEANS

"The flag of the Soviet navy now proudly flies over the oceans of the world. Sooner or later, the U.S. will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."—Admiral Sergei Gorshkov.

The author of that threatening boast walked up to a snake charmer in the Indian city of Agra last week and, while his aides looked on aghast, seized a thick, six-foot-long python in his strong hands and draped it over his shoulders. Making a ten-day tour of India, the commander of the Russian navy was acting like the traditional sailor on

shore leave. He viewed the Taj Mahal by moonlight, visited the Nehru Museum and the site where Mahatma Gandhi's body was cremated, and shopped for souvenirs. But Admiral Sergei Georgievich Gorshkov's trip to India had an entirely serious purpose, as do all his trips these days. He is trying to line up a worldwide system of ports of call and bases for his navy, and he hoped to persuade India, which is about to receive at least three submarines from the Soviet Union, to reciprocate by allowing Soviet men-of-war to fuel and make repairs in Indian ports.

While the attention of the U.S. is focused on Viet Nam, the Russians are mounting at sea a new challenge that the U.S. and its allies will have to deal with long after the fighting in Southeast Asia is ended. This may come as a surprise to most laymen—but not to U.S. naval experts. While Russia's stock of intercontinental missiles and its huge land army on Europe's periphery still remain the major military threats to the West, in recent years the Russians have developed a global navy second only to the U.S. in size and weaponry. As a comparison between the two navies shows (see chart), the U.S. remains indisputably the world's greatest sea power. But, in a remarkable turnaround since World War II, Moscow has transformed a relatively insignificant coastal-defense force that seldom ventured far from land into a real blue-water fleet. If any one man is responsible for this change, it is Admiral Gorshkov, 57, who became the youngest admiral in Soviet history at 31 and has guided the growth of the navy as its chief for the past twelve years. He has totally re-shaped the Soviet Union's once conservative naval strategy and transformed the fleet into the most effective and flexible arm of Soviet foreign policy.

NAVAL STRENGTH

United States		U.S.S.R.	
Type	Number	Type	Number
Attack carriers.....	15	Attack carriers.....	0
Helicopter and support carriers.....	17	Helicopter carriers.....	2
Battleships and cruisers.....	14	Cruisers.....	19
Destroyers, frigates, and destroyer escorts.....	330	Destroyers, frigates, and destroyer escorts.....	170
Nuclear-powered submarines.....	75	Nuclear-powered submarines.....	55
Other submarines.....	80	Other submarines.....	305
Landing craft.....	105	Landing craft.....	100
Torpedo and missile boats.....	0	Torpedo and missile boats.....	560

MERCHANT FLEET

14,000,000 deadweight tons.....	1,000	10,000,000 deadweight tons.....	1,350
---------------------------------	-------	---------------------------------	-------

FORMIDABLE FLEETS

Since 1957, Russia has added to its navy virtually all of the ships that now make up its impressive striking power. It has a modern force of 19 cruisers, 170 destroyers, missile frigates and destroyer escorts, and 560 motor torpedo boats. Its 360 submarines, 55 of them nuclear, give Russia the world's largest submarine fleet, far exceeding the U.S. total of 155 subs but falling short of the U.S. fleet of 75 nuclear subs.

Moreover, unlike other naval powers, the Soviet Union uses its merchant marine and other seagoing services as important arms of the navy. Russia has the world's fastest-growing merchant fleet, which will pass the lagging U.S. merchant marine in tonnage in the early 1970s. Its high-seas fishing fleet is the world's largest and most modern; many of its 4,000 craft fish for vital information along foreign coasts as well as for the creatures of the sea. The Soviet Union also

has the largest oceanographic fleet, whose 200 ships plumb the earth's waters for militarily valuable data on depths, currents, bottom topography and other information of interest to its ships and submarines. Says Admiral John McCain Jr., commander in chief of U.S. naval forces in Europe: "The Russian program to develop its seapower is more advanced and fully developed today than most people realize. It encompasses the full spectrum of the uses of the sea—in its military, economic, political and commercial connotations."

The new Soviet emphasis on seapower represents a major strategic decision. With its arsenal of 720 ICBMs more than offset by a larger U.S. deterrent, with its huge land army muscle-bound and deprived of global mobility in the middle of the great Eurasian land mass, Russia has turned to the sea to break out of its own geographic confines and attempt to wield truly global power.

Using the navy as a political as well as a military force, the Kremlin hopes that its mere presence in many places will act as a deterrent to the U.S. Moreover, the Russians want to be ready to move quickly into any areas where U.S. power and prestige may recede. They not only plan to project a more tangible Russian influence in the underdeveloped world but also, by using their merchant fleet, to get a strong hold on the raw materials vital to Soviet—and often to American—industry. Ultimately, though, the Russian navy's biggest threat is a military one. Its offensive strategy not only zeroes submarine-carried nuclear missiles in on U.S. cities, but aims to isolate North America from Europe and Asia in case of war.

BRIDGE OF TROUBLE

The imperial reach of the Soviet navy has already begun to have its impact on world events. In the tense Sea of Japan, a flotilla of 16 Soviet cruisers and missile frigates has in the past few weeks shouldered its way between the coast of North Korea and the U.S. Navy task force that was sent into the area to add some muscle to U.S. diplomatic demands for the return of the *Pueblo* and its crew. Soviet destroyers have also closely shadowed the carrier *Enterprise*, which withdrew because of North Korean protests shortly before the Soviet navy's approach. The Soviet presence checkmates the U.S. pressure on North Korea and gives the Kremlin a local pressure point without having to resort to nuclear threats.

Soviet seapower sustains the two countries that are giving the U.S. the most trouble. A bridge of 150 freighters from Russian ports carries to Haiphong the SAMs, the petroleum, the rockets, the assault rifles and the ammunition that keep North Viet Nam fighting and killing U.S. soldiers. Moreover, it is the fear of hitting those Russian ships that has so far kept the U.S. from bombing Haiphong's piers or mining the harbor. And it is another bridge of Soviet ships that carries the \$1,000,000-a-day in supplies that sustains Castro's Cuba as the only Communist foothold in the Hemisphere.

OUTFLANKING NATO

In the Mediterranean, the impact of the Soviet fleet has been particularly dramatic. Where Russia had only half a dozen ships a year ago, it now has 46 ships, almost as many as the 50-ship U.S. fleet, which for years had made the "Med" practically an American lake. Many of the Soviet ships came through the Dardanelles during the Six-Day War, and their arrival helped persuade the Israelis to accept a cease-fire. The Soviets have enhanced their new image as the protector of their Arab allies by keeping a few ships in Alexandria and Port Said so that Israeli bombers will not be tempted to blast away at the vast amount of war matériel that is flowing into those ports.

One main Soviet objective is to outflank NATO's land-based defenses—a goal that the

Russian navy has partially reached by penetrating the Mediterranean. In a report to the Western European Union last November, Dutch Delegate Frans Goedhart warned: "It is no longer correct to speak of the 'danger' of the Soviet Union outflanking the NATO southern flank. This 'danger' has become a reality." To the north, the Russians have also turned the Baltic into a virtual Red Sea on which their warships now outnumber NATO forces 5 to 1.

To support its growing naval activity, Russia is searching for new bases and ports of call. Soviet diplomats are setting up an embassy in the new republic of South Yemen, where the Russians have their eye on the former British naval installation at Aden; the installation not only controls entry to the Red Sea but is an ideal base from which to expand influence into the oil-rich Sheikdoms of the Persian Gulf. The Soviets may also be able to use the facilities of the big British naval base at Singapore, which Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew has said he will rent to all comers after the Royal Navy pulls out in 1971. The big question in the Mediterranean is whether the Russians will move into the Algerian naval base at Mers-el-Kebir, which the French evacuated last month; it is only 315 miles east of Gibraltar. Russians have also used their influence with the Arabs to set up secret stockpiles of spare parts within trucking distance of Arab ports.

RUSSIAN MARINES

Admiral Gorshkov's ships are not only wide-ranging but among the world's newest and best equipped. Unlike the U.S. and Britain, both of which emerged from World War II with large surface fleets, Russia had to start practically from scratch after the war. The result: while 60% of the U.S. fleet consists of ships 25 years old or older, the Soviet navy's surface fleet is sleek and modern. "Almost every time you go into a harbor," says U.S. Navy Captain Harry Allendorfer, an expert on Soviet seapower, "if there are no flag markings and you pick out the cleanest and best-looking ships, nine out of ten of them will be Russian."

The Soviet Union is adding to its fleet of 55 nuclear-powered submarines at the rate of five a year. Most of the Soviet nukes are hunter-killers whose mission is to destroy U.S. Polaris subs in time of war, but a growing number fire a new underwater missile that has a range of at least 1,500 miles (v. the U.S. missile's range of 2,500 miles). Since he believes that naval guns are obsolete, Admiral Gorshkov has equipped almost all Soviet surface ships, from the smallest to the largest, with ship-to-ship missiles. The Soviet missiles are so-called "cruise missile" that fly about 700 miles an hour, steer themselves either by radar or heat-seeking systems and carry either conventional or nuclear warheads. The U.S. experimented with similar weapons in the 1950s but dropped them in favor of concentrating on the Polaris and airpower. No Western navy in fact, has such missiles.

Soviet cruisers and the *Kresta*- and *Kynda*-class destroyers carry the SS-N-3 missile, which can hit enemy ships at a range of 200 miles. The *Krupny*- and *Kildin*-class destroyers carry the 100-mile range SS-N-1 missiles, and the speedy *Osa* and *Komar* torpedo boats are armed with Styx missiles, whose effective range is 20 miles. A Styx fired by the Egyptians from a *Komar* sank the Israeli destroyer *Elath* off Port Said last October. U.S. Navy-men insist that their planes would knock out Soviet ships before they got within firing range of U.S. warships or, failing that, that U.S. antiaircraft rockets would intercept the missiles in flight. But the U.S. Navy has now started work on ship-to-ship missiles of its own.

Admiral Gorshkov is also developing a new force that will give the Russians the ability to intervene in trouble spots, much as the U.S. did in Lebanon and the Dominican Re-

public. The Soviet navy has built its first carrier, a new 25,000-tonner called the *Moscow*, which is now on a training course in the Black Sea, and is readying a second the *Leningrad*, for sea trials; some Western sea experts feel that the Russians may build many more. The Soviet carriers have landing areas only on the rear and can thus handle only helicopters or vertical-takeoff aircraft. They are similar, in fact, to the American *Iwo Jima*-type LPH (for Landing Pad Helicopter), of which the U.S. Navy has eight, two of them stationed in Viet Nam waters as offshore bases for Marines. So far, the Soviets have given no indication that they will advance to the large U.S.-style attack carriers, since they consider such carriers vulnerable to attacks by missiles.

The Russians do have, however, a force similar to the U.S. Marines. It is the so-called Naval Infantry that fought as regular ground units during World War II but was later disbanded. Reorganized in 1964 just after the construction of the carriers began, the Naval Infantry now numbers 10,000 men who wear distinctive black berets, are chosen for outstanding physical fitness and aggressiveness. The Naval Infantry are carried on special landing craft and have tanks that can "swim" from ship to shore in amphibious landings.

COLLECTING LOVERS

The Soviet surge at sea should come as no surprise to the West. Actually, the Russians have been reaching out to the oceans since Peter the Great ascended the throne in 1689. Under the guise of Peter Mikhailov, carpenter, the young Czar traveled to The Netherlands and England to learn how to build ships. In 1714, his fleet defeated the Swedes at Hango, thus opening through the Baltic a "Window to the West" for his backward country.

Peter's successors frittered away the fleet, but when Catherine the Great came to power in 1762, she began a massive rebuilding program. To find enough officers to command her new ships, Catherine collected foreign naval men almost as fast as she collected lovers. Among them was the American Revolutionary War hero, John Paul Jones, who, despite his bravery and gift for quick phrasemaking, had risen no higher than captain in the U.S. Navy. In return for an admiral's rank, Jones took command of a Russian sailing fleet composed of four battleships, eight frigates and assorted smaller craft that helped chase the Turks from the Black Sea. Unfortunately, his morals were nearly as bad as Catherine's, and rival admirals used a scandal about his deflowering a young Russian girl to chase him out.

Throughout the 19th century, Russia remained the world's third largest naval power (after Britain and France), but it was a largely untested one. The testing came in the 1904-05 war with Japan. In the straits of Tsushima, the Japanese met a fleet of 37 Russian ships and sank or captured all but four of them. It was the last time the Russians fought a naval engagement on the high seas.

What was left of the navy became a hotbed of anti-czarist agitation. In 1917, the guns of the cruiser *Aurora* fired a blank salvo at the Winter Palace in Petrograd and started the October Revolution. At first, sailors were the new Soviet government's most trusted fighters, but Lenin managed to alienate them. He put in charge of the navy a commissar who was, of all things, a woman, named Larisa Reisner-Raskolnikova, and refused to allow the sailors to organize their own self-ruling local governments. As a result, the Baltic Fleet suddenly mutinied in 1921. Lenin crushed the revolt, but he never forgave the navy. He demoted it to the inglorious position of "naval forces of the Red Army" and decreed a new strategy that called for only a defensive fleet whose main weaponry would be submarines.

By 1932, the U.S.S.R. had some 25 subs, but Lenin's successor, Stalin, was dissatis-

fied with such an invisible fleet. In the mid-1930s, he reinstated the navy as an independent service and started building a huge surface fleet. The Germans captured the partly finished hulks when they swept into Russia in 1941. Thus the mission of defending the Red Army's coastal flanks fell to the Soviet navy's ragtag fleet. Most seagoing men would have chafed at such a coastline assignment, but a young captain named Sergei Gorshkov welcomed it as an opportunity.

YOUNGEST ADMIRAL

Born in the Ukraine, Gorshkov joined the navy when he was 17, and graduated from Leningrad's Frunze Academy, the Russian equivalent of Annapolis, four years later. When war broke out, he was the commander of a handful of antiquated cruisers and assorted small craft in the Black Sea. As the German invaders rushed toward the oilfields of the Caucasus, Gorshkov became expert at amphibious operations, plucking trapped Soviet troops from the Crimean coasts and landing them farther eastward to fight again.

During those years, Gorshkov also formed the attachment for heavily armed small craft that is reflected today in the Soviet navy's emphasis on *Komar* and *Osa* torpedo boats. He welded the turrets from T-34 tanks to motorboats and formed a river fleet that harassed the Germans from Rostov-on-Don to Vienna on the Danube. The young admiral impressed some Red Army officers who were fighting in the area. One was a major general named Leonid Brezhnev, another a lieutenant general named Nikita Khrushchev.

SITTING DUCKS

After the war, Stalin started building big warships again, but only 15 cruisers had been completed by the time he died in 1953. The new chief in the Kremlin had no sympathy for Stalin's plans. Nikita Khrushchev fired Stalin's navy chief, Admiral Kuznetsov, and brought in Gorshkov, who by then was naval chief of staff.

The assignment turned out to be a bitter one. Khrushchev believed that missiles had made surface ships "sitting ducks." He derided cruisers as "fit only for traveling on state visits," and scrapped four that were still under construction. He even passed the word to the admirals to stay away from the round of receptions and parties during the 1956 air force day celebrations. Spotting four soldiers rowing a boat on a Moscow pond, Khrushchev joked to one of his American guests: "There is our navy!" He went as far as to contemplate disbanding the navy and transferring its missile-firing submarines to a new unified missile command.

As a party member since 1942, Gorshkov knew better than to openly oppose Khrushchev. But as a skilled politician himself, he knew well how to stall. He subtly resisted the missile enthusiasts in the Kremlin, kept alive the concept of surface ships. Then Khrushchev decided to put missiles in Castro's Cuba—and the whole game changed. The humiliation of their backdown under the guns of the U.S. Navy impressed on the Soviet leaders the value of naval power. Shortly after the crisis, Khrushchev sent an order to the admiral: Create a surface fleet.

Gorshkov's own status reflects the navy's elevation to a place of importance. His fleet ranks in the top troika of Russian weaponry, alongside the ICBM command, a separate service in the Soviet setup, and the air force strategic bombers. In the chain of command, Gorshkov reports directly to the Defense Ministry. He was elected to the Central Committee in 1961, became a Hero of the Soviet Union in 1965 and was promoted last year to the exalted five-star rank of Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union, only the third to get that honor in the history of the Soviet navy.

As befits his rank, he is chauffeured each morning from his spacious Moscow apartment to the Defense Ministry in Arbat'skaya

Square. Gorshkov seldom entertains and rarely appears at diplomatic functions. Married, he often spends weekends with his wife at their government-supplied dacha near Moscow. Like most high-ranking Soviet officers, he is withdrawn even from his personal staff, spent most of the time that he was not traveling about in India alone in his bedroom.

CZARIST TRADITIONS

Peter the Great would probably feel more at home in the Soviet navy than Lenin or Trotsky. Aside from the fact that nearly all officers are party members and that each ship has a political officer who gives daily indoctrination lectures for everyone, navy life reflects the traditions of the czars more than those of the commissars. Discipline is extremely rigid, and the gap between officers and men is far greater than in the U.S. or British navy. The officers' quarters are far more spacious, their food far tastier, their dining rooms more elegant, their uniforms much fancier. The disparity in pay between officers and men is right out of the times that drove Karl Marx to write *Das Kapital*; a first-term seaman earns \$5 a month, a lieutenant earns 100 times more, and a rear admiral 400 times that much. There is an additional discrimination that probably is due to the Soviet Union's problem with alcoholism. While officers may tinkle in moderation onshore—and those of the Black Sea Fleet may even enjoy white wine at meals—Soviet sailors are forbidden at all times to drink on either land or sea. From all indications, the order is surprisingly well obeyed.

Russia's seamen—nearly all are draftees who serve for three years—nonetheless live better than many factory workers. The food is plentiful, and the crew quarters are relatively comfortable and clean. The ships have air conditioning, well stocked libraries, TV sets for recreation in ports and coastal areas and movies twice a week. Sailors organize singing and music groups, play dominoes and chess and, at every opportunity, sunbathe on deck in what U.S. Navy men call the "Soviet uniform"—white jockey shorts.

Unlike their Western counterparts, the Soviet sailors are not allowed to let off steam in foreign ports. They go ashore only in groups escorted by a petty officer, take in local museums, points of historical interest, and window-shop. They buy few souvenirs, avoid bars and prostitutes and never tip. Usually they return to their ships by nightfall. In the ports along the Mediterranean where the Soviet fleet has displaced the Western ones, hawkers and whores are dismayed by the spartan conduct and serious demeanor of the Russian sailors.

HARASSMENT POLICY

The Soviet navy's 465,000 men are also deadly serious about their chief task: a potentially lethal game of espionage and tag. Gorshkov's fleet has expanded its activity on the seas by three hundredfold in the last ten years, and much of its effort is devoted to a determined policy of harassment, probing and provocation. Across the oceans of the world, the light-grey-hulled Soviet warships are watching, trailing and sometimes crowding the ships of the Western fleets, especially those of the U.S. Navy.

Soviet warships and electronic intelligence trawlers stalk U.S., British and other Western fleets far from the shores of the Soviet Union. Soviet subs and destroyers shadow the U.S. carriers in the Mediterranean, keeping a watch offshore when the carriers go into port and taking up the chase again when they come out. A fleet of espionage ships keeps watch off U.S. Polaris submarine bases at such places as Holy Loch in Scotland, Rota in Spain and Charleston, S.C. Other snoopers sit off Seattle, New England, and Cape Kennedy, where the Soviets monitor the U.S. space shots.

Soviet behavior at sea is becoming increasingly cocky. From the Mediterranean to

the Sea of Japan, Soviet destroyers and trawlers boldly maneuver into the midst of formations of U.S. ships. Frequently, the intruders suddenly cut across the bow of an American ship to test the skill and technique of the helmsmen. The Russians also try to ruin maneuvers between the U.S. and its allies. In the Sea of Japan last year, Soviet warships scraped the U.S. destroyer *Walker* twice in an obvious attempt to break up a joint antisub exercise between U.S. and Japanese fleets. "Seafaring nations for centuries have allowed ships to proceed peacefully on the high seas," says Vice Admiral William I. Martin, commander of the U.S. Sixth Fleet. "This is quite new—to barge in on a formation."

CARRIER VERSUS BOMBER

Because the Russians consider the U.S.'s seaborne airpower to be a major threat in case of all-out war, one of their favorite tricks is to harass and probe U.S. carriers. Soviet destroyers and trawlers try to break a carrier's screen of protective smaller ships in order to force the flattop to change course while launching or landing aircraft and thus maybe dump a few planes into the sea. In the air, bombers of the Soviet navy's 750-plane, land-based air force continually test to see how close they can approach U.S. carriers before they are detected by radar and intercepted by the carrier's own planes. Their aim is to avoid being caught until they have got within 100 miles of the carrier. Reason: from that range, the Russians would have a good chance of scoring a hit with their air-to-ship missiles before the carrier could scramble fighters to shoot down their bombers.

The U.S. Navy has become increasingly watchful and wary of the Soviet navy. To keep track of its movements, U.S. reconnaissance planes overfly Soviet warships at sea at least once daily and sometimes more often in areas near the U.S. coasts and Viet Nam. U.S. planners plot the course of every Soviet ship in the Pacific on a huge map in the war room of the U.S. Pacific Fleet headquarters in Hawaii; the U.S.'s Atlantic and Mediterranean fleets keep similar grids on the location of Red warships. As a precautionary measure, U.S. carriers keep a so-called Air Cap of three or four fighters in the air at all times whenever they sail within range of Soviet navy bombers. The Air Cap mission is to intercept the Soviets at least 200 miles out and to "escort" the Russians as they fly over the U.S. task force.

SEARCH FOR SCARS

The most dangerous game of all takes place beneath the seas. For the U.S., the game involves chiefly the detection and tracking down of Soviet subs. For the Russians, it is largely a matter of attempting to elude the American searchers.

As they pass through the ocean depths, submarines invariably give off "scars"—traces of heat and turbulence caused by the ship's passage through the waters. The U.S. employs ultra-sensitive infra-red devices in satellites and planes to look down into the oceans and detect the scars. Submarines also give off what Navy men call "an electronic signature" that, like a human fingerprint, is unique. The signature is the sum total of the sub's sounds—the beat of its screw, thump of its pumps, rustle of its wake. To detect those signatures, the U.S. uses a variety of acute listening devices, including two networks of sonar cables, called Caesar and Sosus, that are placed in the ocean depths in areas frequented by Soviet subs. U.S. planes, destroyers and hunter-killer subs also use sonar devices to trace Soviet subs. Through such systems, the U.S. Navy is able to track Soviet subs with uncanny accuracy throughout most of the world's waters.

SUB HUNTING

A sonar operator needs a highly trained ear to sort out the sounds of the sea. Apart

from a sub's noises, the sea is full of other sounds, a syncopated symphony of crackling shrimp, clucking sea robins and grunting whales; there is even the engine-like throb of an unknown sea animal that Navy men call the "130-r.p.m. fish." Once the various sounds have been sorted out, the American sub hunters flash the details of the sub's signature to a Navy base in the U.S., where a computer has memorized the signatures of the vast majority of the Soviet submarines. Within seconds, the computer flashes back the name and description of the sub.

On some occasions, the U.S. hunters pounce on the Soviet sub in what the Navy euphemistically calls "informal exercises." The object of the chase is to give the Soviet submarines a healthy respect for the capabilities of the U.S. Navy's ASW (Antisubmarine Warfare) forces. In a duel reminiscent of the fictional shoot-out in *The Bedford Incident*, a U.S. destroyer locks on the enemy boat and tracks his every move. Sometimes, to impress on the Soviets the futility of their plight, an American skipper will play *The Volga Boatmen* over and over again on his destroyer's underwater sound system until the ears of the Russian sonar operator are numbed by the noise and the Soviet sub is finally forced to surface.

The Russians lag well behind the U.S. in submarine warfare. One reason is that their ships are slower (about 25 knots submerged), make more noise and cannot dive so deeply as U.S. subs, and are thus easier to detect. But the Soviets are continually trying to improve. They are using their big hydrographic fleet to learn more about the sea environment and to find hiding places in the canyons of the ocean for future generations of deep-diving submarines. The U.S. Navy tries to keep up with even the most minor changes in the development and deployment of Soviet subs. One reason that *Pueblo* was cruising off Wonsan was to check on a report that, because of ice in Vladivostok, the Soviets had temporarily switched their Pacific sub base to Wonsan and the nearby island of Mayang-Do. The U.S. is also equipping its nuclear submarines with silent pumps and heat-dispersal systems so that the Soviets will not be able to use infra-red detection systems to locate the scars of American subs.

SOVIET 6TH FLEET

One reason the Soviets watch the U.S. Navy so close is that they learn so much from it. As perceptive students of naval warfare, Gorshkov and his admirals were impressed with the performance of the U.S. Navy in World War II. When they began to build their own navy, they consciously patterned much of it on the successful American model. Soviet admirals even refer to their new Mediterranean flotilla as "our Sixth Fleet."

The Soviets have a long way to go before they catch up with their American teachers. They lag far behind in perhaps the most important aspect of all: combat experience. Many Western experts refuse to rate the Soviet navy as a truly efficient seapower until its untested officers have been called upon to handle their complicated modern weaponry under combat conditions. Nor have the Russians yet mastered the sophisticated technique of refueling and replenishing their ships while under way, as U.S. ships do. Thus, they must spend great amounts of time in sheltered anchorages where they would be easy targets in time of war. Because their navy has no large attack carriers, Soviet warships lack air coverage when they venture away from their own shores, even though Gorshkov himself has conceded that no fleet can fight successfully on the high seas without air protection.

AMERICAN RESPONSE

Such drawbacks are unlikely to deter the Soviet Union from placing increasing emphasis on seapower. Moscow not only relishes

the new global reach that Admiral Gorshkov's navy has finally brought it, but it also views as an ideal opportunity the chance to capitalize on the U.S.'s preoccupation with Viet Nam and Britain's hasty withdrawal from East of Suez, seeking to impose its own presence where Western influence is diminishing.

The West, and especially the U.S., has no alternative but to accept the Soviet challenge on the seas, because the welfare of the U.S.—and of the entire free world—is so solidly tied to the sea and to the untrammeled flow of trade. It would be a historic error if a nation as powerful as the U.S. allowed a crisis elsewhere, no matter how troublesome, to distract it from its determination to retain the mastery of the sea that Admiral Gorshkov is so anxious to wrest from it.

RUSSIAN SEAPOWER

Pacific Ocean fleet, Admiral Amelko, 750 ships:

Cruisers	6
Destroyers, frigates, and escorts	50
Submarines (nuclear and other)	100
Torpedo and missile patrol boats	150

Northern fleet, Admiral Lobov, 800 ships:

Cruisers	3
Destroyers, frigates, and escorts	35
Submarines (nuclear and other)	150
Torpedo and missile patrol boats	60
Icebreakers	28

Baltic fleet, Admiral Mikhallin, 750 ships:

Cruisers	4
Destroyers, frigates, and escorts	35
Submarines (nuclear and other)	70
Torpedo and missile patrol boats	200

Black Sea fleet, Admiral Chursin, 700 ships:

Cruisers	6
Destroyers, frigates, and escorts	50
Submarines (nuclear and other)	40
Torpedo and missile patrol boats	150
Helicopter carriers (new)	2

Scattered around the world are some 35 intelligence ships.

[From the American Security Council Washington Report, Washington, Feb. 5, 1968]

THE VIEW FROM GROSVENOR SQUARE: COLD WAR ESCALATION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

(By Holmes Alexander, guest editor)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Guest editor Holmes Alexander has been an astute observer of foreign affairs and the Washington scene for over two decades. The author of a number of books, he has written a widely syndicated column for the McNaught Syndicate since 1947.)

Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., a seadog of bull terrier poise and fighting propensities, paces his headquarters, Grosvenor Square, London, and growls with frustration. He has reason. McCain is commander in chief, U.S. Naval forces, Europe. The American strategic concept for this part of the world sometimes seems as tattered as a shell-torn battle flag.

Look north of Britain, look south of France, the Russians are outflanking the landlocked stalemate in the heart of Europe. The combined navies of NATO, which is longhand for the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, were supposed to prevent this breakout, but the rules of the Cold War favor the enemy. The crafty Soviets are winning positions-in-strength that can be as disastrous to the Free World as Trafalgar was to the French and the loss of Suez was to the British.

One must go to foreign references for apt analogies. The U.S. Navy has never lost a major engagement that endangered its role as a world power. Today we are slipping toward an Apocalypse catastrophe both in the Mediterranean and the North Atlantic, and

McCain can see what's coming. Never was a victory-minded sailor in such a tight set of psychological irons. He cannot order a shot in anger, and does not feel free to talk for quotation. He can only describe the harrowing situation, as he did to this newsman, and exhort the scribe to check it out and report it.

Mr. Cain's parting remark was to bid his visitor, headed into the Middle East, to be sure and interview American ship commanders in the Mediterranean. But a few weeks later, three ships of the Sixth Fleet approached Istanbul, Turkey, and were prevented from landing at that NATO port by a mob of student-demonstrators. And in Beirut, Lebanon, when the reporter asked Ambassador Dwight Porter when and if the Fleet might dock, the story was much the same. The people and government of Lebanon were friendly, said the Ambassador, but the dock workers' union wasn't—hence no shore leave for American sailors.

These tawdry examples indicate the quandary of American seapower, and the vacuum which the Russian Navy is moving to fill. The Sixth Fleet, a detachment of the Atlantic Fleet, has the dual purpose of maintaining peace and friendship in the Mediterranean world and of buttressing that flank of NATO. The purpose of the Russian presence is to nullify our efforts and to bring the entire area into the Communist sphere. Today there isn't anywhere along the Med's eastern and southern shores (unless it's Haifa, Israel, which we diplomatically avoid) that our sailors are welcome.

But Russian sailors, intensely indoctrinated for super-correct behavior and exaggerated friendliness, are warmly received at Latakia in Syria, and Alexandria and Port Said, Egypt. Recently, a delegation of Russian Navy officers made a hush-hush call at Mers-el-Kebir in Algeria, two thousand miles from the Soviet homeland. Actually, it wasn't a social visit. Mers-el-Kebir is a French-built navy base, soon to pass into Algerian control, and it had been receiving Soviet freighters which reportedly were bringing 90-foot missiles.

The turn of events in the Mediterranean staggers the imagination and mocks the witness of personal observation. At the time of the Cuban missile crisis (these self-same Soviet freighters were probably there) the Sixth Fleet, with its two carriers, two cruisers, its Polaris submarines and 40-odd other vessels, was supreme in the waters between Europe and Africa. The Russians had only two to four ships in the million square-mile spread, and these were there under the sorry pennants of a loser's legend, since Russia for centuries hadn't been able to win at sea, and had many times failed to establish herself in warm water.

