

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UTILITY POLICY ON ADVANCE  
DEPOSITS BY CUSTOMERS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, some utility companies have been criticized because of discriminatory policy with respect to advance deposit requirements. Deposits have been required of persons whose credit may be excellent, but who live in a poor neighborhood or are engaged in menial work. Deposits often are not required of persons in more expensive neighborhoods and engaged in more prestigious work, even though these persons may be poor risks financially. There is some evidence that the poor have been more prompt in payment of utility bills than the well to do, despite the burden of advance payments which, in some cases, were not refunded as they should have been after credit was established.

Last year I asked the Federal Power Commission, Federal Communications Commission, and National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners what policy obtained in the various States with respect to advance deposit requirements. I learned that, as so often is the case in utility matters, information on the subject was not readily available. However, I am pleased to report, it was the feeling at both the Federal Commissions and at NARUC that this information should be obtained.

Former NARUC Chairman James W. Karber appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Customer Deposit Practices of Utilities. It sent a questionnaire to the chairmen of the regulatory commissions in the various States. The information received was analyzed, after which the NARUC executive committee approved draft model State commission rules governing establishment of credit for utility services.

Mr. President, I wish to commend NARUC for its efforts to remove discriminatory practices in this area. NARUC has welcomed comments on its draft model rules. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

NARUC's office, for those who wish to comment on the proposed rules, is at 3327 Interstate Commerce Commission Building, Box 684, Washington, D.C. 20044.

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

MODEL STATE COMMISSION RULES GOVERNING  
ESTABLISHMENT OF CREDIT FOR UTILITY  
SERVICES

Section 1. *Declaration of public policy.*—The Public Service Commission of this State, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission", declares that it is in the public interest for each utility to fairly and indiscriminately administer a reasonable policy reflected by written regulations, in accord with these Rules, which will permit an applicant for service to establish, or an existing customer to re-establish, credit with the utility for

the use of its service. The Commission further declares that when it is necessary for an applicant or customer to make a cash deposit to establish or re-establish credit in accord with these Rules, the making of such deposit is in the public interest because it avoids, to the extent practicable, the creation of a burden arising from uncollectible bills which would have to be borne ultimately by the ratepayers. The Commission further declares that the essential ingredient in each utility's administration of deposit policy in accord with these Rules is its equitable and indiscriminate application to all applicants for service and customers throughout the service area without regard to the economic character of the area or any part thereof, and such deposit policy shall be predicated upon the credit rating of the individual over and above the collective credit reputation of the area in which he lives or does business.

Section 2. *Establishment of credit.*—(a) Each utility may require an applicant for service to satisfactorily establish credit which will be deemed established if:

(1) The applicant owns a significant interest in the premises to be served or other real estate within the territory served by the utility unless the applicant has an unsatisfactory credit rating; or

(2) The applicant demonstrates a satisfactory credit rating by appropriate means, including but not limited to, the production of credit cards, letters of reference, or the names of references which may be quickly and inexpensively contacted by the utility; or

(3) The applicant has been a customer of the utility for a similar type of service within a period of twenty-four consecutive months preceding the date of application and during the last twelve consecutive months of that prior service has not had more than two occasions in which a bill was not paid within thirty days after it became due; *provided*, that the periodic bill for such previous service was equal to at least fifty per centum of that estimated for the new service; and *provided further*, that the credit of the applicant is unimpaired; or

(4) The applicant furnishes a satisfactory guarantor to secure payment of bills for the service requested in a specified amount not to exceed the amount of the cash deposit prescribed in Section 4 of these Rules; or

(5) The applicant makes a cash deposit to secure payment of bills for service as prescribed in Section 4 of these Rules.

(b) The establishment of credit under the provisions of this Section, or the re-establishment of credit under the provisions of Section 3 of these Rules, shall not relieve the applicant for service or customer from compliance with the regulations of the utility as to advance payments and the prompt payment of bills, and shall not constitute a waiver or modification of the practices of the utility in regard to the discontinuance of service for the non-payment of bills due for service furnished.

Section 3. *Re-establishment of credit.*—(a) An applicant for service who previously has been a customer of the utility and whose service has been discontinued by the utility during the last twelve months of that prior service because of non-payment of bills, may be required to re-establish credit in accordance with Section 2 of these Rules; *except*, that an applicant for domestic service shall not be denied service for failure to pay such bills for other classes of service.

(b) A customer who fails to pay bills within thirty days after they become due and who further fails to pay such bills within five days after presentation of a discon-

tinuance of service notice for non-payment of bills (regardless of whether or not service was discontinued for such non-payment), may be required to pay such bills and re-establish his credit by depositing the amount prescribed in Section 4 of these Rules.

(c) A customer may be required to re-establish his credit in accordance with Section 2 of these Rules in case the conditions of service or basis on which credit was originally established have materially changed.

Section 4. *Deposit; amount; receipt; interest.*—No utility shall require a cash deposit to establish or re-establish credit in an amount in excess of two-twelfths of the estimated charge for the service for the ensuing twelve months. Each utility, prior to receiving a deposit, shall furnish a copy of these Rules to the applicant for service or customer from whom a deposit is required and such copy shall contain the name, address and telephone number of the Commission.