Despite attempts to take advantage of the early Cyprus troubles, Russia placed no more than 10 to 12 ships in the area in January '67. Then, suddenly, with the Arab-Israeli June war, the Soviet had 47 ships, almost equal to the Sixth Fleet's normal complement of 50. The Communists were not merely making a show of force. Their two cruisers, numerous destroyers, and submarines were missile-armed to fight, but more especially they had the short-range missiles and torpedoes for commerce-raiding. Particularly intriguing and alarming to American observers were two Russian assault ships, capable of putting 1000 fighting men on beach heads. The U.S. Marine detachment, 1500 strong, was not much larger. Supremacy had passed from American hands, and superiority was in contention.

In a pitched battle, there's no doubt that the Sixth Fleet has the seapower, airpower and nuclear sock to blast the Russians off the water and out of their home cities. It's the Cold War positioning, where bluff and audacity are the plays, that we are losing.

The enemy is roaming the Mediterranean, once a NATO lake, in frowning gray hulls that plainly tell the helpless, poverty-ridden, unstable inhabitants that the same force which rules in East Europe is standing offshore from their vulnerable peninsulas and scattered islands. In three years the Soviet presence, measured in ship-days, has increased 600 percent.

Before examining the Soviet sea monster more closely, we must notice the other claw of the pincer which the Admiral watches from Grosvenor Square. This talon arches out from the Baltic Sea and down the Arctic Ocean where Soviet nuclear-driven, nuclear-armed submarines hide under fog and ice. The Norwegian Sea, off that nation's Atlantic coast, is the practice ground for Russian war games which have increased every year in participants and complexity. The make-believe battles are between surface ships, and between submarines that are pitted against landbased aircraft. From McCain's viewpoint, all this is dummy practice for cutting the Western world's lifeline between North America and West Europe.

In two world wars, the Battle of the Atlantic was crucial to eventual victory. Today, with Britain deficient as a naval force and France an arrant deserter, it's very much up to the U.S. Navy's Eastern Atlantic Command which, like the Sixth Fleet, is being drained of men and materials for the war in Asia. Again, if it came to shooting, there's little doubt that the Russian flotillas would end up with Davy Jones. But in Cold War terms the Communists are exerting a relentless and simultaneous abrasion upon the morale and confidence of Norway and Denmark, the northern NATO partners, and upon Greece, Turkey, and Italy, the southern partners. Meanwhile, an inexorable time factor seems running everywhere in favor of the enemy.

We must ask whence came this emergence of Soviet seapower. The quasi-peaceful manifestations can be taken as outcroppings of scientific and industrial growth. Russia is the fastest moving nation of all in fish culture, with protein factories off every coast in the world. She has 200 oceanographic and hydrographic research vessels at work. Her merchant marine calls at 500 ports in 61 countries, and ranks far better than our own. Nearly all these craft are of postwar construction and equipped with the best of modern devices. Since Communist statecraft is total, we have to assume that every moving Soviet object in water, air and space is an active gatherer of military intelligence and of potential use in warfare.

Slavic creativeness accounts for much, but the Western World never expected Mother Russia's womb to deliver an armada of warships in an abnormally short period of gestation. Tradition was against it. Professor James Billington, the American Russologist, writes that fear of the sea "was perhaps to be expected among an earthbound people whose discovery of the sea coincided with their traumatic discovery of the outside world." Czarist Russia almost never had a sea victory over its maritime neighbors, Turkey and Egypt, unless allied with such seagoing powers as Britain and France. On occasion a Russian fleet would lurch out from the Bosphorus to make a grab at the Greek island of Corfu, the Ionian islands and even at Crete, midway in the Mediterranean. But these conquests never held. An ambitious naval program was blitzed out of existence by the Nazis, and Russian submarine forays in World War II were reckless but feckless. As recently as Khrushchev's regime, the Soviet Navy was a coastal defense unit. Programs for aircraft carriers were begun and cancelled.

But, if U.S. Navy thinkers are right, the modern Kremlin discovered a tenuous relationship between guerrilla warfare and operations at sea. The so-called "wars of liberation" could be fought on oceans as well as in

jungles. If the capitalist powers were weak by being over-wealthy and too democratic, they were also awkward in being dependent upon their long sealines of supply. Admiral Gorchikov, Chief of the Soviet Navy, wrote in 1963: "Atomic submarines are the foundation of combat might . . . New submarines, aircraft and surface ships with the powerful weapons have radically changed former concepts of the Navy's missions. . . ."

Soviet leaders made use of the Toynbee principle of challenge-and-response. Natural handicaps of the landmass, inland seas and ice-locked harbors could be turned to advantage. Shipyards could operate in the interior without much foreign scrutiny. The four great fleets at the coastlines of the Arctic, the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and the Pacific could be centrally supplied by intersea transfers.

There was an inland route of every ocean. The Volga-Dan canal system connects the Caspian Sea with the Black Sea which has egress into the Mediterranean. The Marinski canal system connects the Baltic-White Sea waterway with the Volga River. But by far the most impressive link in the USSR's intersea exchange is the Northern Arctic Sea Route which allows Soviet ships to pass from European Russia to Asian Russia without leaving Soviet territorial waters. The fog-shrouded, ice-jammed passage from Murmansk, just behind the Scandinavian peninsula on the Barents Sea, to faroff Vladivostok on the Pacific is certainly the most difficult regular sea route in the world, and it may be the most significant. Writing in the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings for December, 1967, Navy Captain T. J. Laforest calls it "an integral geographic part of the Soviet Master Plan for world economic domination."

While these routes were carrying shipping and ship supplies, twenty Navy officers training schools with four year courses in navigation, gunnery, engineering and general seamanship were turning out cadets for summer cruises. Lack of bases was another handicap to be surmounted. Russian planners copied American "fleet trains" to reach distant fleets, and devised floating bases in weather-protected international waters. There are two principal anchorages in the Mediterranean, one off the Greek island of Kithira; another in the Tunisian Gulf of Hammamet. These logistic-depots will serve very well until the Russians get permanent tieup harbors in Egypt, Syria and Algeria, with a possible missile-base at the latter place just opposite the U.S. Polaris base at Rota, Spain.

Soviet entrance to the Mediterranean is not restrained on the western end, past Gibraltar. Turkey controls the eastern ingress at the Dardanelles, but the Montreux Convention permits peaceful passage of ships if reported in advance. Turkey has quarreled with Greece, the U.S.A. and Britain over the Cyprus affair, and has become progressively friendly with Russia, despite 13 wars in 200 years with the Bear.

It is not necessary to guess very wildly about Russian capabilities in the Mediterranean. The two Soviet cruisers there during the Six Day War are identified by the Pentagon as OCA-159 (Sverdlov class) and CLG-145 (Kirov class), both heavily armed with six inch guns and guided missiles. The destroyers and submarines are also missile-equipped. There is a sizeable complement of ELINTS (electronic intelligence trawlers) that watches every American move. Soon to join the amphibious assault vessels are two Russian helicopter-carriers for putting "navy-infantry" (the Russian equivalent of Marines) ashore. Last October, in an ominous exhibit of strike-power, an Egyptian Russian-made warship, with a Russian-trained crew, jumped an Israeli destroyer. The Eilat was destroyed in a matter of minutes with Russian-made Styx sea-to-sea missile that

works by automatic, unjammable, infrared, homing guidance. It was about the fastest job of destruction in naval history.

As U.S. Navy authorities study the Mediterranean, they see hostile or distrustful countries in an almost unbroken line eastward from Algeria to Turkey. On the northern shore they see the client-nation of Franco Spain, the ex-partner of Gaullist France, an Italy flanked entirely by neutralist or Communist neighbors, a disturbed Greece with land frontiers up against Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Rumania, a changing Turkey that is contiguous to the USSR and Nasserite Syria.

Only the sea-borders of these nations front on Western power, which means the Sixth Fleet. When American ships had the run of the Mediterranean, a comforting blanket of friendship and encouragement covered them all. The 26,000 merchant ships which carry 99 percent of the imports into innumerable ports and inlets were guarded by mighty vessels, by more than 200 carrier-borne warplanes, by underwater arsenals of nuclear deterrence and, above all, by the immeasurable prestige of an invincible custodian.

But today the Mediterranean inhabitant and politician cannot sight a hull and know it almost surely has to be a guardian of peace. The hull might be a merchant-raider, or it might be the transport of some landing party to support a Communist coup.

From the Grosvenor Square headquarters, the pincer prongs say that Soviet power is no longer contained in continental Europe. The only known way to meet Communist penetration on land or sea is by the employment of such manifestly superior force in which allies have complete confidence. Sadly, the U.S. Navy can no longer display near-omnipotence nor offer full security.

The "drawdowns" ordered by Defense Secretary McNamara to reinforce the Seventh Fleet in Asia have enfeebled the European naval forces. True, as McNamara has insisted, the billets are filled with bodies and the inventories show sufficient supplies on hand or on order. But the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, reporting last year, found many deficiencies: "destroyer escorts . . . unable to go to sea . . . shortage of trained and experienced petty officers . . . boatswains mates, electronic technicians, diesel engineers, aviation ordnancemen . . . many pilots billets . . . filled by nonpilots."

In both the North Atlantic and Mediterranean, the Russians are approaching naval parity. The deterrence that flows from American superiority, let alone supremacy, is no longer self-evident.

A solution? In layman's language—give the American Navy whatever it needs to do the job.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 25, 1968]

IVAN HUGS SHORES OF TRIPOLI
(By John Maffre)

The admission was painful for a sea dog who once rammed the U.S. Sixth Fleet through the tricky Straits of Gibraltar at night, in fog and at 27 knots, only a bit below his rated speed.

"We are losing our unquestioned control of the Mediterranean, which we first enjoyed in the days when our young but vigorous nation defeated the Barbary pirates."

To whom is the control being lost? To the Russians. That's the sad judgment of Adm. Arleigh Burke, retired former Chief of Naval Operations whose wartime flair for flank speed earned him the nickname 31-knot Burke.

Even if Burke's version of who controlled the Med in the early 1800s raises the eyebrows of British naval historians, there is no question that the U.S. Sixth Fleet no longer controls it as it did 20 or ten or even five

years ago. And all the indications are that this erosion of control will persist.

DOUBTS CREATED

Not that the Russians have any intention of slugging it out with the larger, stronger Fleet. They don't have to. Just by being in the Med in respectable force, they compromise the freedom of action of the Fleet—and what is vastly more important—they create doubts that it will act decisively. The existence of doubts where few existed before has a somber diplomatic significance.

"They can work toward their objectives without risking a confrontation with us," says David G. Nes, former deputy chief of mission at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo. He quit the State Department in January, to no one's great surprise, after openly criticizing its handling of the Middle East tensions that exploded last June in the Arab-Israeli war.

"Their objectives are primarily political. They want to raise their own prestige and influence, to get control of the Arab military establishments, to create a military presence that is disadvantageous to us. They've taken advantage of our indifference to the whole area."

Nearly a year ago former Ambassador to Iran Julius C. Holmes directed a team from State and the Pentagon to survey the parlous state of U.S. influence from Morocco to the Horn of Africa and north to Turkey. The report is still classified, though it is known to contain a clutch of recommendations to bolster the conservative, traditional regimes that look to the United States for backing. Some of State are unhappy at remaining in this groove, or at least seeming unable to get out of it. Others, who say the Pentagon detachment was more solidly in favor of the report's tone than State was, are fearful that the report will remain pigeonholed instead of being given White House attention.

In any event, there is a general agreement that the persuasive power of the Sixth Fleet—like that of U.S. diplomacy in the Med—has diminished.

LEBANON LANDING

It wasn't always this way. Just ten years ago the Fleet could squelch what was seen as an incipient Communist coup in Lebanon by landing some Marines, with hardly a second thought about who might say them nay. Today a small but spry and well-led Russian flotilla, made up of new ships compared to the aging U.S. warships they constantly shadow, must be taken into account.

Just seven years ago there were stout allies around like the British, who could mount an impressive show of force to cool Iraq's desire to gobble up Kuwait. But by 1972 the British will have faded away east of Suez and to a token force in the Med, in a striking fulfillment of Kipling's 1897 prophecy: "Far-called, our navies melt away . . ."

The French naval force in the Med melted away from NATO some years ago. The Italians are chiefly concerned with watching their long and vulnerable coastline. The Greeks and Turks are chiefly concerned with watching each other.

All this leaves the United States very lonely in the Med, and since the Arab-Israeli war last June the Russians have taken advantage of it. Their warships make increasingly frequent show-the-flag visits, particularly to sensitive Arab ports that are now closed to U.S. Navy ships. Americans say the Russians are very good "on the beach," meaning that they behave themselves well ashore. Moscow has even established relations with independent Malta, which has a fine naval harbor at Valetta to rent out now that the British have left. It's ironic that back in 1799 Britain's greatest naval hero, Lord Nelson, wrote: "The Russians are anxious to get to Malta, and they care for nothing else."

SOVIET GLOBAL ROLE

Today the Russians do indeed care for much more besides Malta. After centuries of

regarding seapower mainly as a "wet flank" for their land armies, they have in the last decade taken a historic step: their huge and new navy, allied to the world's newest and largest merchant marine, has been given a global, strategic and offensive role. Western intelligence experts were not at all surprised when in 1963 Admiral of the Fleet Sergei Gorskoy, the dynamo behind Russia's naval rebirth, said: "We must be prepared through broad offensive operations to deliver crushing strikes against sea and ground targets of the imperialists on any point of the world ocean and adjacent territories."

One of the 465,000-man Russian navy's next natural projections will be southward from the Med through a reopened Suez Canal and the Red Sea into the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. There it will have an even freer hand than in the Med. Soon there will be no warship there on patrol with white ensigns at their mainmasts to maintain a Pax Britannica. Nor is there much likelihood that the overstretched U.S. Navy will attempt to fill the vacuum left by the departing British.

So far the Russians in the Med, like the Americans, have avoided seeking formal base rights, which involve sticky political overtones. The Sixth Fleet refuels and resupplies while it is under way, a sophisticated naval exercise that the Russians have not yet mastered although they are studying it.

Instead, their task force—anywhere up to 46 ships and rarely without at least ten submarines—heaves to in shallow anchorages in international waters to take on supplies. There are half a dozen such spots that they favor, from near Spain's Alboran Island in the western Med to the Crete area. At one time the Russians had a fine submarine base in Albania, but then Albania sided with Peking, and that finished that.

BRUSHFIRE WARS

Nothing bothers Western observers more than the fear that Russia's force in the Med is gearing up to intervene in small, brush-fire wars, or "wars of national liberation" that have become a Communist article of faith. They have reactivated their naval infantry, a sort of marine commando, and last year they launched landing-tank ships. Also last year, they broke with the past by building two "baby flattops" or helicopter carriers, which are handy for injecting into "third world" conflicts. These elements can be supported by new, fast destroyers and frigates—some armed with long-range "cruise" ship-to-ship missiles that Americans envy—which compare favorably with their older counterparts in the Sixth Fleet, many of which are of World War II vintage.

Moreover, the Russians have been pouring more and more arms into the Arab countries that are rankled over the face they lost to the Israelis last June. With those arms have gone top-level officers and technicians. As Nes put it, "our minimal position with the so-called progressive, radical states—Algeria, the UAR, Syria—has been eliminated."

Some, like Burke, feel the United States may well have been influenced by the Soviet naval presence in the Med when it strove to cool the Greek-Turkish crisis over Cyprus last November. The Sixth Fleet was kept well in the background while Cyrus Vance, the former Deputy Secretary of Defense, joined with top NATO and U.N. officials to keep that pot from boiling over.

"War in the Mediterranean potentially involving both the United States and the Soviet Union has been avoided—for the moment," said Burke, who now directs Georgetown University's Center for Strategic Studies, in a recent speech.

"But no longer is the Sixth Fleet free to ply those blue troubled waters without risk of a confrontation with the Russians. Mare Nostrum could one day become Nashe Marye—Ivan's sea—so the U.S.S.R. hopes."

We Can Win the War in 6 Weeks

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, today Secretary McNamara leaves his post in the Pentagon. As with all such changes in command, we are now afforded an opportunity to reevaluate our policies in Vietnam.

Recently, an article in *Science & Mechanics* magazine was brought to my attention. It is entitled "We Can Win the War in 6 Weeks." A very enterprising reporter, Lloyd Mallan, interviewed many of the most distinguished military figures of our time relative to their views on Vietnam—such experts as Nathan Twining, Thomas S. Power, Arleigh A. Burke, George H. Decker, and Arthur G. Trudeau.

There is a general consensus among these men that the Vietnam war can be ended quickly and decisively. While I do not necessarily agree with all of their conclusions, I feel that now that the administration, free of Mr. McNamara, is able to move in new directions, the thoughts contained in this article should be read by all concerned with our participation in the Vietnam war. I, therefore, include it as part of my remarks:

WE CAN WIN THE WAR IN 6 WEEKS

(By Lloyd Mallan)

If you are a parent with draft-age sons, if you are any draft-age male, if you are simply a decent American who desires all peoples of the world to live in peace and freedom—then you will be happy to learn that the war against North Vietnam can be irrevocably won in six weeks. It may also make you happy to know that Communist intimidations and aggressions in the free areas of Asia can also be struck a paralyzing blow in that same brief frame of time.

And once the war in the North is ended, the remaining Vietcong guerrillas in the South could be conquered within six months—their tactics of terror and murder reduced to sporadic individual acts of desperation. Eventually, these, too, would vanish under pressure from the free Vietnamese people.

The foregoing time-estimates for victory in Vietnam are based on serious, lengthy discussions with some of the most experienced and astute military strategists in this country. Not one of these military authorities knew in advance what the others had told me. Yet every one of them was in strict agreement with every other one. They were also unanimous in their confidence that neither Russia nor Red China would dare step in physically to confront us—if we did what we have to do for victory.

Here are their recommendations for a quick victory in Vietnam:

Officially declare a state of war against the Hanoi Government.

Immediately close the port of Haiphong, through which Hanoi receives at least 70 percent of her war supplies.

Invade the North above the 17th Parallel.

Swiftly destroy all targets of consequence, after first warning the North Vietnamese people to get out of the target areas.

Warn Red China and Russia that we are now legally at war with North Vietnam—and that any attempt to supply the North with arms would be answered militarily as an overt act of war against us.

Harsh as these measures may appear to be, they are the only way abruptly to stop a war that may go on for another five, ten or more years—if it continues to be fought as at present.

The average person—no matter how well-informed he may be in other matters—cannot possibly know what goes on behind the scenes of Government. He cannot know the spurious political "reasoning" that determines why we are fighting a war in a weak-sister manner that is unprecedented throughout the history of military science—when we have the strength to squash North Vietnam in practically a single blow.

Feeling that the American public has an inalienable right to know why our Government is not doing just this, S & M assigned me to the task of finding an answer. The task took three months of steady digging and interviewing for behind-the-scenes information.

My first bit of information was surprising: I tried the Pentagon and discovered that no military officer of either high or low rank was permitted to talk about why we are doing things the way we are in Vietnam. They are allowed to give you a "briefing" on the way things are going in the war, but they are not allowed to give you their personal criticisms—even "off-the-record." As one Public Affairs Officer in the Department of Defense explained it to me: "Even if you would not attribute your quotes to a specific officer, his name would be known after you published your article—because there would be a record here of the officers we cleared you with for interviews. That record is mandatory."

In other words, the press of this free nation does not have a right to inform the public about Government policies that could be wrong. I was effectively blocked by the Department of Defense at the very beginning—or so they thought. Since I happen to have a few old friends in the Pentagon who are willing to see me without the intervention of the DoD Public Affairs people, I went directly to one of them who had spent more than a year in Vietnam and was not long back in his new job. To make things "legal," I talked with him outside of the Pentagon. Although I cannot identify either him or the military department in which he works (otherwise he would be in deep trouble), I can say that he is a ranking officer with considerable experience. Here's what he told me:

"I can't understand the way we're fighting this war. We knew about the SAM (Russian Surface-to-Air Missile) sites at least five months before the first one was fired—and we did not knock them out for fear of killing Russians working on them! Now the SAMs are killing our boys. So now we attack those missile sites—after the enemy has had a chance to protect them with modern radar-controlled weapons.

"In fact, our slowpoke way of fighting this war has given the enemy the time and security to build up the most concentrated antiaircraft firepower in military history."

What would he suggest doing to win the war faster than we are now doing?

"Although the element of surprise is now gone," he answered, "the North could be paralyzed quickly with an all-out invasion by air, sea and land. Blockade all of Hanoi's harbors. We could do this effectively by filling some of our old Liberty Ships with cement, drive them on up there to the harbor-mouths and scuttle them—sink them in the shallow waters. Of course, they would have to be conveyed to their scuttling destination by our Navy and protected against enemy fire by both the Navy and our Air Force. But it can be done.

"I would also mine the Haiphong harbor. It would be comparatively easy to drop the

mines from our aircraft. Hell, the enemy has mined the harbor at Saigon—and caused a lot of damage to our shipping. Why don't we do the same thing to North Vietnam?

"Meanwhile, an amphibious landing of our forces in the area surrounding Haiphong would be decisive. It would force Ho Chi Minh's hand. He would have to recall his troops from the South to fight for survival in his own homeland. And I might mention that our firepower is superior to that of the North Vietnamese Army. Another factor, an extremely vital one, in this kind of invasion is the psychological one. The people of North Vietnam would see that we meant business. It would shake them up. And Ho would be faced with internal dissent as well as with external military force.

"Add to this an invasion over the 17th Parallel and concentrated bombardment of every important target by air and sea—and the war in the North would be finished within six weeks."

"But how about the Vietcong in the South?" I asked. "Wouldn't they continue to fight their guerrilla war against Saigon?" "They would—for awhile," he said. "But anyone who wants to fight effectively needs food as well as arms. Their major supply of both would be cut off with the defeat of Hanoi. Then you blockade the borders of Cambodia and Laos—and you cut off their minor sources of supply. The Vietcong couldn't last. They would just dry up and drop off the trees."

There remained a great big question: *why* are we not fighting the war in Vietnam the way it *should* be fought? I asked this of another officer, even higher in rank and broader in experience. Understandably he wants to remain anonymous. His answer was: "Politics, people who mistrust the military, naïveté and fear resulting from misinformation. Another important quality involved in the concept of 'flexible response,' which was derived from the personal aspirations of a single individual."

This very high-ranking military officer then told me the following story:

"Just after the Air Force was disengaged from Army control and set up as a separate military department, the emphasis was being placed on air power. At the time, President Eisenhower saw the vital importance of building a powerful Air Force, second to none in the world. So the biggest portion of the Defense budget went into realizing this aim.

"General Maxwell Taylor, then Army Chief of Staff, resented this. He personally had two dislikes. Number one, with a vengeance, was the Air Force. Number two, with lesser intensity, was the Navy. He saw the Army being neglected, losing the elite prestige it had held during all the years before. He tried persistently to persuade the President to build up the Army rather than the Air Force. His reasoning was that, if a shooting war ever again got started, there would be a huge vacuum if the Army were not supported.

"Ike wouldn't buy this reasoning. There are some enemy armies—the Red Chinese, for instance, with their multitudes of potential conscripts—that you cannot effectively fight with a land army. But you *can* destroy an enemy's capability to support an army with superior firepower from the air and sea; you knock out his means of communication, industrial production and food production. Thereby you paralyze not only an enemy's capability but his will to wage war. So who cares about the vacuum? You can't step into it anyway.

"Nevertheless, General Taylor continued to badger General Eisenhower about the need to fill that vacuum. He finally went to his friends in the Congress, asking them to put pressure on the President. Ike got mad. He called Taylor in and very firmly demanded that Taylor stop hitting away at the subject on Capitol Hill and elsewhere.

"General Taylor was silenced until a new President was elected. Then he went to JFK with his old pitch. He also proposed a new approach to warfare—because he wanted to get some Army troops into Vietnam. (During Ike's Administration, a comparative handful of U.S. military advisors had been sent to Vietnam at the request for aid of the Saigon Government. And Ike had insisted that these advisors wear civilian clothes.) Taylor's new plan would be step one toward rebuilding the Army's prestige and power.

"He proposed the present system of minor escalations: hit an enemy—but not too hard—and stop and wait to see what he will do next. This was the theory of 'flexible response.' It is a slow-moving way to fight a war, because it keeps you basically on the defensive. But it served its purpose for General Taylor.

"The idea appealed to President Kennedy and his intellectual advisers in the White House, Department of State and Department of Defense. Most of them mistrusted the military anyway. They thought that this would be a 'humane' way to show the enemy we were supporting the South Vietnamese Government—without any danger of an actual confrontation with Red China or the Soviet Union.

"After they bought the idea, General Taylor saw his Army gradually come to life again. The comparatively few American military advisers wearing civilian clothes in Vietnam under Eisenhower soon expanded to 16,000 troops in uniform under Kennedy. Because the 'flexible-response' technique actually bought time for the enemy to infiltrate more and more troops from the North into the South, the United States was forced to meet the challenge by sending an ever-increasing number of troops to Vietnam. As of right now (mid-November 1967), there are almost a half-million of our men in Vietnam, much more than half of them being troops of the U.S. Army. Little more than ten percent of them are Air Force and Navy personnel.

"So under LBJ, the war has escalated in terms of men and firepower. But both are restricted to a 'flexible response'—which is not so flexible after all, because it places us in an unscientific straightjacket of limiting our objectives. In the minds of those civilian Government intellectual advisers to the President, the phrase 'Limited War' has been equated with 'Limited Warfare.' And *this* is a no-win policy."

After listening to this story, I was stunned. It just couldn't be true that a tiny group of intellectual advisers could control the destiny of the most powerful nation on Earth. Whether or not they were sincere in their beliefs is beside the point. I decided to check out the story at its source: I phoned General Maxwell D. Taylor, now retired from the Army, at his home in Washington, D.C. He was at work and his wife gave me the phone numbers for his two offices. One of these was in the White House. It was late in the afternoon and I could not reach him. But next morning I caught him in at home. Here's how our brief conversation went:

"I'm Lloyd Mallan from Davis Publications in New York."

"Yes. What can I do for you?"

"One of our magazines, *Science & Mechanics*, is trying to do an objective article on the war in Vietnam, from a military point of view. I wonder if you'd mind answering a few questions?"

"No. I'm not for quotation, thank you."

"Well, at least, can you give me some background information?"

"No. Just read (he laughed) . . . Just read the record. (A pause.) Call General (Earl) Wheeler. He's on duty. I'm not."

"I did try the Pentagon. They won't talk."

"Well (another laugh), they're the people that ought to talk. I'm just another private citizen, out here reading the newspaper."

That was it. But I was curious about his having an office in the White House, so I phoned to ask for his title. General Taylor wears two hats in the White House. He is Special Consultant to the President and a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. Some "private citizen"!

My two anonymous military friends had earlier given me an excellent suggestion: try to get in touch with general officers of outstanding experience and insight, who are now retired. No Pentagon restrictions can prevent them from talking and being quoted by name. They suggested a few names to start and this led me to others. Altogether I interviewed nine generals and an admiral. All of them took valuable time away from other work to talk with me for periods of from one to two-and-a-half hours.

I will now present their cases for a quick end to the war in Vietnam, trying to list them in the order of their position and rank, as well as alphabetically in these terms wherever possible.

Air Force General Nathan F. Twining is a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the recipient of 27 medals from the United States and numerous foreign governments in recognition of his skill and courage. During World War II, among many other duties, he was respectively Commander of the Mediterranean Allied Strategic Air Forces and Commander of the 20th Air Force in the Pacific.

General Twining feels most strongly that "either we should hit the North of Vietnam with everything we've got, bring them to their knees fast—or get out. My own opinion is that we should declare a state of war and invade the North. Then we could legally blockade the harbor of Haiphong—and sink any foreign shipping that attempts to violate the blockade. Running the blockade would be a tacit act of war against us—and the Russians as well as Red China and any other nation supplying the North well know this."

He is not worried one bit about China or Russia coming into a war against us. He is only worried that the longer we wait to finish the job, the more strength we're allowing the enemy to build. "I would tell them all that we're changing our strategy, that as of right now we are starting a new war. I'd ask them to get their people out of important target areas—and then I'd lower the boom on them! We'd win that kind of a war real fast."

Regarding the desultory way we are now fighting in Vietnam and the way in which we give Hanoi sanctuaries to build strength by stating that certain targets are off-limit to our flyers, General Twining has this to say: "I played a lot of football in my day. You are in there to win the game, so you don't ever tell the opposing team when you are going to try a pass or make an end run. But this is exactly what we are doing in Vietnam. We even tell Ho that we have no intention of destroying either his economy or Government. Therefore he *knows* that there are vitally important targets we cannot destroy."

General Twining told me an exceptionally interesting inside story to illustrate how Russia and Red China have our Government's civilian advisers hoodwinked—and how these same advisers can impress their views upon the highest office in the land, unless at least one person with ranking authority bothers to investigate all sides of the issue. The issue in this case was the crisis in Lebanon, when the Russians were preparing to send in their tanks and armies to take over that small Middle Eastern nation. If the Kremlin could take over Lebanon, they would feel confident to attempt other coups among the CENTO (Central Treaty Organization) and even the NATO nations. President Eisenhower was worried about engaging us in a war with

Russia if we took military steps to prevent a Kremlin invasion of Lebanon. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was even more deeply disturbed because the President was depending upon his advice.

At two o'clock in the morning on the day of decision, General Twining received a phone call from the Secretary of State. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs was asked to come over and discuss the situation from a military point of view. The Lebanese Government had requested American troops to thwart the Kremlin, but Dulles' civilian advisers had warned him that by making a show of force in Lebanon World War III would be started.

Twining found Dulles pacing the floor when he arrived. The Secretary's first words were: "Nate, I want you to advise me about this. Is there any real danger that the presence of our troops in Lebanon would cause the Russians and their allies to go to war against us?"

The Chairman shook his head. "Negative. Not a chance," he answered. "They know our response would be massive—and our power is superior to theirs."

"Are you absolutely sure of this?" asked Dulles.

"Nobody can be absolutely sure of anything," said Twining. "But I am as sure as anybody can be that it will not happen."

Dulles was still disturbed. "If that's the real truth, why are my advisers so worried?"

"I don't know," answered General Twining. "But maybe they misread the situation and underestimate our military strength—something that the Russians never do. But if you want, I'll phone the Chiefs of Staff and ask them to come over here and verify what I've just told you. They'll tell you, I'm sure, that the real danger to world peace would be to allow the Soviets to get away with this maneuver."

The Secretary of State smiled. "That won't be necessary, Nate. I've known you for a number of years and asked your opinions on many serious questions. You've never let me down yet. Go back home and go to bed."

Not long after that early morning meeting, more than 3,000 Marines were landing on the shores of Lebanon. Khrushchev, who had been loudly rattling his tanks and rockets, never sent a single weapon to stop them.

According to General Nathan Twining, John Foster Dulles was one Secretary of State who wanted to stay on top of military matters. He frequently consulted with the Joint Chiefs of Staff for information about current opinions and strengths. He understood that the validity and effectiveness of any foreign policy are dependent upon the military force ready to back it up.

This is something that the civilian intellectual advisers in the White House, State Department and Department of Defense have yet to learn. Their naivete not only promotes the concept of "flexible response" in Vietnam but goes even farther afield with another concept: that of military parity. They feel that by reducing our own military power to the level of our next most powerful enemy, we will gain the confidence of that enemy to the point where he will be content with a status-quo deadlock. In other words the Government civilian intellectual advisers feel that the destiny of this nation is in their hands, that world peace can be maintained only by reducing American superiority in arms to a parity with Russian military strength.

As General Twining put it to me: "I was never afraid of our military superiority causing a war. I knew that we had no intention of using it in an aggressive way. It was there solely as a deterrent, to discourage any other major power who is a potential enemy from attempting acts of aggression."

One thing that bothers the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs most is the misuse of airpower in Vietnam: "What is going on

there now might someday reduce our Air Force to a small ineffectual fighting force—when we will most sorely need it! In Vietnam, the role of airpower is being played down. Research and development of new aircraft is practically at a standstill. And everything in Vietnam is controlled from Washington—all the target-strike decisions are made here, none by commanders in the field—even down to the platoon level in the case of the Army and Marine Corps."

In full agreement with General Twining about the way the war in Vietnam is being mishandled is Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, the only man ever to hold the position of Chief of Naval Operations for three successive terms. During World War II in the Pacific, he became known as "31-knot Burke" because he pushed the destroyers under his command to their targets at just under boiler-bursting speed. The nickname is symbolic of how you win wars: strike fast, hard and with full force. Admiral Burke was a member of the United Nations Truce Delegation in Korea to negotiate with the Communists for a military armistice—so he is well-familiar with the sneaky and evasive tactics of the Reds. He has been decorated many times for "extraordinary heroism," for "conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity," for "exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States" and for "exceptionally meritorious conduct." He has received three Distinguished Service Medals and three Legion of Merit Awards.

At present, Admiral Burke is Director for the Center of Strategic Studies of Georgetown University. I spent more than two hours with him in his spacious oak-paneled office. Against the wall facing his desk are three flags: flanking each side of the centrally placed American Flag are the Navy Department Flag and his personal 4-Star Flag as Chief of Naval Operations. A large ashtray on his desk is filled with pipes. Shortly after we shook hands, he picked up a pipe, filled it with tobacco—and then forgot to light it as we talked.

Well over six feet tall, he stood up and paced the room to emphasize his answers to my questions. There was an interesting contradiction in his quietly philosophical attitude as he made emphatic points.

When I asked him: "What would you do to win the war in Vietnam?" his answer was instantaneous.

"I would put our entire nation on a war footing. Mobilize the Army, Navy and Air Force. Go into mass-production of airplanes, take battleships out of mothballs (we are only just now beginning to use the 'New Jersey'). I'd call up the reserves. Then I would attack the enemy on all fronts—and show him that we really mean what we are doing, that we want to win."

"Individuals always act on an emotional basis—not on the basis of logic. When an enemy sees that you mean to win, his emotional response will be to retreat. He may still try to harass you and come back at you on a small scale—but if you convince him that you are out to win, he will psychologically know he is defeated. Provided you have superior war power—as we do."

"At no time in the entire history of warfare has a war been won through minor escalations. Yet this is what we are doing in Vietnam—using minor escalations. So the enemy must feel that he can hold out. His reasoning goes: 'We're not being hit as badly as we thought we would be. We can hold out this way long enough for the peace-doves in the United States to prevail.'"

"So we escalate ten percent at a time—and each time the enemy feels that he's not being hit so hard after all, that we're not hitting him as hard as we can hit him, if we wanted to."

"Of course, if you go all-out to convince an enemy that you really mean to win, it may at the moment appear to cost more money. But it's much better to have more men and

equipment than you need—than to have too little."

"This is where Mr. McNamara makes a sad mistake. He is basically interested in 'cost-effectiveness'; 'Do I get the maximum value for each dollar I spend? And does this value represent the minimum necessary force to maintain our military strength?' But he is so much concerned with minute details that he cannot see the broad picture. He is lost in a murky morass of details—yet he is absolutely self-assured that he is correct."

"Only God and McNamara know they are right."

"In fact, the reason that Mr. McNamara was chosen as Secretary of Defense by the Administration was precisely because of his attitude—his interest in saving money—and not in saving lives or equipment. His is truly a political job—and not a military one. To him, war is a game of showmanship, often of salesmanship, but rarely of a deep desire to win."

"Then there's the matter of body-counts. I believe this was Mr. McNamara's idea—to release counts on the number of enemy dead versus our own dead. But body-counts don't mean a thing—they're barbaric to begin with—because you don't want to kill people; you want to paralyze an enemy to the point where he is convinced that he must lose if he continues the war."

"We are not doing this today in Vietnam. And as a result, our own people are becoming discouraged, tired, disinterested and disenchanted. Many of them want us to pull out of Vietnam—and that would be fatal now."

"We can't pull out, because if we do, the Communists—and the world—would think we are weak. But nobody in the Pentagon—particularly Mr. McNamara—among the civilian planners ever asks the question: 'If we fail with our present attitude in Vietnam, what is our alternative to win the war?' We have no alternate plan."

"At the present rate of minor escalations of the war, we'll be in Vietnam for another five or six years—or more. Maybe we'll eventually contradict the known facts of military history and win. We probably will. But the cost in lives, equipment and money will have been tremendous."

"Well," I asked, "if we take your approach toward winning the war, how about the Soviet Union and mainland China? There are a lot of intelligently thoughtful people who feel that a third global war would be started if we invaded North Vietnam."

Admiral Burke nodded and smiled. "You're right. Many people who know nothing about military science are afraid of what Mainland China and the Soviets would do if we invaded North Vietnam—and I would invade the North as well as mine the harbors, Haiphong and all the rest. In the case of Red China, they have their own internal political problems. Besides, their logistics to support an expeditionary force in Vietnam would be formidable. Our Navy and Air Force could strike and destroy vital targets anywhere inside the great Chinese land mass, thereby cutting off supplies from the Chinese Army in Vietnam. As for the USSR, their logistics would be also formidable—and their economy might be so strained in these conditions that they would just say to themselves: 'It's not worth it. Let's pull out altogether.'"

"These are alternatives that the Administration and many of our people never seem to consider."

"Admiral Burke," I said, "if you were given full command of the war in Vietnam, how long do you think it would take you absolutely to defeat the enemy?"

He smiled again. "Nobody really can know how long it will take to win a war. There are too many variables and individuals involved. But considering the time required to mobilize and deploy the required forces, I would guess at from eight weeks to three months. At any rate, it would be a *much, much*

shorter time than the years it will take using our present rate of minor escalations."

Supporting Admiral Burke's thesis that the war in Vietnam, if properly fought, could be won quickly is four-star General George H. Decker, a former Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. Among his many important assignments, General Decker has been Deputy Commander-in-Chief, U.S. European Command; Commander-in-Chief, United Nations Command; Commander, United States Forces in Korea; and Commanding General, Eighth United States Army. He is a soft-spoken, earnest and intelligent man—a thoughtful person who is not given to snap judgments. Before our interview began, he asked me to emphasize that he was not on a soap box to promote his ideas, but any answer that he gave to my questions would be carefully considered. I spent a full hour talking with him.

My first question was: "What can we do, that we are not now doing, to win the war in Vietnam fast?"

His answer was: "Invade the North and blockade the port of Haiphong."

"Wouldn't that actively bring Red China and Russia into the battle?" I asked, to see whether or not his answer would match the answers of Admiral Burke and General Twining.

It did: "I am not afraid of mainland China or Russia. We are the most powerful nation on Earth today. We might not be able effectively to inactivate the Chinese foot armies, but we wouldn't have to. If we destroyed their strategic targets—notably their nuclear development installations—they would be defeated. They know this and it could be a strong deterrent to their entering a war against us. People around the world would cheer if we knocked out Red China's future potential as a nuclear power."

My next question was: "Then why don't we invade North Vietnam and blockade Haiphong?"

He grinned, "We try to build the illusion that this is *not* our war, that we are cooperating with friends—which we are. That illusion would be destroyed if we formally declared war against the North. But although this is essentially an Asian war, it is actually our war—a war to protect our national interests. A Communist-controlled Asia would be a real threat to those interests. Yet unless we do declare war against the North, we cannot legally invade or blockade."

"We do not have to fire shots to blockade. We merely tell the Soviet Union, Red China, Britain—whatever nation is delivering supplies to Hanoi—to keep their ships out of the area, if they do not want them damaged or sunk. This would be an effective deterrent."

"We have to be credible. Because of our present position of weakness, neither Hanoi, nor the Soviet Union, nor Red China believes us. They do not believe that we are determined to win."

"China entering the war physically would be abhorrent to Hanoi because they would overrun the North. They would probably pretend that their armies were comprised of volunteers, as they did in Korea, but this would make no difference if we were *legally* at war with the North."

"How about the Vietcong in the South?" I asked.

"They would dry up on the vine," answered General Decker. "Without supplies from the North and/or the Soviet Union and Red China, they could not continue to fight. Right now they have trouble getting recruits from among their own Southern people. They have had to draw on the North for recruits."

"Then you do believe that the only answer to sure and quick victory is to go 'all-out' to win right now?"

He nodded. "Now our stated policy is that we do not want to destroy the Government of North Vietnam. Invasion might do this—but not if we handled things as General MacArthur did in Japan. We could make a

treaty with Hanoi and place restrictions on their aid to the Vietcong, among other things. They would have to abide by that treaty, whether or not they wanted to, because we would police them."

"General Decker, would you mind elaborating a little more on why Red China would not enter a war against us if we invaded North Vietnam?"

"Well, there are a half-million Nationalist Chinese troops on the island of Taiwan. I saw them practice maneuvers—and they are excellently trained soldiers and airmen. They are eager to take a crack at the Red Chinese. In case of war, we, of course, would have to transport them to the mainland of China. But in the doubtful event that we are in a formal state of war with Red China, such a move would be routine."

"I don't know how nervous mainland China would be about this threat from Taiwan, but the threat is not inconsiderable—in a practical physical sense."

General Decker's personal attitude is, in summary: "We have never won the war in Korea—because of our methods. We are not winning in Vietnam for the same reason. If we are going to fight a war—we should fight it."

General George Decker should certainly know whereof he speaks. As Commander of all United Nations troops, including those of the United States, in Korea for two years, his experience is firsthand.

Another officer with great firsthand experience is Air Force General Thomas S. Power, who not too long ago was Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command. In fact, as Vice Commander of SAC under General Curtis E. LeMay, he was responsible, along with his boss, for building the command into the world's most powerful strategic force. This was accomplished within six short years. Today, SAC remains the world's most potent force for peace, since no potential enemy of the United States would dare to challenge its power.

Apart from his combat tour of North Africa and Italy as a B-24 pilot with the 305th Bomb Wing, during World War II General Power was also Commander of the 314th (Very Heavy) Bomb Wing in the Pacific. He directed the first large-scale B-29 fire-bomb raids on Tokyo. He was also Commander of the Air Research and Development Command (now the Air Force System Command). In 1959 he was presented the Air Force Association's H. H. Arnold Award as "Aviation's Man of the Year."

His decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit with one cluster, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal with one oak-leaf cluster, the Commendation Ribbon with one cluster, and the French Croix de Guerre with palm.

I asked General Power: "What would you do to end the war in Vietnam—fast?"

"First I'd close the port of Haiphong," he answered, "and then I would keep going until the works of man were literally destroyed. At any time along the way, the North Vietnamese could end the war—if they wanted to. All they would have to do is say: 'We will stop the killing in South Vietnam. We will get out of South Vietnam.' And the war would end at that minute. They have complete control over ending the war."

"So if you were in command, what specifically would you do to convince Hanoi that their goal was futile?"

Without hesitation, General Power said: "I'd destroy the works of man in North Vietnam."

"You mean, all strategic targets?" I asked.

"I mean *all* targets. *All* the works of man." He paused and then stated emphatically: "If you show them that you mean what you say, you're going to defeat them."

"Do you feel that they think we mean what we say right now?"

"Well, right now we're doing things in a very restrained and moral way—but in this way we lose the psychological impact. We cause the enemy to think he can survive, because someday we'll be forced to quit due to internal pressure."

"And of course all these damned fools here in this country who are creating the wrong image—one of weakness—cause Ho Chi Minh to think that he is going to win this war in Washington. And this is what keeps him going."

"How would you change his mind?"

"I think the thing to do is just increase the level of pressure on him—so that he'll be damned well convinced that these knotheads in the United States who are so loudly protesting for peace are not going to be able to stop our actions. Because those actions will be coming at him too fast for him to be encouraged."

"The worst thing you can do in a war is to fight it piecemeal—because then you encourage the enemy to keep going. And we're piece-mealing the whole thing right now. I think we're winning, but very slowly. The enemy can't take all that pounding day after day and not be somewhat discouraged. But air power—and any other power—is not being used properly in North Vietnam. We're piece-mealing it."

"One of the lessons we learned in World War II was: never go back to a target. In other words, you're going in to destroy it—so destroy it. For two reasons: one, it saves your life—you don't have to keep on going back into that flak again and again. But the second thing is: the psychological impact of destroying a target—all at once, for good. This has a tremendous impact. Now if the enemy survives an attack, this kind of gives him hope that he'll survive all attacks—which, psychologically, is bad."

"If our Government acted on your advice, how soon do you think the war would end?"

General Power paused. "It would depend upon the condition the North Vietnamese are left in. There's not too much in their country to begin with. But after all, they have to have something—they have to have food. So if you closed their ports and then *really* hammered them—that war would be over, but quick!"

"My only point is this—and this is a crude example: if we leave Ho Chi Minh sitting on a broken down orange crate with his bare butt sticking out of his ragged trousers while he looks over his whole country in ruins, then he would have to ask himself: 'Well, Little Man, was it such a good idea after all to invade the South?'"

"I think we ought to ask him if he'd like to be in that position."

"And if he *does* end up in that position, I think we ought to tell all other potential gangsters who are trying to grab countries, such as Thailand, for instance: 'Take a look at Ho! This is what can happen to you. This is no child's play. We're just not going to let you get away with aggression. And if you try, here's what will happen to you.' That's the way I feel about the war in Vietnam."

Another Air Force General, Frederic H. Smith, Jr., has equally strong feelings about the way the war in Vietnam is being fought. General Smith was Vice Chief of the Air Staff under General LeMay. His other credentials include: Chief of Staff, Strategic Air Command; Commanding General, Eastern Air Defense Force; Vice Commander, Air Defense Command; Commander, Fifth Air Force; Commander, United States Forces in Japan; and Commander, United States Air Forces in Europe. He has been awarded 14 major decorations, several of them with clusters, and is a keen, earnest student of military history.

How does General Smith feel about our present tactics in Vietnam?

"The war could continue for years if it is carried on at the present rate. We allow the North Vietnamese to get used to our bombing

each time before we step it up. Then they get used to the step-up. And so it will go for a long, long time. Using this approach, at the very beginning we lost the element-of-surprise advantage that is vital to winning a war. That war would have been over in less than a year—if we fought it correctly at the beginning."

"What would be the correct way to fight it?" I asked.

His answer matched the answers of every other knowledgeable military man I had spoken with: "Blockade or mine the port of Haiphong. At least seventy percent of all supplies to Hanoi come through Haiphong and ancillary ports. Once the ports are knocked out, the main supply-load would be placed on a couple of railroads from mainland China—which could easily be knocked out at strategic points."

"Then there are the dikes and canals in North Vietnam which feed the rice paddies. If we knocked them out, the people would soon be without food—and give up. Once they surrendered, we could supply them with food, of course, and help them rebuild their agriculture and industry."

I asked: "How soon would the war be over if we did as you suggest?"

"A couple, three months—maybe less," he answered immediately.

"Would this apply to the Vietcong in the South as well?"

"Well, they would be cut off from supplies because Hanoi was cut off. We could then go all-out to pacify the Vietcong—divide, 'splinter' them. When the Southern villagers saw that we meant business, when they knew that we were fighting for them, then they would not cooperate with the Vietcong—who get their support by intimidation and terrorism. The villagers really do not care for the Vietcong—but under the pressure of threat they really don't know what else to do but support and supply the Communist guerrillas."

The question of small nuclear weapons came up, since General Smith is an expert in this field. He does not recommend their use—but feels that if we did use them the war would be over in a week, without any radiation danger either to the people of Vietnam or of the world. As he put it:

"The radiation effects would be local, they would not spread if we used small two-tenths-of-a-kiloton bombs in air bursts. Only the dust kicked up would be radioactive and soon would be dissipated harmlessly to the atmosphere. A nuclear ground burst, of course, would create a 'hot spot' at the site of the explosion. But you could get away with air bursts for specific targets."

"The public, including the press in general, doesn't know the difference between tactical nuclear weapons of low yield and strategic weapons of megatonnage yield. They equate both—and our own Government has laid the foundation for this belief by years of 'abhorring' the use of nuclear weapons. Now this present Administration cannot dare to employ even the smallest tactical nuclear weapons. It would take a new Administration, using a solid educational program on the subject, to be able to build up to the use of small nuclear weapons."

"Of course, if we did employ these small 'nukes' there would be a big fuss kicked up by Russia and Red China. But neither would dare attack us. They would know that we meant business. The Russians would try to harass us in Europe, of course, as they did in the situation that caused the Berlin airlift—but they would not want to start a global war over our use of small nuclear weapons in Vietnam. Neither would China want to start such a war. They know that the odds would be against them. Peking is extremely sensitive to the well-trained half-million troops on Taiwan. Before employing any small tactical nuclear weapons, we could make a big show of getting those troops

ready for an invasion of Red China: we could openly build their efficiency even further by giving them practice in war-games. We could have a number of landing barges sitting in the Taiwan harbors. This would intimidate the Red Chinese leaders—who would expect an invasion of their homeland if they entered the war against us in Vietnam. But I don't really advocate the use of nuclear weapons—except for their element of surprise and to clear out the Demilitarized Zone in Vietnam."

Regarding the so-called Demilitarized Zone, which is used as a staging area by the North Vietnamese Army, General Smith pointed out that a tremendous saving in time, American lives and equipment could be accomplished swiftly by the use of low-yield nuclear bombs. One 20-kiloton tactical nuclear bomb would be equivalent in its effect to 16,000 sorties of tactical aircraft each carrying two napalm tanks under its wings. If Hanoi wants to fight dirty, he feels, so should we. But we can do it without any dirty fallout of radiation—even if we used tactical nuclear weapons.

Still another Air Force General, one with three stars this time, who is bitterly critical of the way that our Government is waging the war in Vietnam is Lt. General Ira C. Eaker. General Eaker is an oldtimer with considerable military experience and insights. He has assiduously kept himself current on all aspects of world affairs, and especially on the war in Vietnam. General Eaker was Vice Chief of the Air Staff under the famous and forward-looking General "Hap" Arnold, the man who founded and developed the science of air supremacy. General Eaker was Commander of the Eighth Air Force in England during World War II. Later, he became Commanding General of all U.S. Army Air Forces in the United Kingdom. Following this assignment, he was named Air Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Allied Air Forces. He has also been Chief of the Air Staff.

One of General Eaker's many citations reads: "His contribution was of major importance in the successful prosecution of the war against the Axis."

As regards the prosecution of the war in Vietnam, I'll let General Eaker speak for himself:

"Without question, Ho Chi Minh is encouraged to continue his efforts against us by the Vietnam war-critics in this country. His continued aggression is now causing more than 2,000 U.S. casualties each week."

"Having a few of our people give aid and comfort to the enemy appears to be a price we pay for fighting an undeclared war. Such criticism of national policy was not tolerated in World Wars I and II—and it probably would be muted now if we were officially and legally at war."

"Our civilian leaders have also said that they do not wish to build up a war-psychology in this country. This might bring irresistible pressure upon them to use more force than they presently desire to employ. Well, they can't have it both ways. They can scarcely expect all-out popular support when they themselves are not sure whether we are really at war."

"The most serious form of dissent and criticism of our tactics in Vietnam is the constant expression, in some quarters, of a morbid fear that our effort there may bring Red Chinese or Russian forces into the conflict. This hand-wringing, craven attitude is an open invitation for such an intercession. If the Red Chinese become convinced that our national leadership is palsied with fear and can be deterred from our just purpose in Vietnam, they will certainly invade there as they did in Korea."

"The clearest lesson from fifty years of dealing with Communists must be this: negotiate only from strength and with firmness. Our leadership should now issue an unmistakable warning that any Russian or Chinese forces which invade South Vietnam will be destroyed promptly."

Among the many points made to me by General Eaker, the following are most pertinent to our quick success in Vietnam:

1. "After our determination to go to war, subsequent decisions involved the forces to be committed and the strategy and tactics to be employed. These have been made by our political leaders, sometimes without—or heedless of—military advice. These leaders made such frequent and pleading proposals to the enemy to come to the peace table that Ho Chi Minh drew the natural conclusion that he was winning. At times our political leaders have appeared to be palsied by fear of world opinion, or of what Russia and Red China would do. The Israelis recently demonstrated that these need not be controlling considerations."

2. "Our political leaders elected to fight a land war, where every advantage lay with the enemy, and to employ our vast sea and air superiority in very limited supporting roles only."

3. "Surprise, perhaps the greatest of the principles of war (confirmed by the Arab-Israeli conflict), was deliberately sacrificed when our leaders revealed our strategy and tactics to the enemy. For example, they told the enemy that he need not fear invasion of North Vietnam. Whether or not we ever intended to invade the North, we should have employed every ruse known to the military art to convince Ho Chi Minh that invasion was imminent."

4. "The enemy was told also that we would not bomb populated areas, heavy industry, canals, dams and other critical targets—and thus sanctuaries were established by us along the Chinese border and around Haiphong and Hanoi. This permitted the enemy to concentrate antiaircraft defenses around the North Vietnamese targets that our Air Force was permitted to attack—greatly increasing our casualties. Missiles, oil and ammunition were permitted to enter Haiphong harbor unmolested and without protest."

5. "Unified command in the war zone, a necessity for military success as demonstrated in World War II and Korea, has not been established in Vietnam."

6. "U.S. political leaders have said that we do not desire to eliminate a viable economy in North Vietnam. This is tantamount to forswearing victory—since a prime essential for military success is a viable economy. If Allied leaders had pursued such a policy in World War II, Hitler and Tojo might now be in charge of Europe and the Pacific nations."

7. "The Vietnam war is costing Russia about one billion dollars a year (at the dubious Russian established rate-of-exchange). It is costing the Red Chinese even less. The United States is spending more than twenty-five billion dollars in Vietnam annually. And the Allies are suffering over ten thousand casualties a month, of which about seven-or-more thousand are Americans. The Kremlin and Peking obviously look upon Vietnam as a very profitable venture in the overall East-West conflict. They can be expected, therefore, to insure that it continues so long as it proves profitable."

8. "Our leaders have elected to remain on the defensive in Vietnam. If we had stayed on the defensive in Korea, we might still be fighting there. If the Israelis had remained on the defensive in the Arab War, they would not have won."

What is General Eaker's recommendation to end the war in Vietnam quickly? It is exactly the same as the recommendation of every other experienced military expert with whom I have spoken: invade the North, close Haiphong and destroy every target that permits Hanoi to continue carrying on the war against us and the South.

One of the most astute of the military experts I questioned is Lt. General Arthur G. Trudeau, former Army Chief of Research and Development. His earlier assignments of importance, to name only a few, include: Com-

mandant, Army War College; Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence; Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, Headquarters, United Nations Command and Far East Command; and Commanding General, Headquarters, First Corps, in Korea. At present, General Trudeau is President of the Gulf Research and Development Company, Gulf Oil Company. He has been awarded a dozen important decorations for heroism and distinguished service.

Regarding the "threat" of mainland China and the Soviet Union, he said: "Red China doesn't both me. They won't enter the war. They have too many internal troubles. And to support a war today would be beyond their logistic capabilities. Soviet Russia would not overtly enter the war either. They might try to harass us in many ways—to divert our efforts and energies. But again, their logistic lines would be impossible for them to support a war against us in North Vietnam."

With that big bugaboo cleared away, General Trudeau then proceeded to analyze the war situation in Vietnam as it stands now: "Two years ago, we could have quickly defeated Hanoi. When you decide to apply force—as we have decided to do—then you must apply it at once and on as massive a scale as possible.

"But the way we're doing it is like someone suffering from a long illness that gradually gets worse. The gradual development allows the victim to become accustomed to more and more pain—so he learns to bear it. While if he were in an accident and broke a leg, or suffered an even worse, more abrupt shock, his tendency would be to give up. It's an 'unbearable' situation—because he was not prepared for it. In warfare, the element of surprised shock is vitally important. And we have not used that element in Vietnam."

"Is there any possibility," I asked, "that we can still recover that advantage of surprise and shock. How would you do it now?"

General Trudeau was thoughtful for several moments. "What would I do to bring this element into being again—although now it's late and much tougher to achieve? One, I would close the port of Haiphong. Two, I would destroy the rail communications between Hanoi and Red China. Three, I would cross the Seventeenth Parallel and set up a land army at two positions above the line to command passes and roads to the South.

"This would not be easy to do, but it's possible—if we controlled access to the sea, we could supply our troops by sea. It appears to me that we are already in control of the sea—if we wanted to make a point of it."

General Trudeau picked up a pencil and drew a map for me. He pictured the Chinese island of Hainan, on which Russian MIG fighters are based, safe from our bombs because we are afraid to irritate Russia and the Red Chinese. From the sanctuary of Hainan, the MIGs fly out to engage our tactical bombers and fighters. They've shot down far too many of our pilots as of this writing. But General Trudeau was now talking about control of the sea. "Our ships pass by this island at will right now. The Chinese have done nothing to stop us."

Next he drew the Vietnamese seacoast and indicated the positions of Haiphong, Vinh and a small mountainous area with a high point of 3,000 feet. The area is 150 miles north of the Seventeenth Parallel. He continued to draw in the Ho Chi Minh Trail and the roads that branch from it into Laos and Cambodia. Over these roads come a percentage of war supplies for the Vietcong from the two "neutral" countries. He indicated the position of a pass along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, which lies south of the roads and just below the 3,000-foot high-ground area. Finally, he penciled in the railroad from the Port of Haiphong to Longson on the Chinese Border, as well as another railroad that branched off from it at Hanoi to No Cay in China.

"Now," said General Trudeau, "if we make an amphibious landing of troops and settle them in on the high ground, they can control

that pass and prevent supplies from going south to the Vietcong. Then we close Haiphong and destroy those railroads—to prevent supplies from China and anywhere else from reaching Hanoi. If we do this, the war will be over fast."

"How fast?" was my natural question.

He paused long and thoughtfully. "That's tough to answer. But let me put it this way: If we closed off the enemy's supply lines as I suggest starting now, it would be a great big boost to the Democrats' convention next August. I am not saying that it would take that long for the war to end. I am just giving you a time-envelope so you can make your own deductions.

"Personally, I am a Republican—and I would hate to see the Democrats gain such a boost. They would win the election, probably. But I would like to see them do this right now—for the good of our country. The security and survival of the United States must not depend upon partisanship. It must cut across all political considerations.

"The war in Vietnam is not merely an Asian war to give the South Vietnamese a chance to govern themselves. It is much bigger than that. It is a policy war to stop those behind both the Bamboo and Iron Curtains. It is aimed at preventing both Russia and Red China from gaining their stated objectives—which are to defeat their mightiest 'enemy,' the U.S.A.

"In this sense, it is a war of survival for us. And the sooner the people of the United States understand this, the healthier and safer we will be."

As to closing the port of Haiphong, General Trudeau believes that the easiest way would be to sink the North Vietnamese barges that are continually clearing out and deepening the port's shallow channels. The barges could be sunk from the air.

General Trudeau punctuated our interview with an indignant postscript:

"McNamara claims that Haiphong supplies only a small percentage—he says about fifteen percent—of war materials to Hanoi. He is simply not correct. A major source of supply is Haiphong. It's more like seventy percent."

Neither General Trudeau nor Admiral Arleigh Burke is alone in their censure of the Secretary of Defense. One very high military authority, who doesn't want to be named, told me: "Mr. McNamara has never made a major military policy, decision or forecast about the war in Vietnam that has been correct." Still another authority said of the Defense Secretary: "He reasons from a conclusion to a hypothesis."

A more bitter critic of the Secretary is Air Force Maj. General Gilbert L. Meyers, a man who has been intimately associated with the Vietnamese war. In fact, until about a year ago, he ran the air war both inside and outside of Vietnam. As Deputy Commander of the Seventh Air Force, he had the practical nuts-and-bolts job of not only managing the air strikes over the North but also of directing the Thailand-based B-52s in their bombing of the South. One of my Pentagon friends says of him: "Gil Meyers is the most knowledgeable man you'll ever find regarding the war in Vietnam."

General Meyers himself says of Secretary McNamara: "If you can't come up with a numerical figure that proves we're going to win, why he won't buy any plan or suggestion. He's always looking for 'evidence.' And you just can't look at a war on a facts-and-figures basis. For example, Mr. McNamara uses a figure to show why we don't have to knock out Haiphong. He claims that in South Vietnam the Vietcong and the North's regulars need only a relatively small tonnage of supplies to continue the war. And that if we knock out Haiphong, they could still bring in that minimum amount of tonnage without any difficulty."

"Is that true?" I asked.

"No, it isn't true!"

General Meyers continued. "I think the best description I've heard about the way

Washington runs the war in Vietnam was General Eaker's. The sum and substance of his comment was that in the past, wars were fought by the civilians and managed by the professionals. But in this war, it's being fought by the professionals and managed by the amateurs."

General Meyers certainly has the professional background to speak out authoritatively. He is a fighter pilot with many important credits and 22 major decorations and medals. He was Commander of the First Fighter Group, the first jet fighter unit in the Air Force. For two years, during the Korean War, he was Director of Operations of the Fifth Air Force. Under his command, the 368th Fighter Group was the first Air Force unit to land in Normandy during World War II. More recently, before he was assigned to Vietnam, he was Commander of the USAF Tactical Air Warfare Center. His personal philosophy of life is: "Initiative and hard work will solve any problem." This is borne out by his survival of almost 60 tough combat missions on which he destroyed tanks and gun positions.

What does General Meyers think we should do to end the war in Vietnam quickly?

"You go after the lighters that unload the ships in Haiphong Harbor. The water is fairly shallow up there and the ships from Russia, China and Eastern Europe have to anchor some distance offshore—which means the lighters have to travel a considerable distance. They can obviously be intercepted and destroyed by our Navy and some of them by air. I don't see any reason why we'd have to come in contact with the ships themselves—if we're afraid of angering the Russians and Chinese—in order to destroy their cargo.

"And I'd keep going after those lighters until the enemy ran out of them, could not build any more. Then there are other important targets I'd hit. There's the Command Headquarters in Hanoi. The Air Defense Headquarters are there too. These are the kinds of targets, for example, that we hit all the time in World War II. And all I'm suggesting is that we use the same kind of targets in North Vietnam."

"So why don't we?" I asked.

"Well, that question defeats me. Of course, in Washington, the big bugaboo they talk about is a fear that the Russians and the Chinese will come into the war. I think that's ridiculous! Our civilian planners in Washington always refer to the 'increased risk.' Now, I'll admit that there would be some increased risk. But you have to qualify that risk. It's a one-in-a-thousand kind of thing—which is a heck of a lot different than if it were one out of two. Nobody has ever attempted either to qualify or quantify it. And as you well know, our Secretary of Defense is a great man for quantifications. He quantifies many other things. Why not this risk?"

"Personally, I think that the greatest risk we ever took in the war was our initial attack against the enemy in the Gulf of Tonkin. If the Russians and Red Chinese wanted to come in against us, that was the time to come. Obviously, today, in Vietnam, we're in a much better position to fight the Russians and the Chinese if they decided to come into the war. But if they were afraid to come in against us earlier, why would they want to come in against us now? There are too many reasons against it.

"As far as Russia is concerned she'd have to bring her troops in through Chinese territory—and obviously, the Chinese wouldn't let Russian troops come into her territory. I know. Sure, China would permit the Russians to support the war—just as she's doing now, with supplies and instructors. But Russia couldn't really do much about fighting us—not much more than she could do about our confrontation with her over the Cuban missiles.

"On the other hand, China is so occupied at home that she needs all the troops she's

got just to maintain law and order within the country. So when you add these two facts together, I just don't see how there can be any chance at all of those people coming into the war against us."

If we fought the war as General Meyers feels it should be fought, how long does he think it would take to victory?

"Well, I'm going to estimate this on the long side intentionally. It would probably be much shorter than this—but I'd say we'd have it over in six months, at the most."

Hypothetically, if General Meyers were given complete command of the situation, what would he do?

"In the air war, I'd hit the North with everything we had. And in the South, I would give Westmoreland the ground troops that he needs to win the ground war. He's never been given what he's asked for. And I know this, though it never comes out publicly. I know what he thinks: I've talked with him many, many times about this. What we're doing now violates every principle of warfare that we in the military have ever known. For comparison take the Israeli-Arab affair. Israel got there 'firstest with the mostest'—and the war was over in six days. That's because they went all-out."

"You can't win wars necessarily by killing people. You've got to overwhelm the enemy. And when you overwhelm him, you kill fewer people than you do by picking at him day after day—as we do now. This has been my feeling all along. And Westmoreland and the Army people certainly feel the same way about this as I do."

"But you never read this in our newspapers. This is why I feel so strongly about the situation. It really hurts me to see American people over there dying unnecessarily. You have to understand all the little details—how the targets are picked, for instance—to really know how closely this war is being run from the White House and the Department of Defense. Every target, of course, is cleared with the President. I don't think the general public knows this."

"Let me give you an illustration: when Lyndon Johnson was sick with his first operation a year ago, we didn't get any new targets. I'll give you the man's name who told me this, but please don't use it. (It was someone exceptionally high up in Government.) I met him in Vietnam on a visit. And I asked him: 'Why aren't we getting more air targets?' And he said: 'Gil, you've got to remember the President is sick—and nobody wants to bother him.'"

My final interview was with Brig. General Henry C. Huglin. General Huglin is a military-political scholar and a specialist in strategic warfare. He was Deputy U.S. Representative to the NATO Military Committee and Standing Group from 1959 to 1963. He is a graduate of the National War College and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, New York, as well as the Institute for Strategic Studies, London. At present he is Senior Military Scientist with TEMPO, General Electric Company's Center for Advanced Studies.

General Huglin's is the objective scholarly approach. He feels that we're coming along fairly well now in the Vietnam War—but not well enough. He told me:

"I think that several years ago we should have put on a lot more concentrated pressure with our air strikes—and I think that would have helped to defeat the enemy. Right now I would like to see the port of Haiphong mined—or closed off. And I would like to see more overall pressure used against Hanoi."

"I also think that we would have had the results we were seeking if we hadn't had the dissent in this country that Hanoi has misread into thinking that they could hold on a little bit longer—until finally the dissenters would prevail."

"How about mainland China and the Soviet Union?" I asked him.

"I'm not worried a bit about them. Never have been."

"Why should Soviet Russia take us on over Vietnam, when she didn't take us on over Cuba—where she was directly concerned? And China—belligerent though she is verbally—has been extremely cautious in actual actions wherever our interests or commitments are involved. And rightly so. Because things are so much different now than they were during the Korean War—where we were relatively weak. We are so very much stronger now. And China isn't any stronger today than she was during the war in Korea. Politically, she's much weaker. The atom weapons that she may have don't make that much difference. And she's not about to give us an excuse to launch even conventional air strikes against key installations that we would choose to strike. Such as her nuclear research center or her transportation system—or anything."

"We wouldn't have to fight a land war with China. And I don't think we would choose to do it. So I don't think there ever has been any real chance of China coming into the Vietnam War—although, of course, a lot of people have been worried as hell about this. Many of these are really thoughtful people, not merely peaceniks. But they just don't assess the situation the way I think that the Chinese have to assess it—before taking any action."

Thus General Huglin, from the scholarly point of view, is in agreement with everyone else I interviewed regarding the tenuous "risk" we would be taking if we went all-out to win the war in Vietnam. So why don't we win it?

America's Antipoverty Program: An Essential Part of Our National Effort To Meet the Growing Crisis in the Cities

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in his recent message to Congress on the crisis of the cities, has asked for \$2.18 billion to continue the war on poverty. I certainly hope this Congress will heed his request.

Last year, the President asked for \$2.06 billion to combat poverty. Unfortunately, the Congress appropriated less than even the \$1.788 billion Sargent Shriver said he needed to carry out most existing programs at last year's levels.

The result, as we have seen in recent days, has been the cutback of virtually every antipoverty program in the country. Sixteen Job Corps centers have been closed. And good applications for new and necessary programs are being turned down for lack of funds.

Mr. Speaker, it is a false economy to shortchange the poverty program. For one thing, it costs less to run the war on poverty than most people think. Taxpayers pay less than 2 cents per Federal tax dollar to keep the war on poverty going. War on poverty administrative costs at the Government level are just about 3 percent of the total cost of the program.

Even more important, the war on poverty is not a giveaway but an investment. It benefits not only the poor, but all of us. Each man-year of unemployment costs the economy about \$3,000 in

lost wages or production, or about \$9 billion for some 3 million unemployed. More than that, unemployment means additional millions of dollars paid out in welfare checks.

The war on poverty is the first national effort designed to move poor children into schools, poor adults into training and jobs, poor elderly citizens into useful, meaningful lives, and to extend to all our 30 million poor some of the basic American blessings all the rest of us have come to take for granted.

These are the considerations I hope we can keep in mind when considering this new and important Presidential message, which I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE CRISIS OF THE CITIES

To the Congress of the United States:

The cities that sprang up along the seaports, the river banks and the prairie crossroads of America were built and grew with pride and hope—until the early 20th century.

For several decades, now, the tide has run against the growth, strength and vitality of cities.

Today, America's cities are in crisis. This clear and urgent warning rises from the decay of decades—and is amplified by the harsh realities of the present.

The crisis has been long in forming. At the turn of the century, Lincoln Steffens told of "the shame of the cities." Jane Addams spoke of "the vast numbers of the city's disinherited."

Powerful forces swept the city after World War II, hastening its erosion.

People who could afford to began moving by the hundreds of thousands to new suburbs to escape urban crush and congestion. Other hundreds of thousands were trapped inside by a wall of prejudice, denial, and lack of opportunity.

They were joined by still thousands more from America's rural heartland—the unskilled and the unprepared, displaced by advances in technology. Their thirst was for opportunity, for jobs, and for a better life. They found instead a mirage: for stripped of its bright lights, the city for them was poverty, unemployment and human misery.

We see the results dramatically in the great urban centers where millions live amid decaying buildings—with streets clogged with traffic; with air and water polluted by the soot and waste of industry which finds it much less expensive to move outside the city than to modernize within it; with crime rates rising so rapidly each year that more and more miles of city streets become unsafe after dark; with increasingly inadequate public services and a smaller and smaller tax base from which to raise the funds to improve them.

But these problems exist in hundreds of smaller towns and cities across America—towns and cities whose growth is in numbers of people, but not in homes, or jobs, or public services, or schools or health facilities to serve them. The result too often is that these cities grow with decay, human misery, lack of job opportunity and increasingly concentrated poverty.

If the promise of the American city is to be recaptured—if our cities are to be saved from the blight of obsolescence and despair—we must now firmly set the course that America will travel.

There is no time to lose.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY

The human problems of the city are staggering:

Ghetto youth with little education, no skills and limited opportunity.

Citizens afraid to walk their streets at night, and justifiably so.

Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican Amer-

icans barred by prejudice from full participation in the city's life.

Illiteracy and disease, a lack of jobs and even dignity itself—these are the problems of the city, just as its tenements, traffic jams and rats are problems.

The city will not be transformed until the lives of the least among its dwellers are changed as well. Until men whose days are empty and despairing can see better days ahead, until they can stand proud and know their children's lives will be better than their own—until that day comes, the city will not truly be rebuilt.

That is the momentous and inescapable truth we face in this hour of America's history.

No single statement or message can embrace the solutions to the city's problems. No single program can attack them.

No one can say how long it will take, or how much of our fortune will eventually be committed. For the problems we are dealing with are stubborn, entrenched and slow to yield.

But we are moving on them—now—through more than a hundred programs, long and short range, making financial commitments of more than \$22 billion to the task.

THE WORK SO FAR

The last several years have witnessed a remarkable record of legislative achievement—and most of it has borne on the problems of the cities.

We struck down discrimination in job opportunities, public accommodations, and voting in the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965.

We provided job training for nearly two million disadvantaged men and women who now have the skills to support themselves and their families with dignity and self-respect.

We cut through a century of opposition and controversy to help the poor school child with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

We brought healing and health to the elderly and the poor through Medicare and Medicaid.

We moved to help combat the pollution that poisons a city's air and fouls its waters.

And, with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, we finally embarked on a concentrated effort to eliminate poverty in this nation. That landmark measure has helped to change the lives of 6 million Americans.

These programs have brought hope to people in every city and town in America. Children from the slums find a new chance to succeed through Head Start. Poor teenagers earn their first paychecks through a Neighborhood Youth Corps program and stay in school. Needy young men and women, whose talents might once have been their life's frustration, go on to college through Upward Bound. Men find self-respect and good jobs through work training programs. Half a million volunteers are engaged in a mission of service to the destitute of their communities. More than 6 million Americans have been lifted out of poverty.

But almost 29 million citizens still remain in poverty.

If the problems of the city are to be solved, there can be no retreat in the War on Poverty. It must be pressed, with renewed emphasis on the most critical needs of the poor—job opportunities and education for the young, and the chance to join in cooperative self-help efforts to improve their own lives, as well as to participate in the broader community attack on poverty.

Last year the Congress extended the life of the poverty program for two years—but it appropriated only \$1.77 billion, some \$290 million less than we sought.

For Fiscal 1969, I recommend appropriations to the full level of Congressional authorization—\$2.18 billion—for the anti-poverty program.

All of these measures help the people who live in our cities.

They are new programs, and only now are they beginning to take hold in improving lives of men, women and children.

With other proposals I have made to Congress this year—for open housing, for safe streets, for gun control, for 500,000 new, private sector job opportunities for the hard-core unemployed, for better education—we can further protect and improve the lot and the life of the city dweller.

Today, however, I want to speak of programs designed especially for our cities—of shelter for its citizens and plans for its revitalization. This message, too, is for men and their families. For our lives are profoundly affected by the environment in which we live, the city in which we work and reside, the home in which we relax and renew our strength.

AN EVOLUTIONARY RESPONSE

Five Presidents and fifteen Congresses have forged the Federal response to the problems of housing and urban development.

It began in 1937, when Franklin Roosevelt saw a third of the nation ill-housed. He and the 75th Congress recognized that poor families could not, with their own resources, afford homes on the private market, and that some form of Government help was necessary if they were to have decent shelter. The result was the historic legislation that launched the Public Housing program.

Twelve years later, with the Housing Act of 1949, President Truman and the 81st Congress started urban renewal and pledged "as soon as feasible . . . a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

In the 1954 Housing Act, President Eisenhower and the 83rd Congress expanded the program of urban renewal.

At the beginning of this decade, President Kennedy and the 87th Congress enlarged the Government's role to bring decent houses into the reach of families with moderate income.

In spite of these strides, when I became President:

We had a loose collection of federal housing agencies, each operating programs in isolation, not only of each other but also of the federal assistance programs of other departments.

Urban renewal was demolishing slum housing and dislocating people, but not enough new housing was being built for those forced to relocate.

There was little interest in the private sector—by builders, architects and engineers—in providing decent shelter for poor families, and the public housing program was stagnated in numbers and in quality.

Our concern with housing, health care, education, welfare and other social services was fragmented in the local neighborhoods where it counts.

Over the past four years, you in the Congress have approved our proposals to:

Establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development to bring scattered housing and urban development programs together and give the American city the cabinet role it deserves.

Begin a new program of Rent Supplements to increase the housing supply for needy families. Built and operated by private enterprise, the portion of rent paid by the Government declines as the tenant's income rises.

Inaugurate the Model Cities Program, the first effort to attack blight on a massive scale and renovate entire neighborhoods, by providing special supplementary grants to those cities that concentrate the entire array of Federal, State and local programs, from health to housing, in the worst slum neighborhoods.

Even these achievements are not sufficient to deal with the crisis our cities face today.

They do provide a base on which the proposals in this message build.

THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1968

I propose the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968—a charter of renewed hope for the American city.

With this Act, the Nation will set a far-reaching goal to meet a massive national need: the construction of 26 million new homes and apartments over the next 10 years. Six million of these will finally replace the shameful substandard units of misery where more than 20 million Americans still live.

This Act will authorize the construction and rehabilitation of 2.35 million housing units with \$2.34 billion of contracting authority for the first five years of the ten year program.

Under this legislation, we will in the year ahead:

Start 300,000 housing units for more than one million citizens who need federal assistance to obtain decent housing. This is triple the rate of this year, and more than half the number built over the last decade.

Continue to restore the core of our center cities—and with that, improve the lives of nearly 4 million Americans—through the Model Cities Program.

Summon the talents and energies of private enterprise to the task of housing low income families through the creation of a federally-chartered private, profit-making housing partnership.

Make Urban Renewal a more effective instrument for reclaiming neighborhoods, through a new neighborhood development program.

Add many thousands of construction job opportunities in the inner city.

Stimulate the flow of private credit for home building in the city by providing flexible interest ceilings on FHA mortgages and transferring the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association to private ownership.

Help American cities develop modern and efficient mass transit systems and services.

Offer the American family an alternative to crowded cities and sprawling suburbs, through a program to build new communities.

Improve planning for the orderly development of public facilities for urban areas.

Establish a base of research, analysis and knowledge of urban areas so we can make better informed decisions about the cities.

WHAT IS REQUIRED

To achieve our housing goal, we must move from low to high production.

We can make that shift only if the challenge summons the commitment of

The capital and mortgage finance markets, to supply the private funds which are the lifeblood of the construction industry. These funds must flow steadily and in increasing scale.

The home building industry, to tap an expanded Federally-assisted market for private low and moderate income sales and rental housing.

The genius of American business to bring to home building its skill and resources and the methods of modern technology so that houses can be built faster, less expensively and more efficiently than ever before.

American labor, which has pledged to provide the necessary skilled manpower without discrimination.

Government at all levels, to improve the working relationships with each other, and with the builders, lenders, and low income families who will be served by this program.

Most importantly, the Congress.

First, the Congress must take steps now to insure strong, stable economic growth for the nation as a whole and the home building industry in particular.

Once again I call upon the Congress to pass the anti-inflation tax which I recommended

more than a year ago. Soaring interest rates will cripple the homebuilding industry. The temporary surcharge tax legislation can help to keep that from happening.

Second, I urge the Congress to enact the fair housing legislation recommended repeatedly by this Administration.

Third, I urge the Congress to renew, fully fund and strengthen the basic housing and urban development legislation already on the books.

HOMES FOR AMERICANS

I urge the Congress to enact a program to provide 300,000 housing starts in fiscal 1969 for the poor, the elderly, the handicapped, the displaced, and families with moderate incomes.

This program would:

1. Enable 100,000 low-income families to buy or repair their own homes.

Home ownership is a cherished dream and achievement of most Americans.

But it has always been out of reach of the nation's low-income families.

Owning a home can increase responsibility and stake out a man's place in his community. The man who owns a home has something to be proud of and good reason to protect and preserve it.

With the exception of the pilot program I began last year, low-income families have been able to get Federal help in securing shelter only as tenants who pay rent.

Today I propose a program to extend the benefits of home ownership to the nation's needy families.

Under this program, the broad outline of which has already been set forth in S. 2700, low-income families will be able to buy modest homes financed and built by the private sector. These families will devote what they can reasonably afford—a specified percentage of their income—to mortgage payments, with the Government paying the difference in the form of an interest subsidy. Under this interest subsidy, the Federal Government would pay all but 1 percent of the interest on the mortgage, depending on the income of the homebuyer.

2. Start 75,000 public housing units, to provide homes for 300,000 Americans.

The job is to turn authorization to action—by accelerating the processing of applications, by moving quickly from commitment to construction, and by involving private industry fully under the new Turnkey concept.

Under Turnkey, a low-income project can be put up in less than half the time traditionally required for public housing.

Turnkey frees the builder from complicated and cumbersome procedures and stimulates his initiative to develop imaginative and well-designed buildings at lower cost.

We have already extended the Turnkey concept to enable private industry not only to build low-income housing developments, but also to manage them.

Some Public Housing projects built in the past—when the challenge was simply to get units in place—reflect a tasteless conformity, and an indifference to community amenities.

At my direction, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development has been working with leading architects and planners to achieve higher design standards for public housing developments. We know new projects can be pleasant places to live, reflecting the needs of human beings, with attention to comfort and convenience.

Our concern must be not only with the quantity of new public housing, but with its quality as well.

I propose a \$20 million program to promote improved tenant services in public housing developments.

With these funds, we can enable those who live in public housing to take better advantage of job, health and education opportunities.

We can help and encourage them to become involved, personally and responsibly, in the day-to-day problems of the projects where they live.

3. Authorize 72,500 units under the Rent Supplement Program to provide shelter for almost 250,000 poor Americans. In fiscal 1969, 35,000 dwelling units will be started under this program.

This program, which holds so much promise for the poor families of America, has been underfunded by the Congress. Last year, we sought \$40 million in annual payment authority. The Congress granted only \$10 million.

Rent Supplements is a free-enterprise program, strongly endorsed by the home building, real estate, and insurance industries which have responded enthusiastically to this new approach to low-income housing. It contains incentives for escape from poverty, while creating modest, but decent shelter for those in poverty.

If we are to match our concern for the cities with our commitments, this program must be adequately funded.

I recommend \$65 million in authority for the Rent Supplement Program for Fiscal 1969.

4. Begin to build 90,000 rental housing units for 360,000 members of moderate income families.

A program to provide housing for families with incomes too high to qualify for public housing, but too low to afford standard housing began in 1961.

This is a below market interest rate program known as "221(d)(3)." It serves families earning between \$4,000 and \$8,000 a year.

After 5 years of testing, we are ready now to move this program into full production. But first we must improve it.

I recommend legislation to strengthen the financial tools under which the moderate income rental housing program operates.

Under this legislation, capital financing would be shifted to the private sector, and the Government would increase its support by providing assistance to reduce rents to levels moderate income families can afford.

Now the Government provides financial support for loans at 3 percent interest. Under this new arrangement, the private sector would make loans at market rates. The Government would make up the difference between the market rate of interest and 1 percent. The loans would remain in private hands.

TO HELP THE NONPROFIT SPONSOR

Many housing projects are sponsored by non-profit organizations—including church groups, and fraternal orders. In many instances these groups lack the technical and financial know-how which modern construction demands.

Their efforts are in the best interests of this nation, and the nation should help them.

I propose legislation to provide needed technical assistance and skills to the non-profit sponsors of our housing programs.

Through grants, loans, and technical assistance, this program will help small private non-profit organizations in our cities. These organizations will then be able to draw quickly upon architects, engineers and financial experts to speed the construction of low income housing.

THE BLIGHTED NEIGHBORHOOD

Model Cities

The slum is not solely a wasteland of brick and mortar. It is also a place where hope dies quickly, and human failure starts early and lingers long.

Just as the problem of the slum is multifaceted, so must the effort to remove it be many-sided.

The Model Cities program gave us the tools to carry forward the nation's first comprehensive concentrated attack on neighborhood decay.

It was developed by some of the country's foremost planners, industrialists and urban experts.

The program is simple in outline—to encourage the city to develop and carry out a total strategy to meet the human and physical problems left in the rubble of a neighborhood's decay.

That strategy, which Model Cities spurs through special grants, is to bring to a dying area health care services, as well as houses; better schools and education, as well as repaved streets and improved mass transit; opportunities for work, as well as open space for recreation.

This program is now in its early stages. Sixty-three cities are drawing their plans to reclaim the blighted neighborhoods where 4 million Americans live. By this summer, a second group of cities will begin their planning.

Last year, I requested full funding of the amount authorized for Model Cities—\$662 million. But the Congress approved less than half that amount.

To the cities of this land, that cut came as a bitter disappointment.

In the cities' struggle for survival, we dare not disappoint them again. We must demonstrate that they can rely on continued Federal support.

I recommend \$2.5 billion for the Model Cities special grants over the next three years:

\$500 million for fiscal 1969.

\$1 billion each for fiscal 1970 and 1971.

In addition, for fiscal 1969 I recommend \$500 million in appropriations for urban renewal solely related to the Model Cities program. This includes full funding for a \$350 million increase in the authorization.

The total funds needed to move the Model Cities program forward in fiscal 1969 are \$1 billion.

I urge the Congress to fund fully this vital request for the people who live in America's worst urban neighborhoods.

URBAN RENEWAL

Urban Renewal is the weapon that deals primarily with the physical side of removing blight. An essential component of the Model Cities Program, it is a major instrument of reform in its own right.

Last year, nearly 900 American communities were reclaiming inner city land under urban renewal.

Last year, the Congress appropriated \$750 million for Urban Renewal in Fiscal 1969.

To give communities sufficient lead time for planning, I recommend that the Congress appropriate now \$1.4 billion for fiscal 1970.

Even at these higher appropriation levels, under existing law Urban Renewal will not operate at sufficient speed to overtake the decay of our cities.

The lag between a community's decision to rebuild a neighborhood and the breaking of ground is far too long. Urgent neighborhood needs go unmet, awaiting the development and approval of a total plan for an entire area.

We must begin now to make urban renewal more immediately responsive to urban needs.

To apply our resources more quickly, I recommend that Congress authorize a new Neighborhood Development Program under Urban Renewal.

This legislation would permit detailed planning and execution to proceed segment by segment in an urban renewal area. Under existing law, neither demolition nor rehabilitation can begin on any portion of the area to be renewed until it is ready to begin throughout the entire area.

With this Neighborhood Program, cities can start work quickly on the most pressing problems that are to be renewed, with the emphasis on the construction of new and rehabilitated housing.

MEETING THE INSURANCE CRISIS OF OUR CITIES

Insurance protection is a basic necessity for the property owner. But for the resident of the city's inner core and the local businessman who serves him, protection has long been difficult to obtain.

The problem has been heightened by civil disorder or its threat.

Last August I established a Special Panel to seek the solutions to this problem. The Panel, headed by Governor Richard Hughes of New Jersey, offered a clear example of how the States, industry and the Federal Government can join in a constructive effort.

The Panel looked deeply into the property owner's dilemma, and reported:

"Society cannot erase the suffering of the innocent victims of fire, windstorm, theft, or riot. But it can at least provide the opportunity to obtain insurance to safeguard their capital, and thereby prevent a disastrous occurrence from becoming a permanent tragedy."

The Panel recommended a comprehensive program of mutually supporting actions by the insurance industry, the States, and the Federal Government.

My advisers and I have reviewed the Panel's proposals carefully. We believe they are sound.

Accordingly, I call upon the insurance industry to take the lead in establishing plans in all States to assure all property owners fair access to insurance. These plans will end the practice of "red-lining" neighborhoods and eliminate other restrictive activities. They will encourage property improvement and loss prevention by responsible owners.

I call upon the States to cooperate with the industry and, where necessary, to organize insurance pools and take other steps to cover urban core properties. These measures will assure that all responsible property owners can obtain insurance, and provide a method of spreading equitably throughout the insurance industry risks that no single insurer would otherwise accept.

I recommend that the Congress establish a cooperative Federal-State-Industry program by chartering a National Insurance Development Corporation within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This Corporation will bring together all those vitally interested in the inner city insurance problem—members of the public, state insurance regulators and other state officials, insurance industry representatives, and interested Federal agencies.

The Corporation will perform a number of vital functions in support of the actions of private industry and the states to assure adequate property insurance in all areas of our nation's cities.

Through the sale of reinsurance against the risk of civil disorders, the Corporation will marshal the resources of the insurance industry and add to this backing of the states and the Federal Government. Without this reinsurance, many insurers and state insurance regulators do not believe the industry can move forward to provide adequate property insurance in urban areas.

This program will assist the insurance industry and the States to offer adequate property insurance for the inner cities. Through reinsurance, the program can help the States provide for the contingency of any large emergency losses.

For those companies who participate in this program, *I recommend tax deferral measures, proposed by the Panel, to increase the industry's capacity to insure homes and businesses in the center city.*

This program will encourage insurance companies to increase their reserves to cover unusual losses. Any deferred taxes will be invested in appropriate Government securities, so that no Federal revenues will be lost by the tax deferral unless unusual losses do occur.

Insurance is vital to rebuilding our cities.

It is a cornerstone of credit. It can provide a powerful incentive for homeowners and businessmen to rehabilitate their own property and thereby improve the community.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The Federal role—a quarter of a century in the making—is designed to assure that every citizen will be decently housed.

The Government's concern is to stimulate private energy and local action—to provide capital where needed, to guarantee financing, to offer assistance that encourages planning and construction.

The real job belongs to local government and the private sector—the homebuilder, the mortgage banker, the contractor, the non-profit sponsor, the industrialist who now sees in the challenge of the cities a new opportunity for American business.

All of the programs I have outlined in this message are directed toward the deeper involvement of the private sector. That involvement must match the massive dimension of the urban problem.

What is needed is a new partnership between business and Government. The first outlines of that partnership are already visible.

We see it in:

The recent undertaking of the American Bar Association to improve the landlord-tenant laws—now more medieval than modern—and to attack other legal problems in our urban centers.

The commitment of 318 of the nation's life insurance companies to invest \$1 billion of their capital in low-income housing.

Within the next several days, the Savings and Loan Associations and the Mutual Savings Bank of this nation will announce their plans to intensify the investment of their capital for similar purposes.

NATIONAL HOUSING PARTNERSHIPS

How can the productive power of America—which has mastered space and created unmatched abundance in the marketplace—be harnessed to meet the most pressing unfilled needs of our society: rebuilding the urban slum?

Last June, I asked a select Commission of leading industrialists, bankers and labor leaders to study this question. That Commission, headed by Edgar F. Kaiser, has now given me an interim report with many valuable recommendations.

Acting on the Commission's recommendation, *I propose that the Congress authorize the formation of privately-funded partnerships that will join private capital with business skills to help close the low-income housing gap.*

The Kaiser Commission identified three principal reasons why American industry has not yet been attracted to the field of low and moderate-income housing. The problems and the steps proposed to meet them are:

1. Concentration of risk

The profitability of individual housing projects varies widely and the risk of loss on any one project is high. The proposed national partnerships would permit industrial and financial firms to pool their investments and spread their risks over a large number of projects.

2. Rate of return

Substantial operating losses are usually incurred in the first 10 years of a housing project's life to cover operating expenses, interest and depreciation.

By employing the partnership form of organization, which some building owners now use, under existing tax law these operating losses can be "passed through" to each investor, and offset against the investor's other taxable income. This reduces the investor's current income taxes otherwise payable, and makes possible an annual cash return on investment comparable to the average earnings of American business in other manufacturing enterprises.

3. Management

The management personnel of major corporations are inexperienced in the field of low income housing. They cannot afford to devote substantial time to occasional housing ventures.

The proposed national partnerships would be strongly financed organizations, fully committed to long term activity in the single field of housing for the poor. As such, the proposed partnerships should be able to attract top flight management and technical experts on a competitive career basis.

The objective of these partnerships will be to attract capital from American industry and put that capital to work. Their exclusive purpose will be to generate a substantial additional volume of low and moderate income housing. They will use the best private management talent, planning techniques and advanced methods of construction. They will probe for the savings inherent in the latest technology and in economies of scale.

They will:

Participate in joint ventures throughout the country in partnership with local builders, developers and investors.

Join with American labor to open new job opportunities for the very people their projects will house.

Participate in our existing and proposed federal programs for assisting low and moderate-income housing projects on the same basis as other project sponsors.

This new undertaking will begin with one national partnership. We expect that others will follow as the approach proves itself.

A NEW ERA IN HOME FINANCING

The supply of credit is not unlimited. The nation's banks, insurance companies, pension funds and other financial sources have an obligation to their depositors and shareholders to seek a fair and competitive return for their investments.

To insure that home financing remains competitive with alternative long-term investment opportunities, I recommend that the Congress:

Authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to adjust the FHA interest rate ceilings.

Authorize federal insurance of bond obligations issued by private mortgage companies or trusts holding sizeable pools of FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed home mortgages.

Transfer the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association to completely private ownership.

FHA interest rates

Mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration can by law carry no more than a 6 percent interest rate. In today's market this is no longer competitive. In practical terms, the result is the sale of mortgages at substantial discounts.

Discounts require hard cash beyond the normal downpayment. They erode the hard-earned equity of a home-owner and the profit margin of the builder of new housing. For when the rate of return on federally-insured mortgages is less than lending institutions can obtain from other investments, they require property-sellers to absorb discounts. To sell their homes, therefore, sellers realize less than they originally anticipated. And when builders of large projects—with 90% mortgages of \$1 or \$2 million, or more—must find additional hard cash to pay deep discounts, they will defer construction until the cash requirements are reduced.

As a result, many a house goes unsold and many apartment projects go unbuilt in a deep credit squeeze.

To assure a steady flow of funds into homebuilding, *I recommend that the Congress authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to adjust the FHA in-*

interest rate ceilings to reflect the economic realities of the financial markets. I have already recommended a similar adjustment on the interest rates for home loans to veterans.

Federally insured mortgage bonds

Some private institutional and individual investors have shunned investments in home mortgages because they could realize nearly comparable rates of return in other investments, and avoid the bookkeeping and paper work associated with hundreds of individual mortgages.

These pools of savings—in large institutional pension funds, private trusts, and occasionally in individual estates—can be attracted to residential finance. It will take a new, marketable financial investment, with competitive yields and security. Such a bond-type obligation can be created to cover federally-insured mortgages held by private mortgage bankers or trusts.

To enhance the attractiveness of such an obligation to investors, and thus attract additional funds to the housing market, I recommend that the Congress authorize the Department of Housing and Urban Development to insure mortgage bonds that are secured by pools of FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages.

Federal National Mortgage Association

Through the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Government has helped keep mortgage funds flowing by buying mortgages when credit was tight and selling them when money was plentiful.

Today, FNMA is a hybrid, owned in part by private shareholders, in part by the government, but managed by Government officials.

This secondary market operation is largely a private function, which ought to be performed by the private sector—as the Congress has always intended.

I propose legislation to transfer the secondary market operation of the Federal National Mortgage Association on an orderly basis to completely private ownership.

This new FNMA, concerned exclusively with providing an increasing and continuous flow of funds into residential financing will close an important gap in the existing network of financial institutions.

This change will not affect the Government's special assistance to selected types of mortgages which are not yet readily accepted in the private market.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION

In the modern city the arteries of transportation are worn and blocked. The traffic jam has become the symbol of the curse of congestion.

It was only a few years ago, however, that we recognized this as a national problem. In signing the Urban Mass Transportation Act in 1964, I said:

"This is a many sided challenge. We cannot and we do not rely upon massive spending programs as cure-alls. We must instead look to closer cooperation among all levels of government and between both public and private sectors to achieve the prudent progress that Americans deserve and that they expect."

Under this Act, we are

Aiding cities to draw the blueprints to modernize, expand and reorganize their transportation systems.

Helping to train specialists in the urban transportation field.

Advancing research to improve the system and the service.

Assisting communities to buy the capital equipment and to build terminals for their transit systems.

We must step up this effort.

In the year ahead, we expect to increase our grants to cities from \$140 million to \$190 million.

I recommend that the Congress provide \$230 million for fiscal 1970 so cities can begin now to plan the improvement of their mass transit systems and service to the people.

Urban transportation is the concern of our two newest Departments—Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is responsible for the development of the metropolitan community—and transportation is an essential part of that effort.

The Department of Transportation is responsible for the coordination of different—but closely related—modes of transportation. Moreover, research facilities bearing on transportation—out of which will come the transportation technology of tomorrow—are concentrated in this Department.

When the Department of Transportation was established in 1966, the Congress required both Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development and Transportation to study this problem and recommend the arrangement which would best assure the Government's ability to meet the transportation needs of America's urban citizens.

On the basis of their intensive study, and their recommendations, I will shortly submit a reorganization plan.

Transferring to the Department of Transportation the major urban transit grant, loan, and related research functions now in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Maintaining in the Department of Housing and Urban Development the leadership in comprehensive planning at the local level, that includes transportation planning and relates it to broader urban development objectives.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE CITIES

Federally-sponsored research has helped us guard the peace, cure disease, and send men into space.

Yet, we have neglected to target its power on the urban condition. Although 70 percent of our people live in urban areas, less than one-tenth of one percent of the Government's research budget has been devoted to housing and city problems.

We must:

Learn how to apply modern technology to the construction of new low-income homes and the rehabilitation of old ones.

Test these ideas in practice, and make them available to builders and sponsors.

Look deep into the fiscal structure of the cities—their housing and building codes, zoning, and tax policies.

Learn how best the federal government can work with state and local governments—and how states and local governments can improve their own operations.

Evaluate our city programs, so we can assess our priorities.

Last year, I sought the first major appropriations for urban research: \$20 million. Congress appropriated only half that amount.

I once again propose a \$20 million appropriation for urban technology and research. This will assist the universities and private institutions of America to carry out the studies so crucially needed.

These funds, along with those from other Government agencies, will also help launch the new Urban Institute, which I recently recommended. This is a private non-profit research corporation formed to create a bank of talent to analyze the entire range of city problems.

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

A passenger on an airline flying from Miami to Boston is rarely out of sight of city lights below.

As our urban areas expand, the citizen's sense of community broadens. He may live in one locality, work in another and seek leisure in still another.

The face of the landscape is changing with our growth.

The question is: How shall our communities grow?

Unless we decide now for order and purpose, the result will be surrender to chaos, confusion, ugliness and unnecessary and exorbitant cost.

The key to orderly growth is planning—planning on an area-wide basis.

Planning, both immediate and long-range, is the function and the responsibility of the State and community. But the Federal Government has long recognized the need for its support.

That need grows as the problem grows.

I urge the Congress to provide \$55 million in Fiscal 1969 to assist planning for the orderly growth of our urban areas, a 22 percent increase over last year.

So essential is orderly development to the future of our urban centers that we must provide incentives to encourage it. In 1966 the Congress authorized—but did not fund—such a program of incentive grants.

I ask Congress to authorize \$10 million for a program of area-wide Incentive Grants in Fiscal 1969.

The Federal share of a project will increase by up to 20 percent of the costs of projects of areawide significance—if they are part of a comprehensive area plan.

The far-sighted community which responds to this incentive program will find its burdens lighter in providing hospitals, roads, sewage systems, schools and libraries.

NEW COMMUNITIES

Over the next decade, 40 million more Americans will live in cities.

Where and how will they all live? By crowding further into our dense cities? In new layers of sprawling suburbia? In jerry-built strip cities along new highways?

Revitalizing our city cores and improving our expanding metropolitan areas will go far toward sheltering that new generation. But there is another way as well, which we should encourage and support. It is the new community, freshly planned and built.

These can truly be the communities of tomorrow—constructed either at the edge of the city or farther out. We have already seen their birth. Here in the nation's capital, on surplus land once owned by the Government, a new community within the city is springing up.

In other areas, other communities are being built on farm and meadow land. The concept of the new community is that of a balanced and beautiful community—not only a place to live, but a place to work as well. It will be largely self-contained, with light industry, shops, schools, hospitals, homes, apartments and open spaces.

New communities should not be built in any set pattern. They should vary with the needs of the people they serve and the landscapes of which they are a part.

Challenge and hard work await the founders of America's new communities:

Careful plans must be laid.

Large parcels of land must be acquired.

Large investments in site preparation, roads and services must be made before a single home can be built and sold.

The development period is long, and return on investment is slow.

But there is also a great opportunity for, as well as a challenge to, private enterprise.

The job is one for the private developer. But he will need the help of his Government at every level.

In America—where the question is not so much the standard of living, but the quality of life—these new communities are worth the help the Government can give.

I propose the New Communities Act of 1968.

For the lender and developer, this Act will provide a major new financing method.

A Federally-guaranteed "cash flow" debenture will protect the investment of private backers of new communities at com-

petitive rates of return. At the same time, it will free the developer from the necessity to make large payments on his debts, until cash returns flow from the sale of developed land for housing, shops and industrial sites.

For the local and State government, the Act will offer incentives to channel jointly-financed programs for public facilities into the creation of new communities. The incentives will take the form of an increased Federal share in these programs.

A SENSE OF PLACE AND PURPOSE

"A city," Vachel Lindsay wrote, "is not builded in a day."

Nor—we know well—will its problems be conquered in a day. For the city's tides have been ebbing for several decades. We are the inheritors of those tragic results of the city's decline.

But we are the ones who must act. For us that obligation is inescapable.

Our concern must be as broad as the problems of men—work and health, education for children and care for the sick. These are the problems of men who live in cities. And the very base of man's condition is his home: he must find promise and peace there.

The cry of the city, reduced to its essentials, is the cry of a man for his sense of place and purpose.

Violence will not bring this. But neither should fear forestall it.

The challenge of changing the face of the city and the men who live there summons us all—the President and the Congress, Governors and Mayors. The challenge reaches as well into every corporate board room, university, and union headquarters in America. It extends to church and community groups, and to the family itself. The problem is so vast that the answer can only be forged by responsible leadership from every sector, public and private.

We dare not fail to answer—loud and clear.

To us, in our day, falls the last clear chance to assure that America's cities will once again "gleam, undimmed by human tears."

No one can doubt that the hour is late.

No one can understate the magnitude of the work that should be done.

No one can doubt the costs of talk and little action.

As we respond to the cities problems—to the problems caused by the accumulated debris of economic stagnation, physical decay and discrimination—let us recall and reaffirm the reasons for our national strength: unity, growth and individual opportunity.

And recalling these truths, let us go forward, as one nation in common purpose joined, to change the face of our cities and to end the fear of those—rich and poor alike—who call them home.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 22, 1968.

Nixon Pulls Even With Johnson

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh, Pa., Press of February 25, 1968:

THE GALLUP POLL: NIXON PULLS EVEN WITH JOHNSON

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Richard Nixon has drawn even with President Johnson in the latest test of election strength after having trailed the President by a sizable margin in a survey conducted prior to the Red offensive in Vietnam.

Mr. Nixon, as reported Wednesday, holds a commanding lead (his widest to date) as the top choice of both Republicans and Independents for the 1968 presidential nomination. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York is the runner-up with both groups.

Although Mr. Nixon has registered impressive gains on President Johnson since January, his support falls short of his November showing when he ran 4 percentage points ahead of the President.

The public's attitudes about the course of the war and, specifically, the President's handling of it, are closely related to the changing tide of political sentiment and may well be the decisive factor in the election this fall.

When confidence in the President's Vietnam policies falters, his political standing suffers. Last October, for example, when the proportion who approved of President Johnson's handling of the Vietnam situation was at a relatively low point, Richard Nixon ran ahead of the President.

The President moved ahead of Mr. Nixon however, as optimism over the war increased during the closing weeks of 1967 and the first weeks of 1968.

The following question was put to a carefully-drawn sample of registered voters in a survey conducted in early February:

"Suppose the presidential election was being held today. If Richard Nixon were the Republican candidate and Lyndon Johnson were the Democratic candidate, which would you like to see win?"

The following table gives the latest results and the trend over the last three months:

	L.B.J.	Nixon	Undecided
Latest.....	42	42	16
January.....	51	39	10
December 1967.....	47	43	10
November 1967.....	45	49	6

Another factor that could also greatly affect this year's race—and one that is causing mounting concern in both Republican and Democratic circles—is the candidacy of ex-Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama. Mr. Wallace, who is running on the American Independent Party ticket, hopes to place his name on the ballot in 48 states.

If Mr. Wallace should win enough states to deny either major party a majority of electoral votes (270), the Constitution requires that the U.S. House of Representatives decide the winner on a straight allocation of one vote for each state delegation in the newly-elected Congress.

If Wallace succeeds in bringing this about, he says he will seek a "covenant" with one of the candidates and throw his votes to the man who agrees to support his policies.

To test Mr. Wallace's strength, he was matched against President Johnson and Richard Nixon in a three-way trial heat.

The Alabamian, who draws 11 per cent of the vote nationally in such a test and 25 per cent of the vote in the South, is found to hurt both major party candidates about equally.

With Wallace in the race, President Johnson and Richard Nixon each lost 3 percentage points nationally and the race remains a standoff. The losses for both men are greatest in the South.

Here are the results of the 3-way race:

	Percent
Johnson	39
Nixon	39
Wallace	11
Undecided	11

Present survey evidence indicates that Mr. Wallace would take away more votes from Gov. Rockefeller of New York than from Mr. Nixon.

The latest survey was completed just prior to the recent clash between Gov. Rockefeller

and Mayor John Lindsay of New York over the sanitation strike.

Gov. Rockefeller has been widely criticized for bypassing New York's Taylor law which prohibits strikes by public employees.

In view of these developments the latest Rockefeller-Johnson results may not accurately mirror current attitudes. They do, however, reliably indicate the impact of the Wallace candidacy on Gov. Rockefeller.

Gov. Rockefeller runs a stronger race against Mr. Johnson than does Mr. Nixon, and leads by a 46 to 41 per cent vote with 13 per cent undecided.

Gov. Rockefeller leads the President by 40 per cent to 37 per cent, with 13 per cent for Mr. Wallace and 10 per cent undecided.

The South accounts primarily for Gov. Rockefeller's losses nationally. Mr. Wallace takes away twice as many votes from him in this region as he does from President Johnson.

Tonkin Information Gap

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, the New Britain Herald, one of Connecticut's best and most responsible daily newspapers, gave voice to area concern about the quality of information given to the Congress and the American public prior to enactment of the Tonkin resolution.

I believe this editorial deserves the attention of every Member of this body.

THE TONKIN HEARINGS

The air war against North Vietnam dates to the Tonkin Gulf incidents. On August 2 and 4 of 1964, North Vietnamese gunboats attacked two United States destroyers. In reprisal, President Johnson ordered air attacks against the North Vietnamese mainland. The bombing of the north had begun.

It is quite clear that until last week, the American public was never fully told the story of what happened on those fateful days in 1964. We were told only that the destroyers were on routine patrol, in international waters, and were subject to unprovoked gunboat attack.

Last week, testimony given in private sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, disclosed that there were dimensions to the Tonkin Gulf incidents which tend to put the whole affair into a slightly different light than we have all previously understood.

Secretary McNamara's testimony indicated, for instance, that there was something more than "routine" about the destroyers' activities. Use of sophisticated radar, for example, would suggest information-finding missions. Further, there are indications that the destroyers had been ordered to cruise in such a way as to divert North Vietnamese attention from other activities to the south.

None of that testimony tended to change the basic facts of the gunboats' attacks on our ships. But it did tend to raise questions, serious questions, such as: Did the Defense Department overreact to the situation?

But even more significant is the realization, belated as it may be, that both the Senate's action on "Tonkin Resolution," and the national attitude toward the events of that fateful month, were based on incomplete information. This is really the nub of the criticism. It is sheer speculation to assume that things might have been different had the whole story been known. But it is fair comment to remark, belatedly as it may be, that the course of history might well have been different.

The lesson we take from these revelations is an old and obvious one. Our democracy functions best when the truth is known. We have ultimate confidence in the wisdom of the people to make fair and honest judgments when they are fully informed. It is when they are told selected parts of the story that uncertainty and doubt begin to set in. We can only regret that there had not been more candor about this situation a long time ago.

Action Hot for Former Press-Chronicle Staffer

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a young Marine officer serving in Vietnam, recently appeared in the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle, and I am pleased to pass it along to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD.

More and more often I am asked, "Why are we in Vietnam?" and I feel that Lieutenant Toohey's letter does a much better job of answering that question than I could ever do.

It is indeed encouraging to know that we have officers of his caliber leading our fighting men in Vietnam.

VIETNAM—ACTION HOT FOR FORMER PRESS-CHRONICLE STAFFER

A Johnson City Press-Chronicle staffer on a leave of absence while serving in the Marine Corps is where the action is hot in Vietnam.

Lt. Bill Toohey, the newspaper's day telegraph editor when he entered the Marine Corps, writes from near Danang.

"This place is something else. The first day I was out on a seemingly routine patrol," Toohey writes, "and before the day was out, all hell had broken out. Our force got 27 confirmed kills and we lost 5 KIA (killed in action) and 4 WIA (wounded in action), but I guess those things are a part of the big picture."

RELATIVELY QUIET

He adds, "Other than that things are relatively quiet where I am."

Toohey also passed along some observations on the Vietnamese situation: "Vietnam is worth fighting for, and I'm glad I am getting my chance to do at least something to help. These children over here are really pitiful. Most of the 2-3-year-olds don't have clothes and all of them lack at least some staple part of their meals."

"If for no other reason, Vietnam is worth fighting for."

"I'm not gung-ho or anything like that, but just stating a fact."

Toohey said he had recently shaken hands with Gen. William Westmoreland, commander of all U.S. forces in Vietnam, when the general stopped to see Gen. Robertson, the Marine commander in Danang.

A BIG PAIN

"All the derogatory, sensational type of stories about the troops over here are a big pain," Toohey writes, "as far as I'm concerned, and in a lot of cases, very much exaggerated. They don't affect the troops over here but they give a lot of people in the States a pretty grim picture of their young servicemen."

Toohey said that "none of the Marine officers I have talked to has seen any marijuana smokers or even heard of any although

75 per cent of all servicemen smoke it, according to a story in print."

Toohey has been in Vietnam since January. His wife and his daughter are living here with Mrs. Toohey's mother.

Skipper Loses Command

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 year ago, a New York State newspaper published the first of many articles about a young lieutenant commander in the Navy who had been relieved of command of a ship—without the benefit of court-martial—as a result of a conspiracy against him by two junior officers. Today, that lieutenant commander may have his day in court before a select committee of this Congress.

The lieutenant commander is Marcus A. Arnheiter and the newspaper is the Middletown Times Herald-Record. For its initiative and enterprise in bringing this story to the attention of the American public, the Middletown Record 2 weeks ago was awarded a first-place plaque in the sixth annual New York State Publishers' Association contest for newspaper excellence.

As a matter of fact, the Middletown Record was awarded two first-place plaques—one for distinguished public reporting of the case of Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter, and the other for distinguished editorial writing. The Record has also, in the past, been the recipient of three national awards for typography and page makeup.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Ulster, Orange, and Sullivan Counties, and everyone who has an opportunity to read the Middletown Record, owe its editor, Al Romm, and Publisher Charles King a vote of thanks—for unrelenting pursuit of the best in American journalism and steadfast refusal to settle for anything less.

I respectfully place the original article which first brought the case of Lieutenant Commander Arnheiter to the attention of the American public, which was written by Thomas E. Pray, in the RECORD at this point:

SKIPPER LOSES COMMAND—CLAIMS INJUSTICE—PROMOTION PASSED OVER

(By Tom E. Pray)

GREENWOOD LAKE.—A young Naval officer, fighting to regain his lost command, has raised an issue which strikes at the very heart of the war effort in Vietnam: Can a competent commander be cashiered for prosecuting the war too hard?

Lt. Cmdr. Marcus A. Arnheiter says he was. And he's fighting now to save what's left of a 15-year career shattered when the Navy suddenly removed him as commander of the destroyer escort Vance. By the time Cmdr. Arnheiter learned that he had been secretly smeared by a group of disgruntled junior officers, he had already lost his command and a chance for promotion.

The Navy's abrupt dismissal of Cmdr. Arnheiter and its indifference to his plea for a full-scale court of inquiry to clear his name also casts grave doubt on the integrity of the

Navy. What kind of a system would permit a career officer—with a record good enough to have earned him a ship to command in the first place—to be relieved of it three months later without so much as a warning that charges had been filed against him, an opportunity to confront his accusers, or the chance to obtain adequate legal defense to counter the charges?

Several senior Navy officers, three of them retired, were outraged. Vice Admiral L. S. Sabin, formerly chief of staff to the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, put it this way:

"The whole crux was and is the manner in which Arnheiter was undercut and the manner of his relief. That represents the much larger and far more important issue, namely, whether a captain (commanding officer) of a Navy ship could—by the malicious actions of a group of dissident officers—be summarily relieved of his command in a war zone. This is the important thing to determine, since—unless it is determined—the whole basic structure of military authority is placed in jeopardy."

Another flag officer, Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, USN, Ret., put it more succinctly: "A couple of beatnik junior officers cut the throat of their C.O. from behind his back and got away with it."

Pentagon admirals, however, weren't as candid. No, they would not convene a general court martial, they told Arnheiter, it was an "administrative matter" that had already been "decided." Why hadn't the Navy furnished him with a copy of all the charges before he was relieved? Arnheiter asked. No comment.

"You'd better look forward instead of backward," one high Navy official warned, adding that if he (Arnheiter) continued pressing his appeal he would "alienate powerful people" and should not be surprised to find himself "selected out of the Navy" altogether.

WHERE TROUBLES BEGAN

Lt. Cmdr. Arnheiter's troubles began when he stepped aboard the U.S.S. Vance in Pearl Harbor a few days before Christmas, 1965. A 1952 Annapolis graduate, he had moved steadily through the various grades—from ensign on the battleship Iowa in the Korean War to full lieutenant on the destroyer Coolbaugh and Abbot, and executive officer on another destroyer, the Ingersoll. Arnheiter was one of the first of his Naval Academy class to be qualified for command of a destroyer. As the Ingersoll's executive officer, he received a perfect 4.0 rating.

The young captain's mission was threefold: To stop and search any iron-hulled vessels on the high seas suspected of carrying arms or contraband to the Viet Cong, to stop and search junks of sampans plying coastal waters with suspected cargo, and to destroy any assigned targets ashore with gunfire if friendly troops called for assistance or an urgent situation existed.

That was the mission intended for the Vance as she lay berthed in Pearl Harbor, but neither the ship nor her crew was ready for it when Arnheiter came aboard.

The ship, itself, was fully filthy and roach-infested from one end to the other. Much of its gear and equipment was operationally unreliable or in need of repair or replacement, and the crew was untrained and undisciplined. Indeed, one senior petty officer has testified that before Cmdr. Arnheiter took command, the ship had had only six or eight battle drills in a nine-month period.

For the most part, the officers seemed to be indifferent to the war or their part in it preferring to keep the ship far out to sea on patrol—far from any possible encounter with the enemy the Vance had been sent out to intercept, Arnheiter says.

In short, the Vance was more of a yacht than a warship and Cmdr. Arnheiter soon realized that he would have to shape it up fast. The ship was due to return to the war zone in less than a week.

It was not going to be an easy task, but it was his first command and he had been chosen from an eligibility list of more than 4,000 lieutenant commanders to command one of the 35 destroyer-type ships such as the Vance.

With a good many years of destroyer service behind him, the commander felt up to the task and expected his executive officer, Lt. Ray S. Hardy, to be equally enthusiastic.

Hardy apparently was not.

As documents on file in the Navy Department would reveal, Hardy played a double role. To the new captain he said one thing. To his fellow officers he said another. Although he agreed at first with Arnheiter that the Vance needed fast, firm direction to put her in fighting trim, he was ever the apologetic bearer of bad tidings from the bridge when he was in the wardroom with his colleagues.

Accustomed to accommodating rather than ordering, Hardy chafed under the new bit. And it wasn't long before the CO and the XO were having daily arguments in the captain's quarters over the operation of the ship. The Vance was turning into a warship, but Arnheiter felt his executive officer was not doing his job.

Instead, the skipper found himself having to take on more and more of the XO's duties and responsibilities: Seeing that daily inspections were held for officers and men, supervising daily routines, attending to the material condition of the ship, and following through on all projects and programs, etc.

ON PROBATION

These were the things Arnheiter did as executive officer on the Ingersoll and he expected Hardy to do the same. Hardy knew he was on probation and that he either improved his performance or would be relieved. He already had been warned that the new captain expected more of him than he was giving. And so the seeds of a conspiracy to "get Cmdr. Arnheiter" were sown, the captain said.

The actual conspiracy began with a letter sent by the Vance's operations officer, Lt. (jg) William T. Generous to a priest Jan. 23, 1966—one month and a day after Arnheiter came aboard. The priest was a personal friend.

He was also close to Arnheiter's boss, Cmdr. O. G. Baird. In that letter, which Arnheiter was not shown until after he was relieved of command, Generous said:

"My rage forces me to use my limited time particularly. Today's gem was no more nor less than a Protestant service . . ."

Generous was complaining that he had to attend an "All Hands Aft" ceremony designed to instill a certain sense of Naval pride in the crew and to acquaint them with the existence of Divine Providence.

Although he admitted later that he had long since ceased to be a practicing Catholic, he used his enforced attendance at the "All Hands" to suggest that his constitutional right of free religious choice was being abridged. And he went on to write:

"The Nuremberg trials have settled for all time the loyalty a military man must show his superior. I cannot be openly disloyal to him (Arnheiter), but I cannot accept illegality and infringement of my constitutional rights. I see relief from this burden, but I do so anonymously."

Generous admitted later that Hardy told him to submit his complaint anonymously to avoid repercussions. As time went on, other letters were sent anonymously to clergymen, also complaining of the quasi-religious "character guidance" sessions.

Were these guidance sessions religious services? Rear Admiral James W. Kelly, Navy Chief of Chaplains, who recently evaluated one of them, didn't think so.

And neither does Arnheiter, who described them as a series of patriotic pep talks designed mostly for the younger seamen, re-

mindings them that they were going into a war zone, where they might be shot at and suggesting that they had best put a little trust in their Maker to get them through it.

The Vance was no longer going to settle for "Barrier Reef patrol" 20 miles out. This time, she was going in close to shore where contraband was most likely to be found. The outboard runabout that had been used for shore leave and water-skiing was to be mounted with a .30-caliber machine gun to add to the Vance's effectiveness in heading off suspicious junks.

And the men were to be trained in the use of the ship's three-inch guns and rifles in case they should be required to repel boarders.

"I was going to seek out VC contraband and, where possible, enemy targets, not wait for them to come to me," Cmdr. Arnheiter said.

While the commander was fighting his brand of war off the coast of South Vietnam, Lts. Hardy, Generous, and an ensign named Louis Belmonte (who was the Catholic lay leader on board) were conducting a private war of their own against the skipper. No one knows how many letters were sent, but this much is known.

Lt. Cmdr. Arnheiter saw none of them, was not aware that dissident officers were trying to have him dismissed, and had no idea that his own immediate superiors, Cmdr. Orle G. Baird in Pearl Harbor and Cmdr. Donald F. Milligan in Subic Bay, the Philippines, were assembling a dossier on him.

Milligan, without notifying Arnheiter as he was required to do under Navy regulation 1404-1 (which makes mandatory the immediate furnishing of verbatim complaints, no matter how received, to the man accused) assembled a list of reports and complaints brought to him by his own chaplain, Lt. George W. Dando, who had been visiting the Vance on a "routine" tour of ship-hopping, and sent them along to higher headquarters.

SPOKE ABOUT CHARGES

Dando arrived on the Vance on Feb. 28. For the next 10 days on and off he spoke with Hardy, Generous, and Belmonte about the charges they had secretly compiled against Arnheiter. He entered them in a log book Belmonte called his "Captain's Madness Log." Among the charges were these:

Illegal disposal of edible food. What was that all about, the chaplain wanted to know?

Their answer was that the captain had declared a supply of candy bars "unfit for human consumption" so that they could be given to South Vietnamese boatmen and their families.

Violating a welfare and recreation regulation by mounting a .30-caliber machine gun on a runabout purchased by the men for their leisure. What was that?

The captain wanted to use the boat to chase suspected VC. We can do our job by radar surveillance with a lot less risk, they said.

Manufacturing enemy targets to fire at. What was that all about?

The commander was seeking gunfire missions for his ship and asking spotter planes to designate targets. "He was taking us in much too close, they complained."

The charges went on and on and on. There were 41 of them. There are three standing today, none of which warrants the dismissal "for cause" of a commanding officer, Arnheiter claims.

A commander is "dismissed for cause" only if he has committed some serious offense, murder, assault, culpable damage to his ship, or the like. Generally speaking, dismissal "for cause" warrants a general court martial because it is assumed the commander did something serious enough to warrant prosecution.

Arnheiter got no such court martial and has several times been denied one.

PROPER CHANNELS

Cmdr. Arnheiter feels, as do several senior flag officers, that if the unsubstantiated complaints against him had been handled properly through normal channels, they would never have reached the two admirals who ultimately agreed to relieve him of his command: Rear Ad. D.G. Irvine and Rear Adm. T.S. King. However, since they did act on the complaints without checking them out or informing Arnheiter of them, they are equally responsible for a mistake in judgment, Arnheiter feels.

The mistake was apparently procedural as well as judgmental. Vice Admiral Thomas G. W. Settle points out that under Article C-7801 of the Navy Bureau of Personnel manual, higher commanders (in this case two of the top flag officers in the Pacific fleet) should have first advised Arnheiter of the brewing discontent and attempted to correct the "morale problem" on his ship without precipitously dismissing him.

They should also have verified the allegations of misconduct, by formal or informal investigation. And, if they had suspected that Arnheiter was unfit to command, they should have given him strong command guidance and, in fact, issued him an unsatisfactory report. Arnheiter got none of these. In fact, the only communications he got from his seniors, prior to his dismissal from command, were commendatory in nature.

ADMIRALS OR ARNHEITER?

Why, then, was he not given his day in court? It seems obvious to Arnheiter: The Navy made a mistake and is not willing to undo it where the full weight of censure may well fall on two senior flag officers in the Pacific fleet. It's a question of the admirals or Arnheiter. Not that all the admirals were timorous, not at all.

Adm. Walter H. Baumberger, USN, commander Cruiser Destroyer Force Pacific Fleet, for example, twice recommended that Arnheiter be returned to command. He was twice reversed by higher authorities.

But Adm. Tex Settle summed it all up when he wrote:

"Has the Navy come to such a pass that it will sweep under the rug a junior flag officer's serious error of judgment and dereliction, thereby jeopardizing future commanding officers' confidence in their senior's loyalty and torpedoing reliance upon their senior's carrying out Navy Department directives? Is the Navy no longer 'big' enough, has it no longer enough 'guts' to admit a mistake and redress it?"

A few weeks ago, Adm. Settle added:

"Were I, now, again a ship commanding officer, I could no longer be confident that my seniors would obey Navy Department directives. I would feel in jeopardy of being similarly torpedoed by clandestine complaints of a dissident in my crew. I would feel constrained to 'go easy' in maintaining military discipline in my ship and operating her aggressively in a war zone. My esprit-de-corps and that of my crew would sag."

Settle was invited by the Navy to examine the full record on Arnheiter and comment on it. This past February he did so, recommending strongly "that Arnheiter's relief for cause be not sustained, and that he be ordered to command an Atlantic Fleet ship."

Vice Adm. Lot Ensey, a deputy chief of naval operations, apparently had the same conviction. Comparing Arnheiter to Lord Nelson, he suggested that Arnheiter's actions deserved commendation—not censure. But that was last July.

Since then, events have taken an ironic twist. Arnheiter has been passed over for promotion, but Hardy and Generous—with nothing in their records about the case which they initiated—are up for promotion with their names pending before the Senate.

CHARGES OF MUTINY

Arnheiter has filed charges of mutiny and conspiracy to commit mutiny against them,

and can only hope Congress will act not to advance, but to terminate the careers of two officers who, in Admiral Settle's opinion, are "unfit for commissions in the Navy."

Under ordinary circumstance, an officer such as Lt. Cmdr. Arnheiter would not seek redress in publicity. He would, instead, prefer to work in official channels. But these by his own admission, are not "ordinary circumstances."

When a three-star admiral writes that he is not only "distressed," but "frightened" at the way Arnheiter's case has been handled, there could be cause for alarm.

When a CO of a Navy ship can be relieved in a combat zone area for cause without even being informed of why he is being relieved by his superiors, without being given an opportunity even to make a statement, and without any knowledge of any charges against him, it seems to me that someone in authority should take a good hard look at this sort of procedure. It is something I never encountered in all of my 44 years of service, and it is distressingly disturbing," Sabin said.

COMMANDER ARNHEITER STATES HIS CASE

"First, let me say that I am most reluctant to express any view which might be construed to reflect questionably on the judgments of any of my superiors. However, I would hope that by my firm continued appeal of this case, I may be able to prevent other dissident malcontents elsewhere in the Armed Services from covertly and successfully banding together to cause the removal of their commanding officer in the way that my own relief was engineered.

The official position seems to be that I was removed in accordance with established procedures. However, not only have I contested this but several flag officers, Adms. Libby, Sabin, and Settle, have actively supported my position that I was relieved contrary to lawful, mandatory requirements which were long ago established to safeguard and insulate a commanding officer from just such an experience.

I do not know for certain why. I cannot presume to comment on what motivated a denial to me of basic rights."

Northeast Iowa's Mr. "Politics"

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a personal privilege for me to be able to pay tribute this afternoon to a man who represented northeast Iowa in this body during the 1930's, and who remains today one of the most respected and loved public figures in our area—Fred Biermann of Decorah, Iowa.

Fred Biermann has been active in the life and development of northeast Iowa since he left Harvard Law School in 1908—as Congressman, newspaper publisher, postmaster, U.S. marshal, and political leader as well as an Army officer.

It has been a most rewarding pleasure for me to know him, and to have the invaluable benefit of his experience, counsel, and most importantly his friendship.

Last weekend, the Cedar Rapids Gazette featured an interview with him which I found to be particularly interesting and timely, and include the article at this point in the Record:

FRED BIERMANN OF DECORAH—NORTHEAST IOWA'S MR. "POLITICS"

(By Art Hough)

DECORAH.—Mrs. Woodrow Wilson "caused more harm to this country than any woman that ever lived" says Fred Biermann, 83, who was born a Democrat and has been closely identified with politics most of his life.

Now retired and slowed down by emphysema and feet crippled long ago by X-ray burns, Biermann lives in a red brick house on Mechanic street that was built in 1881. Born in Rochester, Minn., Decorah has been his home since he was four.

A big man—he stands over six feet in his stocking feet—Biermann has been a newspaper publisher, U.S. Congressman, postmaster, U.S. marshal, an army officer, and a park commissioner, as well as a party leader, during his long career.

He met Wilson before he was nominated for President, knew Franklin Roosevelt when Biermann was in congress at the start of the New Deal, and had an acquaintance with John "Cactus Jack" Garner, FDR's first vice-president.

IMPRESSIVE SPEECH

Biermann met Wilson in Des Moines in 1912, when Wilson was circulating for nomination (The Iowa delegation was for Champ Clark), and met him again early in 1916, when President Wilson made a speech on preparedness.

"It was the most impressive speech I ever listened to," Biermann recalls.

"There was great interest in his recent bride. Every woman in Decorah asked me to pay special attention to her."

"No, it was nonsense that she dominated Wilson," he declared, "but in his illness she determined who would see him."

"She caused more harm to this country than any woman that ever lived. Congress was considering the League of Nations. She sifted out who would see him, she and Admiral Grayson (his personal physician)."

"If he (Wilson) had compromised even a little bit, the League would not have been rejected by congress."

"If we had joined, there wouldn't have been the second World war."

It is Biermann's belief that the League of Nations would have held Hitler down and that the U.S. would have helped prevent the war if it had had some say in Europe.

ROAD AID

Biermann regards Wilson as one of the great Presidents, recalling that "Wilson gave us the Federal Reserve bank and federal aid to roads. Before 1918, every state scrambled its own roads. To get federal aid they had to follow a government system instead of a hodge-podge."

"The Federal Reserve act preserved our banking system."

Fred Biermann was graduated from Decorah high school in 1901, attended the University of Minnesota for three years and was graduated from Columbia college in New York in 1905. He attended Valder Business college in Decorah for a year and studied law at Harvard in 1907-1908.

Between Columbia and Harvard he homesteaded in North Dakota.

"I didn't know what I wanted to do, so I went out and homesteaded."

Still not sure what he wanted to do after Harvard, Biermann bought half of the Decorah Journal in 1908 (the other half in 1911) and ran it 23 years in a Republican town which had three Republican newspapers in competition. He sold out in 1931.

"Democrats were scarce and persecuted," he says. "It was tough sledding for years. Job work and advertising was bought on a party basis."

Biermann became active in politics and was Winneshiek county chairman for 25 years, at various times, as well as a member of the Democratic state central committee for eight years.

WORLD WAR I

During this period he saw service in World War I. He volunteered in April, 1917, and served in this country and in France until June, 1919. He was a first lieutenant in the army at the time of his discharge.

From 1913 until 1923, with time out for war service, he was Decorah's postmaster.

He was a member of the Decorah park commission from 1922 until 1968. During this time, the Decorah park system developed from one park of 43 acres to eight parks of 328 acres, with 3 miles of river front.

Biermann was elected to Congress from the old Fourth District in 1932, 1934, and 1936, but was defeated in 1938.

He went to Congress in the first Roosevelt landslide and he remembers that first 100 days of the Roosevelt administration "were bedlam."

CHARMING

Biermann was on the committee on agriculture and admits he had a "tiny bit to do with agriculture legislation," notably the old AAA.

"FDR was a charming man personally, a very able speaker. He accomplished some great things."

Asked whether it was true that Roosevelt was sometimes ruthless, as well as charming, Biermann replied:

"I have no personal knowledge of anything like that."

Mrs. Biermann, the former Adel Rygg of Decorah, whom Biermann married in 1930, accompanied him to Washington. Mrs. Biermann died in 1963.

Without the aid of TV or radio and with no speaking aids, Biermann made his 1934 campaign on crutches, due to his foot ailment, hit most of the towns in the district.

In 1937, Congress sent Biermann to Paris as a delegate to the Inter-Parliamentary Union conference.

MARSHAL

Biermann found it a "pleasant change to get back to Decorah" after his years in Washington, but from 1940-53, he served as the U.S. marshal for northern Iowa.

"There was only one murder (under federal jurisdiction). An Indian on the Tama reservation murdered another Indian—due to drinking."

It was then illegal for Indians to buy alcoholic liquor. The government has since made it legal, but Biermann thinks it was a mistake.

Asked whether he has been more or less retired since 1953, Biermann said:

"More."

When the Decorah Elks celebrated the lodge's 100th anniversary a couple of weeks ago, Biermann was presented with a 55-year pin. He also has a 50-year pin from the Masonic lodge, having been a member for 56 years. He was marshal of the Decorah Centennial parade in 1949.

He was a delegate to the Democratic national conventions of 1928, 1940, and 1956. In 1928, Al Smith was nominated and in 1956 Adlai Stevenson was named for President. Both were defeated. In 1940 Biermann backed Jim Farley for the presidential nomination, being against a third term for FDR. Roosevelt, of course, was re-nominated.

THE 1968 RACE

Biermann has no doubt about the outcome of the 1968 presidential election. He says:

"Johnson will be re-nominated easily and reelected. I suppose the Republican candidate will be Nixon. He's the best qualified of the Republicans. But he'll run No. 2 again and it won't be as close as it was when he ran against Kennedy."

"There was more bitter opposition to Lincoln in 1864 than there is to Johnson now. The Republicans haven't any outstanding candidate or possible candidate."

Biermann added that a President has never

been defeated in the middle of a war, not even an undeclared war.

"We can figure our Presidents will try to do the right thing—Republican or Democrat."

Foreign Aid Pays Off for United States

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe, on February 25, by a veteran reporter of the Globe, Otto Zausmer. Mr. Zausmer has been foreign affairs expert of the Globe for many years. He wrote on economics and was a newspaper editor in Vienna before World War II. During the war he was stationed in London where he served as the deputy chief of the Office of War Information in the Intelligence Section.

Mr. Zausmer is very well qualified to write on the subject of foreign aid and his incisive, pertinent article deserves the careful consideration of all the Members of the House. I am happy to place it in the RECORD:

FOREIGN AID PAYS OFF FOR UNITED STATES: NATIONS WE HELPED ARE NOW ABLE TO HELP OTHERS

(By Otto Zausmer)

Why couldn't the United States just scrap its foreign aid program—and after all these scandals, instances of corruption, graft and waste, use the \$3 billion for a good purpose at home?

The answer is simple: because there are few better investments this nation has ever made than the money spent on foreign aid.

A few weeks from now, in April to be exact, it will be 20 years since this country started the Marshall Plan at the cost of a little under \$20 billion. These huge funds, except for a small contribution from Canada, were exclusively American taxpayers' money.

The United States distributed this enormous pie among the hungry, war-impoverished nations, who were practically facing chaos and catastrophe in 1948.

Today, Washington pays roughly half the foreign aid bill to needy nations, while the other half is contributed by those countries who were recipients in 1948.

In other words, about as many countries as depended on the United States for assistance two decades ago are now giving assistance to several dozens of poor nations around the globe.

More than that, while American foreign aid has been cut back consistently year after year—and rightly so—foreign aid of the one-time "have-nots," who are "haves" now, has increased consistently year after year.

In Europe, in fact, there is an amazing enthusiasm for giving foreign aid to underdeveloped countries. The Norwegian Parliament, for example, has been nudging the government, again and to increase aid to other countries—unlike the Congress in Washington.

The West German Minister of Economics, Prof. Karl Schiller, a few days ago, made it clear that "my government and the German people share the cares and efforts of the developing countries. Our destiny is theirs. We know that nobody can withdraw to a 'splendid isolation' of national prosperity. We, the older industrialized and the developing lands, are living in one world."

NO CUTS IN BRITISH AID

Britain, in spite of all her much advertised economic problems, has year after year

held fast to her foreign aid program without cuts.

France has perhaps the biggest foreign aid program in Europe, primarily directed at former French colonies. It is true, of course, that the French foreign aid program is a little different from the Marshall Plan.

In the words of French Prime Minister Pompidou, it is meant to spread French culture. It is also true that the tiny island of San Pierre and Miquelon receive the fantastic amount of \$400 per capita for what might be considered somewhat political purposes. It is furthermore true that there are some 40,000 French teachers in Africa alone as part of the foreign aid program with its cultural overtones.

But, this does not mean that these French teachers are not most helpful and that regardless of the purpose behind the program, its effect should be underrated.

Japan, too, the one-time bad boy in world affairs, has demonstrated considerable enthusiasm and sacrifice to lend underdeveloped nations her assistance.

Why all this activity and brotherly love?

The meaning is obvious. Germany's Minister of Economics, Karl Schiller, put it somewhat more rhetorically when he said, "our destiny is theirs. We know that nobody can withdraw to a 'splendid isolation' of national prosperity."

"HELPED EUROPE TO BUY SHOES"

One of the original leaders of the Marshall Plan put it more simply just 20 years ago.

"It's just like this," he said, "we have played with our European friends and we have won. We have all the marbles now and the game is over, they can't play anymore unless we give them a few marbles to start all over again. If we don't help them to get on their feet, they won't be able to buy from us."

He might also have quoted one of the toughest capitalists of this century, the Czech shoe manufacturer, Thomas Bata, who built his shoe empire all over the world, and used to say that "so long as there are barefoot people in Africa, I don't have to worry about selling my shoes."

What the Marshall Plan did was to help the Europeans "buy shoes" in this country. And, what the now prosperous, one time "have nots" are doing is to help the underdeveloped countries "buy shoes."

Of course, there are flaws and failures in foreign aid. Only within a week we have heard from Washington about abuse of U.S. foreign aid in Brazil and about the purchase of wine glasses and liquor with U.S. aid money in the Dominican Republic. In the latter instance, for example, the amount thus misappropriated was about one percent of what Uncle Sam contributed to the Dominican Republic.

Of course, even one hundredth of one percent would be too much mispent, but it would be a rare big business cooperation in which one could not find funds being poorly spent.

STILL ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

The main point in this unjustifiable waste of American money, however, is that it was the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of State which reported the abuse to Congress. In other words, the administration itself is and has been eager to detect and eliminate dishonesty or waste.

It cannot and should not be denied, also that in many instances, foreign aid could have been used more imaginatively and more effectively. There, too, is much room for improvement.

But, while the administration of foreign aid here or abroad may leave something to be desired, the idea of foreign aid has more than proved itself.

What Uncle Sam started single handedly in 1948 has now been taken up by a score of the former "have nots" and even the Soviet

Union has found it imperative to initiate a vast foreign aid program.

It might well be that the Marshall Plan will go into history as the most creative, political, economic scheme of the 20th century. If nowhere else, in foreign aid it has been demonstrated that there are no iron curtains, that there is one world only, that foreign aid is not charity but well understood interest and security and prosperity.

Private Enterprise: Launching of ST "Overseas Alice"

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the administration might well learn a lesson from private enterprise—nonsubsidized—regarding the value and cost of keeping a fleet of ships up to date. For several years many of us have been emphasizing the need for a modern, adequate maritime fleet. The past several administrations, for economy reasons, have not pushed such a program.

Last Thursday it was my privilege to attend the launching of the ST *Overseas Alice*, at the Bethlehem shipyard in Baltimore. This 660-foot, automated, air-conditioned oil tanker, designed for easy conversion to the grain trade, is the first of three ships to be constructed for the Maritime Overseas Corp.

The sponsor was Mrs. Isaac Shalom, whose son is a director of the Maritime Overseas Corp. Mr. Shalom spoke at the launching and I think his remarks deserve careful reading by all members. It seems to me that Mr. Shalom has the answer for those who feel we cannot afford to update our merchant fleet. His remarks follow:

SPEECH BY S. SHALOM

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure for us to be here on this Washington's Day after the successful launching of the *Overseas Alice*. My primary function today is, of course, to thank Mr. Raphael Recanat and Bethlehem Steel Corporation for the honor given to my mother in inviting her to launch this fine vessel. For this, my family and I are deeply grateful.

But since I am also a Director of Maritime Overseas Corporation, I am not going to let you get away without telling you something about MOC.

Let me first say that today's event is only the first of three similar ones scheduled to take place within the next few months. Besides, the *Overseas Alice* is by no means our first postwar vessel built by Bethlehem yard, since two of MOC's tankers were already built right here in Baltimore by Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation.

As most of you well know, the U.S. tanker fleet is in a poor state. It has declined appreciably in relation to the world fleet and it is at least twice as old as aggregate world tonnage. In fact, the *Overseas Alice* and her two sister ships will be the first tankers built in a U.S. shipyard for an independent owner without government subsidy in the last decade. And—if I may be permitted to gloat about MOC for a moment—these three tankers will bring the MOC fleet to a total of 18 vessels aggregating about half a million deadweight tons which—among other things—establishes MOC as one of the largest inde-

pendent operators of U.S. tankers with an average age of less than five years compared with fifteen years for the U.S. tanker fleet as a whole.

For MOC, dynamic expansion has been the best formula for survival and growth. As those of you who are concerned with this type of operation well know, the tanker trade is highly competitive. MOC is required to engage in fierce price competition where a difference of a few cents on the freight rate will determine who will carry the entire cargo. Accordingly, the success of MOC in such a market depends on the extent to which it can maximize the efficiency of its operation and the productivity of its capital equipment. And fully recognizing this, since its establishment in 1953, MOC has constantly strived to replace older units with newer, more efficient, and more adaptable vessels. In this way MOC was able to achieve productivity levels commensurate with healthy and growing operations. This is evidenced by the fact that over 80% of MOC's currently operating tanker tonnage was built in the 1960s.

With the *Overseas Alice* and her two sister ships, MOC now introduces its newest generation of U.S. tankers. These vessels are designed for economical operation, superior service, and a maximum degree of flexibility. They are provided with engine room and bridge automation, and they are specially coated internally and externally. MOC hopes that these features will increase operating efficiency; minimize maintenance expenditure and down time for repairs; and enhance the vessels' ability to shift rapidly and economically between different cargoes and in different trades. I am confident that the future will prove us right.

In conclusion, in behalf of the vessel owners and Maritime Overseas Corporation, I wish to thank the Management and Workers of Bethlehem Shipyard, as well as all those who have participated in the conception, design, and construction of the *Overseas Alice* and her sister ships.

Travel Under Tourist-Dollar Program Should Be Exempt From Travel Tax

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to urge that travel financed under the existing tourist-dollar exchange program be exempted from any tax or restriction on U.S. travel this House may enact; and, further, that travel be exempted in other countries which participate in the debt-credit arrangement which I will outline in this statement.

As a result of an amendment to Public Law 480, which I initiated in 1962, and two subsequent amendments of similar nature, U.S. visitors—business as well as tourist—to Israel, India, Pakistan, Tunisia, Egypt, Ceylon, or Guinea may purchase from the local American embassy a supply of U.S.-owned local currencies equal to their needs while in that country.

The local currencies available for purchase were acquired by the United States in connection with Public Law 480 transactions. The exchange is entirely voluntary, and occurs only when U.S. visitors take the trouble to visit the embassy and

utilize this means of easing our balance-of-payments situation.

Under this voluntary program, visitors to these countries purchased a total of \$7,235,300 in local currencies between the inauguration of the program in 1963 and November 30, 1967.

Purchases and the amount of currencies still remaining available for purchase on November 30, 1967, as reported by the U.S. Treasury Department:

	Purchases through November 1967	Balance available for purchase
India.....	\$4,558,700	\$4,439,200
Israel.....	821,800	8,575,000
Pakistan.....	1,551,000	1,062,600
Egypt.....	286,100	91,048,200
Ceylon.....	8,900	81,700
Tunisia.....	8,800	1,218,000
Guinea.....		6,033,600
Total.....	7,235,300	112,458,500

To the extent that this program is utilized, U.S. travel in those countries does not impair the U.S. balance-of-payments position in any way whatever. Indeed, under it U.S. citizens enjoy the advantage of travel and thereby make use of currencies which are certified to to excess—or, in a practical sense, otherwise useless.

It therefore makes no sense to impose penalties upon such travel or to discourage it in any way. I therefore strongly urge that it be exempted from any tax or proposed restriction this House may enact.

In addition to the \$112,458,500 presently available for tourist-dollar exchange, the United States has agreements with a number of other countries where this same program could readily be established.

Bolivia, Morocco, Paraguay, and Sudan are each classified by the U.S. Treasury as "near excess" currency countries because our holding of Public Law 480 currencies in each country is considered to be nearly in excess of the anticipated requirements of U.S. Government operations there.

In each case, the local government has already agreed to cooperate in the tourist-dollar exchange program, and currencies, in varying amounts, are available for this purpose. But due to the "near excess" classification our Government has not yet inaugurated the exchange.

Under Public Law 480 agreements already consummated, local currencies are available for exchange in "near-excess" countries under the tourist dollar program in the following amounts:

Bolivia.....	\$1,100,000
Congo**.....	4,000,000
Morocco.....	4,000,000
Sudan.....	1,000,000
Paraguay.....	*
Total.....	10,100,000

* Less than \$50,000.

**Congo is classified as "excess-currency" country.

In 16 additional countries, the program has likewise been accepted by the local government and could be put into operation on short notice. In each case

the holdings of local currencies are such that the country is classified as "non-excess" and therefore the U.S. Treasury has not seen fit to inaugurate the exchange program.

In view of the alarming monetary plight of our Nation, it would seem prudent for the U.S. Treasury to review these classifications and inaugurate the exchange program in every possible country, even though this might use up U.S.-owned local currencies somewhat earlier than would otherwise be the case.

Under present circumstances, the United States should seek conversion of foreign currencies into dollars at the very earliest date. It may be that planned U.S. programs will eventually use up the stockpiles of currencies, but the need for immediate improvement in our payments balance is so evident that currency needs for future programs could wisely be reviewed and met when the need or request for them actually occurs.

Meanwhile, the currencies should be available for immediate conversion to dollars by means of tourist-dollar exchange.

Under Public Law 480 transactions already consummated, local currencies are available and approved for tourist-dollar exchange in these "nonexcess" countries but our Government has not implemented the program.

Local currencies available for U.S. use on January 1, 1967 (but tourist-exchange not implemented)

Afghanistan.....	\$300,000
Brazil***.....	*
Chile.....	2,400,000
China.....	2,800,000
Colombia.....	*
Ethiopia.....	400,000
Ghana.....	600,000
Greece.....	400,000
Iceland.....	100,000
Jordan.....	*
Korea.....	1,100,000
Peru.....	*
Syrian Arab Republic***.....	100,000
Turkey***.....	2,600,000
Uruguay.....	*
Vietnam.....	4,100,000
Total.....	14,900,000

*Less than \$50,000.

***Classified as "near-excess" currency country.

To summarize currencies available for existing tourist-dollar exchange program:

U.S.-owned local currencies presently available for purchase in a total of seven countries by U.S. tourists and other U.S. travelers under the tourist-dollar exchange program.....	\$112,458,500
Available for purchase in five additional "excess or near-excess currency" countries under the program but not implemented as yet by U.S. Treasury.....	10,100,000
Available for purchase in 16 additional countries which have approved the program but where U.S. Treasury has not implemented it because countries are classified as "nonexcess currency" countries.....	14,900,000
Twenty-eight countries.....	137,458,500

In three "excess currency" countries, the tourist-dollar exchange program has not been approved by the local government, as follows:

Local currencies available for U.S. use on January 1, 1967 (but tourist-exchange not approved)

Burma	\$11,100,000
Poland	486,700,000
Yugoslavia	49,000,000
Total	546,800,000

Yugoslavia, in lieu of entering into the program several years ago, agreed to purchase with dollars \$250,000 in U.S.-owned local currency. In view of the heavy level of U.S. tourist and business travel to Yugoslavia and the heavy inventory of U.S.-owned currency, this would seem to be a bargain much to the advantage of Yugoslavia. It would be interesting to determine just why this compromise was accepted by our officials in consummating the Public Law 480 soft-currency transaction in question.

In 33 other countries our Government has local currency holdings, most of them acquired under postwar programs other than Public Law 480, and under conditions which make the currencies of little or no prospective value to the United States.

Here is the inventory, as of January 1, 1967:

[In millions of dollars]

Afghanistan	2.4
Australia	.1
Belgium	.1
Cambodia	.3
Cameroon	.1
Chile	9.4
China	7.7
Costa Rica	.1
Cyprus	.4
Czechoslovakia	1.0
Dominican Republic	.6
Ecuador	.1
Ethiopia	1.1
Ghana	4.1
Greece	.4
Guatemala	.3
Iceland	.2
Iran	2.0
Italy	6.5
Japan	25.2
Jordan	.4
Korea	1.1
Laos	4.5
Libya	.1
Mali	1.5
Nigeria	.1
Peru	2.2
Philippines	5.4
Senegal	.3
Somali	.1
South Africa	.1
Thailand	1.3
Vietnam	32.6
Total	111.8

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that, in formulating legislation on travel tax or restriction, the House exempt travel which utilizes the tourist-dollar exchange program; further, that the Treasury Department inaugurate the tourist-dollar exchange program in each of the 21 countries where the program has been accepted by the local government and where the United States owns currencies.

In my view, the monetary crisis is so grave that this should be done regardless

of whether our Government considers our holdings of local currency to be excess, near-excess or non-excess. If the United States owns local currencies in any of these countries they should be made available to U.S. visitors.

In addition, I urge that travel in countries which cooperate in a debt-credit or currency-credit arrangement be exempted.

Under this proposal, the local Government would be required to redeem with dollars \$5 worth of U.S.-owned local currency—or apply a like amount on past-due debts—for each day a U.S. citizen travels in that country.

I have just listed 33 countries in which the United States now owns \$111,800,000 in local currency. In addition a number of countries owe us large sums dating from World War I. To illustrate, Britain owes \$7 billion, France \$5 billion, Germany \$1 billion and Italy \$1 billion.

U.S. travelers abroad spend an average of \$18 a day. This is attractive business to any country. Because of this, most countries would give careful thought to cooperating in the debt-credit or currency-credit arrangement, in order to keep dollars from U.S. travel coming in. Even with the \$5 adjustment, representing the redemption of U.S.-owned currency or payment on old debts to the United States, the local country would still realize an appealing net of \$13 per day per U.S. visitor.

Most travelers will naturally seek to avoid taxes and will therefore travel where they can do so tax-free. Travel under the existing tourist-dollar program would not impair our balance-of-payments at all.

Travel under the proposed currency-credit or debt-credit arrangement would substantially ease the adverse monetary impact of U.S. travel abroad and would have the further virtue of causing other governments to unfreeze a portion of presently useless U.S. currency holdings or begin a modest payment on long-overdue debt. Either development would be propitious, and serve as a precedent for further unfreezing of currency and debt payment in time to come.

These exemptions would also protect, to an important extent, the basic right of individual U.S. citizens to travel abroad without penalty.

The debt-credit or currency-credit arrangement I suggest could be administered in any of several ways. To me, the most efficient arrangement would be settlement of accounts when the U.S. traveler returns. On checking through customs, he would pay the per diem tax for travel in countries not cooperating in either the tourist-dollar, or in the currency-credit and debt-credit arrangement.

For travel in other countries customs officials would establish the correct dollar claim to be paid by the appropriate governments. When the government-to-government account is paid, credit would be made against U.S. holdings of local currencies or other obligations to the United States. Travel could be verified by passport endorsements or other documentation approved by mutual agreement.

If the Congress should decide against reporting a bill taxing or restricting U.S. travel abroad, I hope it will give consideration to a proposal I made to you 3 years ago—H.R. 6474, 89th Congress.

At that time I noted that the tourist-dollar exchange program, like today, was not being utilized nearly to the maximum extent, and suggested that travelers be given an incentive to use it.

My suggestion was that travelers making full use of this program be given a bonus in tax-free allowance for goods brought back to this country. This would give them a special incentive to visit countries where the program is in operation and there to take the trouble to utilize the program.

Funds used for the bonus purchases would be U.S.-owned local currencies, so the tax-free bonus would not actually be a dollar-loss to the U.S. Treasury.

Here is the operative part of H.R. 6474, 89th Congress:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That item 915.30 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, Aug. 17, 1963; 77A Stat. 434; 19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting after "acquired abroad as an incident of the journey from which he is returning," the following: "and articles other than alcoholic beverages and cigars, not over \$500 in aggregate value acquired with currencies of the countries in which such articles were purchased, if such currencies were sold to such person by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 104(s) or section 104(t) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704)."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to articles purchased with currencies sold after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Unless by some means the United States motivates travelers to utilize the tourist-dollar exchange program, a valuable opportunity to improve our balance-of-payments position will be lost.

President Received Bad Advice on Eliminating Visas for Alien Visitors

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from a constituent whose occupation places him in a position of having firsthand knowledge of the immigration practices of the United States. I think the observations of this gentleman should be brought to the attention of not only the President, but to all Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent I include this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the letter, which is self-explanatory, follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1968.

HON. THOMAS PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I recently read in a local newspaper that President Johnson is re-

questing Congress to give him authority to eliminate the need for alien visitors to this country to obtain visas from American Consuls abroad. His argument in behalf of the request is that it will promote tourist trade to this country and help our balance of payments deficit.

Mr. Pelly, that scheme is all wrong. I am an Immigrant Inspector and have been for many years and I and hundreds of other Immigrant Inspectors know that the average alien non-immigrant to this country costs Americans more than the alien brings in. Most of the aliens arrive here with very few funds and while here live off their relatives and friends and very often return home with more money than they arrived with. And a big percentage of them obtain jobs here against the law and, if they return home, take money with them. A lot of alien students, especially, are working. Some of them send money home, while if, as was the intent of the law, they were required to obtain their funds to attend school here from home, it would help our money situation. The alien student program, incidentally, is terribly abused in several respects.

Another point the President should consider is that, if travel agencies are permitted to control permission to visit in the U.S., as proposed, it would open up big opportunities for them to take fees on the side.

The President has obtained bad information on this matter. Actually, it would be in the best interests of this country to cut down on admitting non-immigrants, and, even more so, to drastically reduce immigration, rather than increase it, as the elimination of quotas effective July 1, 1968, is going to do. I doubt that you will recognize the area you represent ten years from now after the flood of Asian immigrants that is going to start in July. But that is another story. I do hope for now that you will check into the matter of admitting non-immigrants to the United States.

Sincerely yours,

Americanism

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to submit for readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by Robert C. Machado, commander, Disabled American Veterans, Department of California, at the past commander's night meeting of San Jose chapter 11 and auxiliary, Disabled American Veterans, on February 21, 1968:

AMERICANISM

(Address by Robert C. Machado, commander, Disabled American Veterans, Department of California at Past Commander's Night meeting of San Jose Chapter 11 and Auxiliary, Disabled American Veterans, February 21, 1968)

In his farewell address to the people of the United States, on September 17, 1796, George Washington—whose birthday we commemorate tomorrow—said, "It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the Foreign world."

It is interesting to note that he emphasized "portion" . . . of the foreign world. In today's terms, this would mean foreign doctrines and opinions. We cannot serve two masters—be an American and believe in a

foreign philosophy too, there is room only for 100 per cent Americans—wholly and completely FOR America.

That is Americanism.

And as Theodore Roosevelt said, there can be no fifty-fifty Americanism.

Today, we are seeing too much of this allegiance to so-called "one world." International communism wants nothing better than to lull Americans into the liberal philosophy that ALL nations are aiming at the same goal, a true and lasting universal peace.

Believing that myth has given too many Americans—especially those misguided protesters of today—a false security that will ultimately make good Russia's Lenin's prediction that capitalism will destroy itself from within, and become enslaved to the chains of communism.

There are a number of opinions as to our country's policy and position in South East Asia.

On this score, I would like to relate a few observations. I am thinking in particular of those who desecrate our flag, the draft-card burners and others who confuse freedom and Americanism. They are of general concern to all members of the Disabled American Veterans and to all Americans who cherish and understand the full dimensions of freedom.

Let me say first that no one, surely, understands better than you how precious is the right to dissent. We also recognize that our institutions have been carefully framed to accommodate all kinds of utterly opposing viewpoints—including merits of our Vietnam policy. It so happens that the Disabled American Veterans is pledged to support our policy in Vietnam—and we are proud to be counted in that category. But we recognize the right to those in opposition to disagree.

What we do not recognize—what we do condemn—what we view with disgust and outrage—are the antics of those who abuse their freedom, make a mockery of their rights and who subvert the whole meaning of liberty.

Let there be no confusion about the identity of these willful delinquents: I am talking about the so-called demonstrators who burn their draft cards, vilify the sacrifices of American soldiers, desecrate our flag, sit in at the Pentagon and, in other childish acts and protests, render aid and comfort to the enemies of everything we hold dear.

No single right of citizenship exists without a corresponding responsibility. Freedom is not a license. The right of one individual cannot be equated as outweighing the rights of many individuals.

This great fight cannot and will not be sustained, if citizens cannot walk their streets in safety, if our storekeepers are terrorized by criminals, if our police are insulted and criticized for doing their duty, if—in short—something is not done—and done soon—to insure law and order.

Kooks and cowards have a right to their kookiness and a right to be cowardly in the privacy of their own kennels. They have no right to cripple the progress of our nation and the pursuit of its legitimate policies in peace as well as war.

A man who burns his draft card or who counsels others to do so is in clear violation of the law of the land and must be prosecuted.

If there is no law to prohibit burning of the American Flag, there definitely ought to be. The flag is more than a piece of silk or cloth. It is a symbol of all we honor and cherish.

We will all rise and pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

The pledge we have just taken, restates the words and thinking of our country's great statesmen, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and others, to keep America free

and Americanism alive, remain loyal Americans first, last and always.

Thank you.

Three Marylanders Die in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Everett Justice, Jr., L. Cpl. Louis W. Kalb, and WO Millard E. Price, Jr., three fine men from Maryland, were recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend their bravery and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM—JUSTICE, KALB, PRICE KILLED IN COMBAT, ACCIDENTS

The Defense Department announced yesterday the deaths of three more Maryland servicemen in Vietnam. They were:

Pfc. Everett Justice, Jr., of Mount Airy, 17, who was killed in combat February 17.

Lance Cpl. Louis W. Kalb, 18, of the 400 block South Lehigh street, who was killed February 14 at Quang Tri, in a grenade explosion.

Warrant Officer Millard E. Price, Jr., 42, of Salisbury, who was killed in a helicopter crash January 8.

The Defense Department also announced the death in combat of Staff Sgt. Luther Page, Jr.

Sergeant Page, who lived most of his life in San Francisco, was the husband of Mrs. Ruth Page, who was staying with relatives in the 1700 block West Lafayette avenue while her husband was in Vietnam.

Acquaintances said last night that Mrs. Page was on her way back to San Francisco, where funeral arrangements were being made.

She was expected to remain in San Francisco after the funeral, the acquaintances said.

Private Justice was a June, 1967 graduate of Mount Airy High School.

Relatives said last night that he enlisted after graduation and was sent to Vietnam shortly after his basic training.

He was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Justice, of Mount Airy.

Lance Corporal Kalb had enlisted in the Marines last April at the age of 17 and had been on active duty in Vietnam since last September.

Born in Baltimore, he had been a student at Patterson Park High School before his enlistment. At Patterson Park he had been on the varsity swimming team for two years.

SURVIVORS LISTED

Surviving are his mother, Mrs. Ruth Kalb, two sisters, Anna Kalb and Pauline Kalb, and one brother, Charles Kalb, all of the home address. Also surviving is another brother, Petty Officer 3d Class John G. Kalb, of the Navy, who is stationed at Newport, Rhode Island.

Warrant Officer Price, who was a twenty-year veteran of the Marine Corps, had been on his first tour of duty in Vietnam since last June.

Mr. Price is survived by his wife, the former Marion E. Ward, to whom he had been married for eighteen years.

Also surviving are two sons, William Price and Millard E. Price 3d, and a daughter, Julie, all of the home address; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Millard E. Price, Sr., of Chance, Md.; and three sisters, Mrs. Dorothy Waller, also of Chance; Mrs. Sarah Vincent, of Cambridge, Md.; and Mrs. Rebecca Ringgold, of Stevensville, Md.

Lithuanian Independence

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the long tradition of the House and its annual public recognition of the national holiday of Americans of Lithuanian descent, I take great pride in bringing to the attention of our colleagues two resolutions which were adopted in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence.

While the resolutions of the Linden branch of the Lithuanian-American Council and of the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker, it is important to recognize in each the unflagging spirit of freedom, the continued determination of free men to work for the restoration of freedom and independence in their homeland. It is this spirit and this determination which has helped to keep America free and which shines so brightly as a symbol of hope to those nations still suffering oppression.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 4, 1968, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN, N.J., BRANCH FOR COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was formally declared a free and independent State by the Council of Lithuania in Vilnius; and

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian origin, commemorating this year the 50th anniversary of the establishment of a free and independent Lithuania, strongly emphasize the fact, that the years of independent government fully proved and justified the nation's integrity for self-government and completed warranted credence and recognition as a free and independent state, accorded her by the other world nations; and

Whereas the Americans of Lithuanian descent hope that Lithuania, presently occupied by the communist Soviets, will again regain the rights of freedom and liberty as a sovereign nation; and

Whereas now, more than ever it has been indicated that no nation is secure from the ominous threat of a dictatorial communism, now bolstered by scientific technology which may be utilized for further harassment of world peace; Therefore, be it

Resolved, that we Americans of Lithuanian descent are determined and united to uphold the efforts of the Lithuanian people to regain their independence and liberation; and

Resolved that we declare, as in the past, our appreciation of the United States policy of non-recognition of the incorporation by force of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union; and

representatives of our Government will firmly maintain this policy at any future deliberations regarding the status of the enslaved nations; and

Resolved that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Lyndon B. Johnson, to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, to the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, to the United States Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case

and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, to the Representatives of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Congressional Districts of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer and the Honorable Cornelius E. Gallagher and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA,

President.

STASYS VAICIUNAS,

Secretary.

MARGARITA SAMATAS,

Chairman of Resolutions Committee.

RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY

The delegates of Lithuanian organizations of New Jersey, representing 60 thousand loyal citizens and permanent residents of the United States of America, gathered on this 11th day of February, 1968 at the Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, New Jersey, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuanian Independence; Resolve:

1. To renew their solemn protest against the usurpation by the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the transformation of the once progressive and prosperous Baltic States into colonies of the Soviet Union.

2. To ask the governments of the free world, and especially that of the United States, to undertake all ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination in the Baltic countries.

3. To request the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to demand that the abolishment of Soviet rule in the Baltic States be included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

4. To request the U.S. delegation to ask the United Nations to put an end to inhuman practices of the Soviet government in the Baltic States.

5. To draw the attention of newly emerged nations of Africa and Asia to the evils of Soviet colonialism in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

6. To renew the dedication of the peoples of the Baltic nations to the cause of liberty and to reaffirm their dedication to continue together with other captive nations of East-Central Europe the struggle against Soviet occupation and oppression.

7. To demand that the Soviets return Lithuania's beautiful Cathedral of Vilnius to the people for worship, rather than maintaining it as a pagan museum.

Newark, New Jersey, February 11, 1968.

VALENTINAS MELINIS,

President.

A. S. TRECIOKAS,

Secretary.

Foreign Investment Controls Questioned

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article by the noted Washington financial writer of the Chicago Tribune, Louis Dombrowski, which appeared in the February 28 edition of that newspaper, and which raises very valid and timely questions on segments of the President's proposed foreign investment controls:

FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROLS QUESTIONED

(By Louis Dombrowski)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Now that the initial shock of President Johnson's New Year's balance of payments program has

worn off, a number of legal questions are being raised on the validity of the executive order establishing mandatory controls on new investments abroad.

President Johnson based his order and authority on the national emergency proclamation of former President Harry S. Truman in 1950 and the World War I trading with the enemy act.

The World War I law which has been amended several times since 1917, provides that authority under the act may be exercised in "time of war during any other period of national emergency declared by the President."

BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

However, Johnson did not issue his own national emergency proclamation to invoke the 50-year-old statute. Instead, he issued an executive order.

The order did not declare that the balance of payments problem has resulted in a national emergency, or declare any new emergency.

It did state, however, that it was being issued "in view of the continued existence of the national emergency" declared by President Truman in 1950, and in view of "the importance of strengthening the balance of payments position . . . during this national emergency."

Truman's proclamation was related principally to our military effort in Korea. In fact, there was no balance of payments problem at the time. The United States gold stocks were at their highest level in history.

EARLIER INTERPRETATION

The main thrust of the 1950 proclamation emphasized an emergency "which requires that the military, naval, air, and civilian defenses of this country be strengthened as speedily as possible" to carry out our military effort in Korea and maintain national security.

Among the questions being asked now are: Is the national emergency declaration issued 18 years ago a valid basis for invoking controls to deal with the balance of payments problem?

Assuming that a given national emergency situation ceases to exist at some point, does the emergency proclamation expire at the same point?

Does the emergency declaration referred to in the 1917 act mean any emergency declaration without regard for its relevancy to the purpose for which it is used?

MUST FIND POWERS

Legal analysts have long contended—and have the support of the United States Supreme court—that "emergency does not create powers."

Assuming that the 1950 declaration of emergency is still valid, the President must still find his powers in the statutes, the analysts said, although an emergency declaration can make a statutory power operative.

It is pointed out that the trading with the enemy act is, in general, a prohibitory statute. Some legal authorities question whether the law authorizes an affirmative order requiring a person "to bring back foreign earnings to the United States." In fact, they point out, the act does not use the term "repatriation."

TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS QUESTIONED

Although the powers of the 1917 act are indeed broad, President Johnson's legislative proposal to control foreign travel also is posing questions of legality.

The 1917 act authorizes the President to "regulate, or prohibit any transaction in foreign exchange . . . and the importing, exporting . . . of . . . silver coin or . . . currency . . . by any person . . . subject to the jurisdiction of the United States."

Are these powers, including the authority to control foreign exchange transactions by foreign travelers, sufficient to regulate travel outside the western hemisphere?

Congress or the courts will be called upon for the answers.

Edwin O. Reischauer Discusses Future American Role in Asia

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress was honored to have as a witness before the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee, former Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer.

His comments on our dilemma in Vietnam and his suggestions for U.S. policy in the future are worth careful study by all Members of the House. With unanimous consent, I place his statement in the RECORD:

It is a great privilege to appear again before this distinguished Committee, but the task you have assigned me is a very heavy one indeed. I have been asked to give an overall appraisal of the future American role in Asia, particularly in the light of the developing political realities in that vast region. Such an assignment would at any time be extremely difficult; today it is almost impossible because of the great uncertainties that surround the outcome of the war in Vietnam. But the effort must be made, because, if we cannot even formulate in our own minds what a desirable and feasible American role in Asia might be, we can have little hope of extricating ourselves from our present predicament and moving toward a more favorable position.

For the past 18 years, that is, ever since the outbreak of the Korean War, the United States has seen Asia as menaced by a great wave of Communist aggression and subversion and has sought to stop this wave by military action, with a view to giving Asian countries the peace and stability they need to develop economically and politically, with assistance from us and other advanced nations. Not all Asian countries have been ready to accept our military aid and guarantees, and our allies among the advanced nations have for the most part given us only token support in our effort. But we have extended what amounted to unilateral guarantees to several of the less developed countries of Asia and, as in the case of South Vietnam, have tried to live up to these commitments at great cost to ourselves.

This concept of our role in Asia has been well motivated and generous, but the Vietnam War has proved that it is not realistic. The cost in American lives, wealth, national unity, and international prestige and influence has proved far higher than any American administration would knowingly have accepted for the objectives achievable through this war. And even these objectives are now proving to be beyond our reach, while the costs continue to mount.

Despite all our effort and suffering—to say nothing of Vietnamese suffering—it seems unlikely that we shall be able to create a viable, fully non-Communist South Vietnam. An even more important American objective in the war—to show that we could stop so-called “wars of national liberation” and thus discourage further attempts of this sort elsewhere in the world—is even less attainable. In fact, we have already proved the contrary. We have demonstrated that Vietnam alone can so enmesh us militarily that we could not easily meet additional threats of this nature if they broke out now. Another reasonable conclusion for Asians to draw would be that Americans have found

Vietnam so painful that they would not be willing to repeat the experience again elsewhere. In other words, proponents of “wars of national liberation” have probably been encouraged rather than discouraged by the Vietnam War.

We thus are approaching the end of a policy. We need to reappraise the situation in Asia as it now is and will probably develop, what this means in terms of our own national interests, and what we are capable of doing at a bearable cost to better the situation. In short, we need to define for ourselves a new and more effective role.

One hopeful fact is that, although the war in Vietnam has proved our inability to stop “wars of national liberation” at a cost that would make the effort worthwhile, there has been no upsurge of such wars. There may have been some spill-over from Vietnam into nearby areas, such as Laos and Thailand, but the fighting in Laos actually antedates our military involvement in Vietnam, and the insurgency in Thailand is small-scale and fundamentally the product of local conditions in the poverty-stricken northeast of Thailand. Elsewhere in Asia there have been no stirrings in response to the Vietnam War. In fact, in Indonesia the course of history has lain in the opposite direction. The North Korean forays into South Korea have elicited no popular response. Smoldering Communist subversive movements in other countries have not flared up, or, where they have, as in the Philippines, it has been entirely because of local conditions.

If the Communist threat in Asia were primarily one of the foreign aggression or even subversion organized from abroad, this is the time it should have shown up. The United States is militarily tied down, while the Soviet Union and China have committed very little of their resources in Vietnam. But nothing has happened, proving, as some have argued all along, that the Communist threat in Asia is fundamentally internal, not external. It is produced by local discontent, not foreign aggression.

Of course, Communists of all sorts hope that their faith and their system will sweep the world some day, and most of them are probably willing to work toward this end. At the same time, neither the Soviet Union nor China seems to expect to expand Communism in much of Asia by aggression. The Russians, in fact, appear to be more interested in stability in Asia than in revolution, much less war. They would like to avoid situations that run the risk of expanding into a major American-Soviet confrontation, and they show little desire to help spread revolutions that are likely to rebound more to the benefit of their Chinese rivals than to themselves. The Chinese, for their part, believe that Communist revolution will spread largely of itself, and they are so bound down by their own internal confusion and economic weakness and face such uniform suspicion and hostility among surrounding peoples that they have little capability of winning mastery over much of Asia.

The developing Chinese nuclear capacity does not change this situation fundamentally. Neither of the two great nuclear powers can afford to let minor nuclear powers play the game of nuclear aggression or blackmail. Barring a complete collapse of the United States or a breakdown of the nuclear balance with the Soviet Union, any effort by the Chinese to rattle their nuclear weapons at their neighbors will ring very hollow.

Communists, no doubt, will continue to intrigue and attempt to stir up revolutions in Asia, but overt aggression is unlikely. The history of the past fifteen years has also shown that the key to success in subversive movements in Asia is not the degree of foreign instigation and support but the level of local discontent and willingness to participate. The danger to the stability of the less

developed countries of Asia thus is largely from within.

If this is true then the Vietnam War has taught us a very important but sobering lesson. We cannot, at a tolerable cost to ourselves or to the nation involved, meet this sort of internal threat successfully with our own military power. In other words, if an Asian government is not capable of maintaining itself against internal subversion or revolution, we cannot give it the protection it needs.

Our chief advantages in military power are lost or at least seriously reduced in a guerrilla-type war. The might of our military machine may prove too heavy for the local economy. Our resemblance to erstwhile colonial masters as well as the inevitable massiveness of our presence are likely to make our opponents seem more nationalistically pure than the side we support, thus turning nationalism against us. The world as a whole, too, is likely to see our enemies as the pitiful underdog—the David in a fight with an ugly Goliath—while we appear as neo-colonialists and aggressors. These images are even present in American minds, undermining our own resolve.

The chief defense of any regime in Asia against internal subversion and revolution is its own capacity to offer efficient government, economic progress, and hope to its people. Victory almost inevitably goes to the side which wins popular support and confidence. A regime which cannot do this cannot, in the long run, be maintained even by our great power—and probably should not, in any case. The guarantees we offer relieve it of the pressure to reform itself, and, to the extent our military support preserves it, we freeze an unsatisfactory *status quo*, slowing down rather than speeding up the sort of economic, social and political development that alone can build a less developed country into a healthy and stable part of the world.

Our concept of the problems we face in Asia has been wrong, and therefore we have seen ourselves in a mistaken role. On the analogy of our postwar efforts in Europe, we have imagined ourselves as building a military dike against an on-rushing Communist wave. But there has been no wave. The real problem has proved to be the swampy economic and political terrain behind the dike we were attempting to raise. It was the local ground water that was undermining political structures. When this threatened to happen in Vietnam, the heavy machines we brought in to heighten the military dikes proved unmaneuverable in the swampy land and, by breaking through the thin crust of the bog, made it even less capable of maintaining the sagging political structure. Economic land fill would obviously have been more helpful.

The Vietnam War has proved that the United States is not very effective in dike-building in the marshy terrain of the less developed countries of Asia—that is, in giving military protection to a beleaguered regime. But we can be extremely effective in providing land fill—that is, in giving economic and technological aid to Asian countries so that they do not become beleaguered in the first place. One great tragedy of the Vietnam War is that we have so concentrated our efforts on a relatively ineffective military approach to maintaining stability in one small corner of Asia that we are cutting down on the much more effective economic approach almost everywhere else.

Some may feel that the land-fill approach is too slow and uncertain for the urgencies of the situation. I would disagree. We have only very minor national interests at stake in the immediate situation in the less developed countries of Asia. Their resources and trade are not important to us. Their power is little and cannot threaten us. Routes through Asia lead us nowhere we cannot reach more easily by other routes. In fact,

our interests in the area are only long range. On the positive side, we would like to see the countries of Asia develop in wealth and stability so that they will not threaten to disrupt world peace and diminish world prosperity but will instead contribute to both these goals. On the negative side, we would not wish to see any great part of Asia so dominated by a hostile power, such as the Soviet Union or China, that this hostile power gained substantial new strength.

For both these long-range objectives, however, the land-fill approach is more effective than dike-building. This is clearly so for the positive aim of building healthy, independent nations. On the negative side, it seems very doubtful that effective Chinese or Soviet domination of much of the rest of Asia is feasible in the face of the massive problems of poverty, backwardness, and violent nationalistic opposition, and moreover, if such domination were achieved, it seems probable that it would weaken, rather than strengthen, the dominating power. But, if for the sake of argument we assumed that domination by China or the Soviet Union were a real long-range menace in Asia, then the economic land-fill approach would obviously be a more effective defense against it than military action by us, because economic aid makes the local countries stronger and therefore their nationalistic response firmer, while our military intervention tends to push the forces of nationalism into the hands of our opponents.

My emphasis on economic and technological aid rather than military defense does not mean that I feel the United States has no valid military role to play in Asia. Our relationship with Asia is complex, being made up of many specific contacts with and commitments to a great variety of individual nations. No simple rule of thumb can be applied to all. Nor can a great country like ours move precipitately from one role in Asia to another without causing confusion and possibly chaos. Any shift in role must be in terms of specific moves in situations where these moves best apply.

Japan has the bulk of Asia's industrial power and therefore has great potential military power. It is our second greatest trading partner, coming next to our great neighbor Canada, and it has many other mutually beneficial relations with us. It provides the bases that make possible an effective American naval presence in the Western Pacific. As a thoroughly modernized nation, it is not internally unstable or susceptible to subversion. For all these reasons, it is entirely sound—one might say inevitable—that we and the Japanese should be joined in a firm pact of mutual security.

Special considerations of history and geography also make the continuation of American defense commitments to South Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines seem both feasible and advisable. Beyond such specific commitments, an American military presence in the Western Pacific has two other values. It helps support the nuclear umbrella which we tacitly hold over all nations that might be threatened by nuclear attack or blackmail. It also gives us the option in East Asia and the Pacific region to oppose blatant aggression if such should occur. The mere fact that we had this option would, no doubt, go a long way toward deterring any would-be aggressor.

There are, however, many aspects of our present military involvement in Asia from which I believe we should attempt to withdraw. I am speaking of military commitments to less developed countries like Vietnam which can end up by involving us in revolutionary guerrilla wars that we cannot fight effectively. We should be careful not to make more commitments of this sort and should move toward extricating ourselves from those we have made. It would be impossible to say how this can best be done, until the outcome

in Vietnam is clearer than it is at present. But in any case it would not be easy or wise for the United States to back out of commitments already made until there are satisfactory substitutes for the guarantees we have given.

Regional groupings might be one answer, and there have been in recent years hopeful beginnings in regional solidarity in Southeast Asia. International guarantees would probably be even more effective. The people in the less developed countries of Asia as well as our allies and partners in the advanced lands of Japan, Australia, Canada and Western Europe share our long-range interests in the development of independent, prosperous and stable nations throughout Asia. In most cases they also have much greater immediate interests in the peace and stability of the area than we do. For example, South and East Asia constitute an important trading area for Japan; the life-line of her shipping routes passes through the region; and close to half of the energy resources on which Japan lives come from the oil of the Persian Gulf. Western Europe, too, depends on the Middle East and North Africa for three-quarters of the oil it consumes.

One of the greatest tragedies of the go-it-alone role we have been trying to play in Asia is that we have convinced most other nations that they could count on us to do all that reasonably could be done. As a result, they have tended to sit back and watch and, often enough, criticize us. In other words, our overly eager response to the problem of instability in Asia has tended to inhibit the development of a truly international response, which in the long run will probably prove to be the only successful way to approach the problem.

Since this has been, at the request of this Committee, an overall appraisal of our role in Asia, it has inevitably run to broad generalizations. I hope, however, that some of these generalizations may prove helpful in indicating areas in which the specific facts should be more carefully examined. I would be happy to try to answer whatever questions the members of the Committee have regarding either my generalizations or the specific facts in Asia that lie behind them.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations Appalled by Vietnam War Suffering

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a resolution on the Vietnam war by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The concern expressed in this statement for the victims who are suffering in this conflict should be the concern of all men who love justice. I quote from the resolution:

We continue to be horrified by the appalling suffering sustained by all subjected to the ravages of this war.

This resolution reminds us that the justice we seek will not come by any amount of might or power that is being employed in this war on both sides. What is needed, instead, is a genuine effort to seek peace through renewed attempts to negotiate, since such talks must eventually come if this tragedy will ever come to an end. Only when peace comes will the suffering stop. The entire resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS, NOVEMBER 11 TO 16, 1967

VIETNAM

We believe that, while men are capable of great evil, they are as children of God, also capable of creating those processes by which conflict in a world of dynamic change can be peacefully resolved. Furthermore, we believe that the insights of Jewish tradition, the lessons of Jewish experience, the values of Judaism and our own organizational strength are a precious resource in work for a world without war.

We Jews have ever kept before us the ideal that justice emerges "not by might and not by power but by My spirit."

Along with many millions of our fellow Americans, we are deeply troubled in conscience by the involvement of our nation in Vietnam. The war's continued escalation not only increasingly disturbs a growing number of our citizens, drains urgently needed economic resources, and threatens a world war, it also brutalizes and degrades all nations.

We reject the ugly campaign of calumny and vilification which seeks to ascribe to the United States a major responsibility for the creation of the Vietnam problem. Equally do we reject the counsel of those calling for intensified military engagement. We continue to be horrified by the appalling suffering sustained by all subjected to the ravages of this war.

Therefore:

1. We commend President Johnson for his offer of November 11, 1967 to meet negotiators from parties to the conflict on a neutral ship and in neutral waters. This offer is consonant with the proposals contained in the UAHG resolutions of 1965. In view of reports from many sources that a cessation of bombing is a necessary precondition for peace negotiations, we believe that prospects for a successful outcome to the constructive proposal by the President would be facilitated by an immediate cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam.

2. We urge the government of North Vietnam and the NLF to respond favorably to such United States initiatives.

3. We ask the United States government to announce its support for the free entry into the political life of South Vietnam of all political forces, including the NLF.

4. We support the proposal of the President of the United States that the United Nations establish an international peace corps to aid in the reconstruction and development of Vietnam, inviting all nations to recruit for it, and ask him to designate now the international agencies to which the United States will contribute the billion dollars proposed by him to aid the people of South East Asia.

5. We salute the courage and sacrifice of those members of our armed forces now in the service of our country.

Business Looks at Social Problems

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, for several years now I have advocated amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for tax deductions for businesses which engage in training and employing unskilled persons who would otherwise be incapable of obtaining adequate jobs. On January 10, 1967, I introduced H.R. 244 for this specific purpose.

I am pleased to note that Mr. F. D. Hall, the chairman and chief executive officer of Eastern Airlines, advocated a similar program in a speech he gave before the New York Chamber of Commerce on February 1, 1968. It is gratifying to know that American business leaders are willing to cooperate with the Federal Government in meeting the Nation's social problems, and I include in the RECORD portions of Mr. Hall's speech:

An unemployed slum dweller with inadequate training to qualify him for a satisfying job, who cannot earn enough to feed himself and his family, and who lacks the minimum basic decencies of life, is a social and economic liability. When, as recently, he becomes a violent force, destroying the lives and property of innocent and productive Americans, the effect of his liability widens.

So it makes sense, for the good of both stockholders and the general public, for the private sector to step up to social problems, to conserve our assets in people as well as machinery and facilities. It makes sense to prevent unnecessary liabilities. It makes sense for the private sector to become directly involved; we need be neither officeholders nor office-seekers to step up to the challenge and assume leadership in social progress as we now take leadership in scientific and economic progress.

We can take justifiable pride that American business has indeed already begun to respond to the challenge. Two outstanding examples come to mind. The insurance companies of the United States have decided to invest one billion dollars to provide housing in the slums of our cities, and to give the people who live there the opportunity for a better life. And the Ford Motor Company has gone into the ghettos of Detroit to recruit the hard-core unemployed, and has made a largely successful attempt to suspend rigid, formal initial requirements in order to facilitate the hiring of the under-educated and underprivileged.

Others have begun in smaller ways. Last year we at Eastern began what we called Operation Summertime, in which we hired and trained 81 young people from the ghetto areas of New York City, Miami and Washington, D.C. Of these, 79 completed their period of summer employment and 65 have been recommended for full-time employment once they complete their formal education. We intend to step up this program in 1968, with 150 teen-agers participating, and with Atlanta and Chicago added to the list of locations.

But these are only beginnings and the greatest challenges continue to beckon us. Each company must answer in a way for which it is best suited. We in the airline industry, for example, think we do a good job of training people for skilled work—and in integrating the efforts of the relatively unskilled with those of the skilled to weld an effective, harmonious team. Certainly all of us know that training is a basic requirement for our neediest citizens to become productive, hopeful members of our society.

But effective training programs cost money, and we cannot in conscience embark on them without serious consideration of the effect of these costs on the other publics to whom we have obligations—our stockholders, our customers and our present employees. Neither should we fail to recognize that our government has, with us, a very real stake in this battle.

But the primary function of the government should be, I think, to provide a climate of encouragement and cooperation in which private industry can do the job.

Fortunately such cooperation is not without precedent. In 1962 the economists of the federal government became concerned over the country's slow economic growth, and that year saw the enactment of the Invest-

ment Tax Credit. This action has since been credited with a major role in stimulating the growth that began to accelerate again in 1963. Similarly, the suspension of the tax credit in October, 1966, triggered a six-month economic slowdown. When the tax credit was in effect, new orders for plant and equipment increased by some 15 percent a year. When it was suspended, the growth rate dropped 7 percent. Again, the restoration of the tax credit in March, 1967, led to a turnabout in which the economy resumed its forward progress.

The analogy and its meaning are clear. Surely it is as important for business to invest in its assets in people as to invest in machines and property.

Could we not, then, provide the same kind of tax incentive for investment in people as we do for investments in tools and machinery?

I propose an investment tax credit for corporate investments in people; I firmly believe that such a credit would go far toward alleviating—on a long-range basis—the problem of the hard-core unemployed in our city ghettos.

I propose a tax incentive that would repay a corporation for its out-of-pocket costs, but not for its investments in existing physical facilities, nor the time and talents of its professional managers, or its tested training techniques. There would be no penalty to the company's stockholders but it would make a major contribution to the alleviation of the problem of training the underprivileged.

There will be those who will say that such ideas are not completely new, that Congress has already turned them down. But has business really urged their adoption?

Others will say—and with justice—that many of the people we try to help to help themselves may not be immediately grateful. Some may have a chip on their shoulders. Many will be hard to train. The work we do may well cause us to be visible targets for someone's wrath. The rough spots our companies will have to go through will be enormous. Furthermore, there can be no turning back.

But there is one fact that in my opinion overrides everything else. A new opportunity is being presented to American business. If we fail to meet it because it has risks, people will rightfully accuse us of failing again in an hour of need—and they will call on someone else to do the job.

Through prompt, energetic and well-organized action, on the other hand, we can help to create a generation of Americans who, working for the public good, can strengthen the system that has made us the greatest country in the world, and give every man the opportunity to be an uncommon man through his own initiative.

The private sector has an unusual opportunity to help recapture the American dream.

I think we have no choice but to step forward—and now.

You may remember the story about Marshal Lyautey, the remarkable French administrator who built up modern Morocco and then retired to live there. One fine morning, the Marshal asked his gardener to plant some fig seeds the next day.

"Tomorrow?" asked the gardener. "But the trees won't bloom for a hundred years."

"In that case," replied the marshal, "plant them this afternoon."

Parts 3 and 4 of the Reorganization Bills

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks today, I include below

parts 3 and 4 of title IV of the reorganization bills—comparison project undertaken by our House Republican task force on congressional reform. This material comprises the provisions of the various bills relating to congressional adjournment, postmaster appointments, and a section of the Bolling bill relating to appointments to the military service academies.

Under "Congressional adjournment," I am including from the final report of the Joint Organization Committee the supporting language to the committee's recommendation of an annual August recess, together with recommendation No. 14 contained in the supplemental views of Representatives CURTIS, HALL, and CLEVELAND, as follows:

PART 3—CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

Sec. 433. Congressional adjournment.

S. 355. Amends the '46 Act so as to provide that the Senate and House shall adjourn not later than July 31 of each year either sine die or to a date subsequent to August 31 of each year, such date to be fixed by concurrent resolution adopted by roll call vote in each house. The effect would be that in any year in which the two houses were unable to adjourn sine die by July 31, they would adjourn or recess at least through the month of August.

Provision not applicable if a state of war exists pursuant to a declaration of war by Congress.

Bolling. Same.

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Same.

(NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 55: "Both Houses should schedule committee and floor sessions on a 5-day workweek, so that the business of a session may normally be completed by July 31, the time for congressional adjournment as provided by law. A session shall be extended beyond that date only by a resolution adopted by a majority rollcall vote in each house. In no event, however, shall any meetings of either House be held during the month of August, except in time of war as declared by Congress.")

From the Final Report, pages 55-56:

"The 1946 act provided that Congress should adjourn no later than July 31, except in time of national emergency. The 'national emergency' clause has been used to avoid the provision in every session since 1946. The section provides for adjournment sine die on July 31 unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

"Every effort should be made to encourage more expeditious handling of legislative business in order to meet the legal adjournment date. Committees have grown accustomed to transacting business on a Tuesday-to-Thursday basis, rather than a 5-day workweek. With a requirement for a majority vote in each House to extend the session, committees might work a longer schedule early in the session, realizing that the session's business might be completed by July 31 if they did so.

"Whether or not the business of the session can be completed, no session should be held during the month of August other than in time of war as declared by Congress. The individual Member has great difficulty in scheduling his own time because he cannot determine with any degree of certainty the schedule for the business of the session. This results in inadequate opportunity to plan for visits in the State or district to work with constituents on their problems or to plan family trips which do not conflict with the school term.

"If a long session were necessary, an

August break would furnish a period during which the Member could 'feel the pulse' of his constituents on major issues. This would also cause the session to conform more nearly to the school year and work less hardship on Members with school-age children.

"Implementation of this recommendation cannot, of course, lessen the Member's workload. This will continue to increase. Nor would the recommendation necessarily reduce the length of sessions of Congress. But it will allow the Member to discharge his duties more effectively—both in Washington and in his home district."

From the supplemental views of Thomas B. Curtis, Durward G. Hall, and James C. Cleveland, Final Report, page 91.

"14. PROGRAMING AND SCHEDULING"

"We recommend, not only in consideration of the minority but for all Members of Congress, that the work of the House be more fairly programed and scheduled than is presently the case. The legislative calendar should be arranged so that individual Members would be advised of its makeup at least 2 or 3 weeks in advance. All Representatives bear an important obligation to make appearances in their own districts. Proper programing and scheduling of legislation would permit this and enable Congress to complete its work by its legal adjournment date."

PART 4—APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Sections 441 thru 444. Appointment of postmasters by Postmaster General, Vacancies in positions of postmaster; Vacancies on rural routes; Saving provision.

S. 355. Provides that the Postmaster General shall appoint postmasters of all classes in accordance with civil service examinations, laws, and rules. Members of Congress are prohibited from soliciting favored treatment for any applicants. Rural route mail carriers are similarly to come under civil service regulations. The usual saving provision protects those already appointed.

Bolling. Same, but see next page.

Reid. Same.

Print No. 3. Essentially same.

(NOTE.—Sections not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 56: "1. Appointment of postmasters and recommendation of rural mail carriers shall be by the Post Office Department under civil service qualifications rather than on recommendation of Members of the House of Representatives, the Senate, or others. Confirmation by the Senate shall not be required.")

BOLLING BILL ONLY—SECTION 445

Eliminates Congressional role in military service academy appointments but retains requirement for geographical representation of all states. Applicants would be selected on the basis of merit as established by competitive examinations.

(NOTE.—The Joint Committee recommended retaining the Congressional role in service academy appointments. See Final Report page 56: "2. Appointments to service academies by Members of Congress should be retained with continuing emphasis and reliance on competitive examinations for the appointments."

(Ref. also to Supplemental Views of Mr. Hechler, page 80, Item 7: "Congressional control over service academy appointments should be retained, but much of the paperwork can be taken out of Members' offices. A full-time clerical staff member should be provided for the selection board, with the duty of informing schools and applicants of the terms of selection by competitive civil service examination, with interview by the selection board. In this way, the Congressman retains control over general policy, including the work of the selection board, but the entire operation does not consume the

great amount of time which it now takes the Congressman and his staff.")

President Johnson Pays Tribute to Lance Cpl. James McCann—America's Kind of Man

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, young James McCann, a lance corporal stationed in Vietnam wrote home to his parents saying:

If I make it home to vote, President Johnson will be my man. He knows the most about the war and I think he will handle it all right if he gets re-elected. . . . That is the way I feel and I hope all the people will stop to realize that it was not Johnson's fault and nobody could have done it any different.

Corporal McCann did not make it home to vote.

He suffered fatal wounds while defending Khe Sanh earlier this month. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. John McCann, of 6223 North Oak Park, Chicago, Ill., have given me permission to place into today's RECORD a letter they received from the President of the United States. The President wrote that Jimmy was "my kind of man."

The McCanns, in this terrible loss, must certainly feel a great pride for their son who committed everything he possessed to this Nation and its defense of freedom. James McCann was America's kind of man.

Mr. Speaker, the President's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN MCCANN,
6223 North Oak Park,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. MCCANN: I have already written to express my deepest sympathy in the loss of your son. Since then I have learned from several sources of your courage and compassion in face of tragedy.

It is clear from press accounts that your Jimmy was a devoted son and dedicated American.

Mrs. Johnson and I talked about him last night. We feel that we know him. To use Jimmy's own words, he was my kind of man—strong in faith, unselfish of heart, proud of his freedoms, and unfearing in defending them against aggression.

His life was not wasted, I promise you that. Its lesson is humbling and inspiring for all who are determined to make sacrifice meaningful by securing lasting peace. That day will come. It will be a day when man will have proud cause to honor your son anew.

You will always have my own deep pride and gratitude. I ask God to allow you comfort in that and extend to you His blessings always.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Irwin Opinion Poll

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days, my questionnaire—the Irwin opinion poll—will be sent to more than 180,000 postal patrons in my district, the Fourth Congressional District of Connecticut.

It has, admittedly, been a long time between questionnaires and newsletters and I am highly pleased that at long last I am able to issue a questionnaire which I believe is extensive in its scope, specific in its content, and perhaps somewhat unusual in its presentation.

I have been anxious to increase the return percentage over my previous questionnaires and I therefore departed from the normal procedure in addressing this questionnaire to postal patrons in my district.

Therefore, on the "Postal patron" address portion of the questionnaire I inserted the following to catch the attention of the recipient:

CONGRESSMAN DON IRWIN'S OPINION POLL

What shall I do with this questionnaire?

	His	Hers
1. Throw it away right now.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Answer it tonight.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Let it sit around for several weeks.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

In a covering letter included with the questionnaire, I also stressed this business of responding. I declared in my letter addressed to "Dear Constituent":

I hope you will spend 10 or 15 minutes before you retire tonight in going over this questionnaire carefully, thinking about your responses and then filling it out.

Then you should fold it—Please do not staple it, glue it or tape it—and affix a six-cent stamp on the fold which addresses the questionnaire back to me, and drop in a mailbox.

The deadline for returns is April 1.

This questionnaire is going to about 180,000 addresses in the Fourth Congressional District—and I hope that the returns will be a great improvement on the last questionnaire I sent out, when only about six per cent responded.

You may well ask: why so long since the last questionnaire or newsletter?

The answer is money!

While the Congressional franking privilege does not require a mailing expense to me, I have to pay personally for the cost of paper and printing (approximately \$1,600). The computer-tabulated statistical results cost me an added \$1,850.

I still believe very strongly that this means of communication is invaluable to me and to you, the people I represent. That is why I again urge you to take the time to consider your answers to this questionnaire carefully, then fill it out and mail it back to me.

I then launched into my questionnaire proper and would like at this time to reproduce my questions for the benefit and guidance of my colleagues. I shall publish the results of the tabulations when they are completed. Here is the questionnaire itself:

IRWIN OPINION POLL

[Please place an "X" in the boxes that represent your opinion]

	His		Hers			His		Hers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you want Congress to pass legislation to prevent discrimination in the sale or rental of housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	round basis, so we could have an extra hour of daylight in the evening during the winter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Do you favor celebrating national holidays (except Christmas and New Year's) on Mondays and Fridays?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Would you like to see the voting age lowered to 18?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. In your opinion, should we observe daylight saving time on a year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Do you think there should be a law to limit the total amount of money spent by or for a candidate running for public office?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For each question below, please choose the 1 alternative which most closely represents your opinion.

	His		Hers			His		Hers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No		Yes	No	Yes	No
6. Do you feel that the major financial responsibility in solving the problems of our cities should be met by—					12. Do you think that the peace demonstrations will—				
1. The Federal Government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Lead to peace	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The State government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Contribute to better communication in our society	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Local government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Make no contribution, but are not harmful	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Private enterprise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Contribute to confusion and discontent in our society	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Do you feel the United States has an obligation to support Israel in the Middle East conflict—					5. Lend encouragement to the enemy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Through moral encouragement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	13. How do you feel about age discrimination in employment?				
2. Through diplomatic support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do you think this problem is (check one)—				
3. With military assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. A serious one	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. By direct U.S. involvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Not very important	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. No support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. One that can be solved by private interests outside the Government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. In Vietnam, do you think that the United States and her allies are—					4. One that can be solved by Federal legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Losing ground	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. One that needs efforts by all government levels and private enterprise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Standing still	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. Making progress	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	14. Should the government spend more (M), less (L), or the same (S) for the following programs:				
4. No opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
9. What kind of policy do you think the United States should follow in Vietnam?									
1. Withdraw immediately	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. Hold only populated areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. Stop all bombing of North Vietnam	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4. Maintain present diplomatic and military efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
5. Bomb Hanoi and the port of Haiphong	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
6. Wage an all-out attack on North Vietnam and if necessary, Red China	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
10. Do you think that the program you have advocated above would—									
1. Lead to immediate peace in Vietnam	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. Lead to a negotiated settlement excluding the Communists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. Lead to a negotiated settlement including the Communists	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4. Lead to a general cease fire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
5. Lead to a Communist takeover	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
6. Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
11. Do you think the United Nations can be helpful in the Vietnam dilemma in—									
1. Moving for negotiations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. Negotiating a peace	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. Providing a peace keeping force to enforce a negotiated settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4. No help at all	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					

	His		Hers		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
15. Beyond any cuts you may have advocated above, do you think Congress ought to—					22. Do you live in:
1. Legislate the proposed 10 percent surtax on personal and corporate incomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bridgeport
2. Legislate a surtax above 10 percent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Darien
3. Legislate a surtax below 10 percent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fairfield
4. Not legislate any surtax	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Norwalk
5. Need to know more about it	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stamford
16. Would you favor wage and price controls as—					Greenwich
1. An alternative to the above mentioned steps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	New Canaan
2. An additional step to the above mentioned steps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wilton
17. I consider myself—					Weston
1. Republican	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Westport
2. Leaning toward Republican	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. Independent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	23. Would you be willing to contribute financially to the production (paper and printing) of congressional newsletters and questionnaires?
4. Leaning toward Democratic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Maybe <input type="checkbox"/>
5. Democratic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
18. Age:					PERSONAL COMMENTS
18 to 29	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
30 to 45	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
46 to 59	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
60 and over	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
19. Occupation:					
White Collar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Blue Collar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Student	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Professional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Executive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Housewife	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
20. How do you travel to work?					
Train	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Car	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Bus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Walk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
21. How do you keep up with the news?					
New York papers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Local papers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
National periodicals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Local radio	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
New York radio	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Hartford and New Haven TV	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
New York TV	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Steuben Society Opposes Travel Tax, Backs Positive Measures To Increase European Tourism to the United States

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, now that the excellent recommendations of the President's industry-government travel task

force have been made, the best course for the short run as well as for the longer haul would be to devote our energies to the steps the task force proposes to attract more European visitors to the United States.

At the same time, we should put aside the proposal for a tax on the expenditures of American travelers overseas.

I have been pleased to note that this is the position adopted by the National Council of the Steuben Society of America. I include hereafter the Steuben Society's statement on measures to improve our balance of payments by reducing the deficit on travel:

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENT—DEFICIT—TRAVEL—RESTRICTIONS—THE WRONG WAY

NATIONAL COUNCIL,
STEBUEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y.

The worsening balance of payments deficit and the drain on America's gold reserve have long been a matter of concern to the members of the Steuben Society of America who will therefore support wholeheartedly any proposal which will help effectively to correct this, now dangerous, condition.

It is our firm belief however that the measures proposed by the President concerning travel outside of the Western Hemisphere (other than the reduction from \$100 to \$10 of duty-free exemptions, and \$10 to \$1.00 for packages by mail) will not produce the needed result. The proposed 5% tax on overseas travel and the high graduated tax on expenditures, causing decreased tourism to Europe will unquestionably lead to retaliatory measures by the countries effected caus-

ing reduced foreign tourism to America which we have just begun to encourage with some results. For example, Germany alone sent 100,000 tourists to America last year. These two items alone would not only make the measure self-defeating but produce an adverse affect.

In addition the taxes tend to restrict our citizens freedom to travel and because they are selective and discriminatory to various elements of the American people.

Consequently, we are opposed to the graduated tax on expenditures and the 5% transportation tax. The solution lies not in measures which tend to curtail tourism to Europe but rather in the expansion of programs which would encourage more European tourism to the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE STOTZ,

Chairman,

National Public Affairs Committee.

For Hartford, a Crisis and a Challenge

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the President has issued a call to action in meeting the crisis of our cities. The programs outlined in his message deserve the support of every Member of this body. The problems of urban areas are indeed vast and demand our increased attention. Since I have the privilege of representing the city of Hartford, I am especially interested in those provisions in President Johnson's program dealing with insurance for inhabitants of the inner city.

Some may choose to call it "riot insurance." I do not agree with that terminology. It is true that insurance companies cannot offer adequate low-cost insurance to property owners in the area where a riot has occurred. But I believe the record will show the same inability on the part of the industry to insure in ghettos where there have been no riots.

Most insurance companies must steer clear of blighted neighborhoods, regardless of whether a riot has already taken place, or whether it is considered as a potential breeding ground for violence, because of the basic economics involved. The risk in such areas is too high to be borne by the insurance industry, which is faced with the problems of financing required growth and expanded coverage services.

This then becomes a vicious circle. Because he cannot get insurance, except possibly at too high a price, the owner of a store or home has no incentive to maintain his property in good condition, and so the property deteriorates still further, lessening its value on the market and leaving still deeper scars on the neighborhood.

If, on the other hand, the owner has some assurance that a well maintained house or store will result in more reasonable insurance rates, he would be foolish indeed to allow his property to decline in value.

Mr. Speaker, the insurance provisions

in this bill can restore pride of ownership to property owners in the inner city. It is one more step we can take to revitalize urban America. It is a step we must take.

More than in the insurance area, however, the President's proposed programs would encourage communities to cooperate with the Federal Government in undertaking local actions and to continue and accelerate those efforts already initiated. Increased public awareness of the need for such actions is evident all around us. I call to the attention of the membership, for example, the following editorial which appeared in the February 20, 1968, edition of the Hartford Times as evidence of these expressions of social conscience:

FOR HARTFORD, A CRISIS AND A CHALLENGE

Greater Hartford has a crisis on its hands. It is not moving fast enough to make things better for the poor, particularly the Negro and Puerto Rican poor.

Greater Hartford has the talent, the money and the conscience. It could make rapid strides in housing, employment and education.

But goals become confused. People of good will turn to bickering. Strong leadership is diluted.

As another summer approaches, there is much talk about law and order. But, as the commission studying the Newark riot noted, law and order can prevail only in conditions of social justice.

We must not do the right thing simply because it is risky not to. We have a moral obligation to speed the day of fulfillment for democracy. The Hartford area needs to take a fresh look at its goals and its resources.

As a contribution to this process, The Hartford Times today lists 10 programs. These programs promise results. They can be achieved with reasonable speed.

The list does not pretend to be all-inclusive. It does try to bring some blurred objectives into focus. Here are the programs:

I. HOUSING: COLT PARK SOUTH

The 90-acre site of Colt Park South should be bought and cleared of junk cars without the red tape of federal participation. This will require City Council approval, by June, and voter approval of a \$3.5-million bond issue this fall. This would be only a fraction of the investment. Aetna Life & Casualty has expressed interest in financing housing there. The potential: 800 to 1,000 units of housing.

II. HOUSING: SOUTH ARSENAL

Some \$11-million in federal money has been set aside for this 65-acre South Arsenal renewal project. The area lies east of North Main Street. Some of the worst slums in the city would be torn down. Neighborhood residents are working on a plan to keep their neighborhood integrity. Ordinarily, federal red tape would hold this up until 1969, but that red tape conceivably could be cut. Hundreds of new housing units would result.

III. HOUSING: SCATTERED SITES

City Manager Eli Freedman is asking the City Council for \$70,000 as seed money (probably recoverable) for housing on five scattered pieces of city-owned open land. This project could yield 160 units—cooperative apartments, row houses and single-family homes, many built by church and other private groups.

IV. RECREATION

Hartford's 17 recreation centers are busy on weekdays but closed on weekends. We lag behind other towns and cities which conduct full weekend programs. In the new budget, City Council can open these pools, gyms and other recreation centers on weekends for an

annual additional appropriation of around \$60,000, which is not an overwhelming item in a \$64-million budget.

In addition, Hartford has the resources to enrich the recreation program of underprivileged youngsters with art, drama, music and other cultural events on the kids' home grounds. For instance, the council can and should find funds to operate a portable stage that the Knox Foundation is willing to donate to the city.

V. EDUCATION

In a burst of progress, the voters have approved a \$44.9-million first-phase school building program. Differences among city and school officials have threatened delays. This can be unlocked with responsible leadership and a genuine willingness to move ahead.

School officials have proposed a \$20-million second phase involving an educational park, a complex running from kindergarten through college, between the new Annie Fisher elementary school and the University of Hartford. The money would build a middle school (grades 5-8) and a high school. The complex would draw heavily on the University's Department of Education. This would draw hundreds of pre-teachers into city schools and create a new vitality there.

Still needed for Phase II is approval by the City Council and a referendum in November.

The cost is well within Hartford's resources and is, in fact, small compared with the price of neglect.

VI. EMPLOYMENT

There must be a concerted attempt to hire people who do not have the usual qualifications for jobs, who cannot pass the ordinary tests. For many employers and unions, it is time to stop merely talking about equal opportunity and adopt some flexibility in hiring standards now, and to improve job training.

Of all the subsidies we now underwrite—ranging from farms to oil fields—none will be as effective as an investment in a nation's most valuable resource: People.

VII. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The police and the courts play important roles in the effort to bring about respect for one another in our society. Hartford obviously must insure the safety of its streets. It also must make it plain to citizens living in high-crime areas that heavy patrols operate for them, not against them.

There is much evidence that present community-relations programs in the Police Department must be deepened and widened. While training policemen in riot control, we must also insure all citizens of equal treatment in the booking process, in bonding, in jail and in court.

Police Chief John Kerrigan's formation of a five-man community relations unit last week is a step in the right direction.

VIII. PROJECT CONCERN

This federal-local program buses 265 Hartford pupils, mostly nonwhite, into schools in five suburbs. It can be expanded to 700 this year if more towns agree to join and if the city makes up for expiring federal subsidies. Some new towns have joined, others are reluctant.

The evidence is that this program has done incalculable good, for both city and suburban children. The suburbs are slowly realizing that they are not and cannot be walled off from the city.

IX. MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

The future of the Model Cities program is uncertain, but so far Hartford is part of it. This can help with renewal in terms of people as well as houses. We must provide the leadership and imagination and sincerity of motivation to keep it from bogging down in interminable planning and quarreling.

X. VOTER REGISTRATION

The registration of voters is low in Negro and Puerto Rican sections, partly because people must go to City Hall to register. The proposed city budget contains \$14,000 for a traveling bus (Infomobile) to bring City Hall to the people, offering information on health, job training and other subjects. This vehicle could and should be used for voter registration. Council also ought to consider an appropriation, perhaps \$2,000, for voter education sessions in the neighborhoods.

To repeat, this 10-point program is not all-inclusive. Work must go forward on many other fronts. Ordinary city services must be provided more equitably.

But the 10 projects are achievable without inordinate delay. Much of the groundwork has been laid by conscientious people. Now a concentrated effort of leadership is required.

The 10-point program outlined in the editorial is indicative of the kinds of problems faced in many of our urban centers. Leadership in solving these problems is required. The President's proposal to meet the challenges of our cities would provide much of that leadership and initiative, and should be supported.

Old Gun Law Finally Fires Its First Shot

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the Pittsburgh, Pa., Press of February 6, 1968, entitled "Old Gun Law Finally Fires Its First Shot," by Mr. Roger Latham, the distinguished outdoors editor of that fine newspaper.

This fine article points out that if existing law were used, we might not be receiving so many suggestions for unwise and unnecessary firearms control legislation. Much of such legislation now pending is directed principally at stripping the law-abiding citizen of the right to acquire firearms for legitimate sporting and defense purposes.

Perhaps if the Secretary of the Treasury devotes himself and his agency more vigorously to the handling of existing laws on Federal firearms, and uses less energy and time for traipsing up to the Hill to sponsor legislation Congress will never consider, law enforcement will achieve a remarkable uplift and the alleged need for the Dodd bill will vanish like the phantom it is.

The article follows:

OLD GUN LAW FINALLY FIRES ITS FIRST SHOT
(By Roger Latham)

An article in the February issue of American Rifleman is written by Charles Lee Howard, an inmate in the Ohio State Penitentiary at Columbus.

Howard, who is serving his third felony sentence (15 to 55 years for armed robbery and kidnapping), tells how at 26 he had possessed 20 different pistols and got all but one of them illegally. In fact, 19 of the 20 were stolen.

He claims that from inside prison walls, the antigun uproar makes strange reading. He says:

"It's baffling that the people who want to prevent criminals like me from getting hold

of guns expect to accomplish this by passing new laws. Do they forget that the criminal makes a business of breaking laws? No criminal would obey a gun law while committing a crime of equal or greater seriousness."

To carry this subject of gun laws a little further, a recent conviction by Federal agents revealed a startling fact. For the first time since its passage in 1938, a provision in the Federal Firearms Act concerning the interstate shipment of guns has been enforced!

Just recently, U.S. Attorney Robert Morgenthau obtained a Federal grand jury indictment against a Nanuet, N.Y., firearms dealer. The indictment charged that the mail-order house violated the 30-year-old law by shipping guns to individuals in other states who had not produced the required state or local licenses or permits.

ENFORCE PRESENT LAW FIRST

Sportsman interests have maintained for years before congressional committees and subcommittees considering new legislation that existing Federal firearms laws suffer from lack of enforcement by the U.S. Treasury and Justice departments.

At the same time, the Treasury and Justice departments have been working strenuously for more rigid gun laws, pushing in particular for increasingly restrictive versions of the Dodd bills.

The delay in acting upon a provision of Federal law is a glaring example of lax enforcement. It lends strength to the position of law-abiding gun owners that existing laws never have been given a real chance.

Sportsmen see little merit in passing additional laws when Federal enforcement agencies have scarcely sampled the effectiveness of laws passed three decades ago.

This same lack of active enforcement probably also has contributed to the general lack of information about gun laws on the part of the public.

PENALTIES ARE THERE

The public has been led to believe there are no laws which prohibit criminals from obtaining firearms, even though such prohibitions have been a basic part of the Federal law since 1938.

The Act provides: "It shall be unlawful for any person who has been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year or is a fugitive from justice to receive any firearm or ammunition..."

A violation of the act can bring imprisonment up to five years, a fine up to \$5000, or both.

Once again, it may well have been the singular lack of enforcement which has created this impression among the public and the news media. Under questioning by Congressmen at hearings in Washington, Treasury officials have claimed they are unable to enforce these firearms laws because of lack of manpower.

During the 1965 hearings, Treasury officials admitted that only two men and three women were assigned full time to enforcement of both the 1938 Federal and 1934 National Firearms acts. This hardly seems a strenuous effort for a department which views the commerce in firearms with such alarm.

This lack of enforcement seems to go along with the lack of action on reasonable and useful firearms legislation.

Programs for Spanish-Speaking
Americans

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 29, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a new day has dawned for the Mexican American

and Spanish-speaking citizen of this land, and the man most responsible for it is the President of the United States.

Believing that equal rights and equal opportunity are goals to be reached rather than slogans to be enunciated, the President last summer directed his new Cabinet Committee on Mexican Affairs to come up with solutions to longstanding problems.

Based on a special conference held in El Paso in October, in which over 1,200 Spanish-speaking Americans met with the President and selected Cabinet officers, new and dramatic steps have been taken to insure improved opportunity for the Mexican Americans.

The President has signed the Bilingual Education Act. He has directed HUD to help cities with large Spanish populations to formulate plans for model cities applications. He has directed that employment offices have people who can speak Spanish work with Mexican Americans on job opportunity. He has stepped up health and day-care programs for the children and families of migrant workers—many of whom are Spanish speaking. He has instructed Government to step up the training of specially trained teachers to work with Mexican American children.

The list of positive steps is long. The results are already being seen. The Mexican American is not to be forgotten—not by Lyndon Johnson and not by the Democratic Party.

I join my colleagues in this House in a salute to the President for helping bring about that new day which is on the horizon for the Spanish-speaking citizen of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the following report by the President of his progress and actions on behalf of Spanish-speaking Americans:

PROGRAMS FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

(Statement by the President on actions taken based on recommendations of the Cabinet Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, February 23, 1968)

Last October, in El Paso, I attended a conference of high purpose. There, with the Vice President and members of the Cabinet, I met with 1,200 Spanish-speaking Americans.

This was the first time that the Mexican-American community had an opportunity to discuss matters of direct concern—ranging from education to economic opportunity, housing to health—with the highest officials of government.

The aim of the 3-day conference was to assure that America's second largest minority was receiving its fair and just share of Federal programs in these areas.

Out of that conference, ideas and suggestions flowed to a Cabinet-level committee on Mexican-American Affairs, which I appointed last June.

Based on the recommendations of the committee—many of which stemmed from the El Paso conference—I have taken the following actions:

In education:

I have signed into law the first Federal bilingual education program. It will help Spanish-speaking children overcome the barriers of language which have prevented them from receiving the fullest benefits of education.

I have asked Congress to provide funds to expand and improve adult and vocational educational programs aimed particularly at those Americans who have no high school

diplomas. About 20 percent of these are Spanish-speaking.

I have instructed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to:

Accelerate the training of specially-trained teachers to work with Mexican-American school children and migrant workers.

Insure compliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. This forbids discrimination in school-district boundaries and in quality of education, wherever the schools receive Federal financial assistance.

In health and welfare:

I have requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to:

Simplify application and claim procedures in Medicare, Social Security and other programs serving the Mexican-American communities.

Gather and analyze data on the health of Spanish-speaking Americans.

I have asked the Congress to increase its support of special medical programs for migrant farm workers, most of whom are Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans.

I have appointed a distinguished Mexican-American scholar, Dr. Julian Samora, to a Presidential Commission evaluating the Nation's welfare system.

In housing:

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has selected a number of cities to begin planning under the Model Cities program. Among them are San Antonio, Eagle Pass, and Waco, Texas; Denver and Trinidad, Colorado; Albuquerque, New Mexico; New York City and San Juan, Puerto Rico—all with large Spanish-speaking populations.

I have directed the Secretary of HUD to work with Laredo, Texas and its sister city

in Mexico, Nuevo Laredo, in an international cooperative effort to help develop a Model Cities program that will improve the condition of life in this border area.

I have requested, in the 1969 budget, \$1 billion for the Model Cities program to revitalize and rebuild entire slum neighborhoods and barrios. In my special message on the cities, I asked the Congress, industry and labor to begin a ten-year program to construct six million new housing units for low and moderate income families, many of whom are Spanish-speaking.

I have urged the Congress—once more—to pass a Fair Housing Law, insuring that all Americans can have the opportunity to live in a place of their own choosing.

In Federal employment:

I have instructed all Federal agencies:

To work together to increase employment opportunities for Spanish-speaking Americans.

To require employees to know Spanish where they serve large groups of Spanish-speaking people.

To re-examine their hiring and recruiting methods to assure that potentially good workers are not refused jobs because a language barrier works against them in written examinations.

In private employment:

I have asked Congress for funds to extend a test training program to relocate workers from areas of high unemployment to those where work is available.

I have moved to assure that Federal manpower training programs provide English language training for Spanish-speaking people who need it.

I have proposed the job opportunities in business sector (JOBS) program—a new

partnership between government and private industry—to train and hire those who have the greatest difficulty finding work.

I have directed the Secretary of Labor to bring together in one unified effort all manpower programs for an attack on hard-core rural and urban unemployment. As a result, the concentrated employment program is underway in several of the largest cities of the Southwest. I have recommended expansion of this program in the 1969 budget.

I have urged Congress again, as I did last year, to give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the power to order a halt to employment discrimination.

In rural matters:

I have asked the Congress to authorize a major project to improve Forest Service grazing land in the Southwest, to serve the small rancher.

I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to expand the activities of the County Extension Service to meet more fully the needs of the small Mexican-American farmer.

I am directing the Secretaries of Agriculture and Labor to hold hearings so that they can set realistic minimum wages for certain farm workers.

Last June, when I established the Cabinet Committee on Mexican-American Affairs, I said: "We today reaffirm this truth: that what we do for any minority, we do as well for any majority. After all, we do this for all of America."

These convictions remain firm and resolute.

With this report of progress and action, we have begun the journey towards full opportunity for the Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and other Spanish-speaking people of our land.

SENATE—Friday, March 1, 1968

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, D.D., pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all worlds and Redeemer of all mankind by whose providence we are citizens of this land of hope and freedom, we rejoice in our heritage.

We praise Thee for leaders of past years who in times of crisis pledged to Thee and each other their lives, their fortunes, and their honor that today we enjoy life in a land of freedom and hope.

We give Thee thanks for a continued march of dedicated leadership as we meet in a moment of prayer at this session of the U.S. Senate. We pray for strength and guidance through the day as these men and women of leadership debate and develop decisions affecting so many. May they feel the support of their people. Bless their homes, their companions, and children. Always we are strengthened for the demands of the day, O God, when we remember those who love us most.

Be with our President, his advisers, as well as all world leaders. Empower them with a wise use of authority in finding peace in a world sick of war. We pray in the name of the Prince of Peace, even Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading

of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 29, 1968, be dispensed with.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 11 a.m. be equally divided between the majority and the minority leaders or whomever they may designate.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on this side I yield time for the message from the House of Representatives, and I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12603) to supplement the purposes of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), by authorizing agreements and leases with respect to certain properties in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of a national visitor center, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the

House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 15069. An act to amend the act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada in order to extend for 2 years the time for selecting such lands;

H.R. 15414. An act to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations;

H.J. Res. 691. Joint resolution extending greetings and felicitations to St. Louis University in the city of St. Louis, Mo., in connection with the 150th anniversary of its founding;

H.J. Res. 933. Joint resolution to proclaim "National Jewish Hospital Save Your Breath Month"; and

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period March 3 through March 9, 1968, as "Circle K Week."

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 15069. An act to amend the act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada in order to extend for 2 years the time for selecting such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 15414. An act to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to pay-