(b) Concurrently with receiving a cash deposit, the utility shall deliver to the applicant for service or customer, a receipt showing: (1) the date thereof; (2) the name of the applicant or customer and the address of the premises to be served or served; (3) the service to be furnished or furnished; and (4) the amount of the deposit and the rate of interest to be paid thereon. Each utility shall provide reasonable means to refund the deposit of a customer, when he is so entitled, if the original receipt cannot be produced.

(c) Each utility shall pay interest on a deposit at the rate of five per centum per annum, or at the rate equal to the average rate of interest paid by the utility for short term debt during the twelve months' period ending on the December 31 immediately preceding the date the deposit is made, whichever rate is higher. Interest on a deposit shall accrue annually and shall be annually credited to the customer by deducting such interest from the amount of the next bill for service following the anniversary date of the original deposit. A utility shall not be required to pay interest on a deposit held less than ninety days, and shall not be required to pay interest on a deposit for the period following three years after discontinuance of service, if during such three year period the utility has made a reasonable effort to refund the deposit. Thereafter, an unclaimed deposit, plus accrued interest, shall be credited to an appropriate account.

Section 5. *Refund of deposit.*—(a) Upon discontinuance of service, the utility shall promptly and automatically refund the customer's deposit plus accrued interest, or the balance, if any, in excess of the unpaid bills for service furnished by the utility. A transfer of service from one premises to another within the service area of the utility shall not be deemed a discontinuance within the meaning of these Rules.

(b) After the customer has paid bills for service for twelve consecutive months without having had more than two occasions in which a bill was not paid within thirty days after it became due, the utility shall promptly and automatically refund the deposit plus accrued interest. If the customer has had more than two such past due bills for such period, the utility shall thereafter review the account every twelve months and shall promptly and automatically refund the deposit plus accrued interest after the customer has not had more than two such past due bills during the twelve months prior to any review.

(c) The utility shall promptly return the deposit plus accrued interest at any time upon request, if the customer's credit has

been otherwise established in accordance with Section 2 of these Rules.

(d) At the option of the utility, a deposit plus accrued interest may be refunded, in whole or in part, at any time earlier than the times hereinabove prescribed in this Section.

Section 6. *Record of deposit.*—Each utility holding a cash deposit shall keep a record showing: (a) the name and current address of each depositor; (b) the amount and date of the deposit; and (c) each transaction concerning the deposit.

Section 7. *Appeal by applicant or customer.*—Each utility shall direct its personnel engaged in initial contact with an applicant for service or customer, seeking to establish or re-establish credit under the provisions of these Rules, to inform him, if he expresses dissatisfaction with the decision of such personnel, of his right to have the problem considered and acted upon by supervisory personnel of the utility. Each utility shall further direct such supervisory personnel to inform such an applicant or customer, who expresses dissatisfaction with the decision of such supervisory personnel, of his right to have the problem reviewed by an official of the Commission and shall furnish him the name of the Commission official to be contacted and his address and telephone number.

#### COMMISSIONER BENNETT SPEAKS FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

#### HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great American Indian leaders of this generation is Commissioner Robert L. Bennett of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Commissioner Bennett has provided remarkable leadership in creating a partnership between the Indians and the Federal Government through the Bureau.

This leadership has been an expression of Commissioner Bennett's philosophy that the American Indian must move into society as a constructive and contributing force, while at the same time maintaining and cherishing his Indian heritage and the Indian tribal organizations.

The Bureau under Commissioner Bennett's leadership has placed special emphasis on the role of the young Indians. This emphasis reflects the Commissioner's understanding of the problems facing the Indian children and young adults, both on and off the reservations.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bennett summed up his philosophy quite well in a speech he made last fall to the National Congress of American Indians in Omaha, Nebr., and I would like to have this speech printed in the RECORD. I would especially like to call the attention of my colleagues to the final section of this speech, the section on "Indian Youth":

#### THE FUTURE AND THE FIRST AMERICANS

It is a pleasure for me as your Commissioner, friend, fellow Indian American, and member of NCAI to provide you with a report of my efforts during the past 29 months. By the way, 29 months is a new record for an Indian Commissioner, as the only other Indian Commissioner, Major Eli Parker, was allowed to serve only 26 months.

No Commissioner has received such wonderful support as you have given me, I want you to know that it is appreciated more than I can say. With this kind of support you have made my job easier, the burdens, cares and worries lighter, and the satisfaction from whatever progress has been made much greater.

Indeed, the past several months have been a time of several "firsts" for the First Americans.

For the first time in history—in this year 1968—a President of the United States sent to Congress a message dealing exclusively with American Indians and the social and economic problems confronting them.

For the first time in history, Indian tribal organizations have begun to take an active part in State and regional economic development planning, so that Indian lands will no longer be surrounded by that invisible barrier that separates reservation economies from growth opportunities with their neighboring communities.

For the first time, Indian people are being afforded a partnership with the Federal Government in Indian affairs.

For the first time, the President in his special message, and the Senate in the passage of S. Con. Res. 11 have taken affirmative action to bury the unilateral termination policies of the 1950's and instead offer new hope to the Indian people that they will be masters of their own fate.

For the first time, the education of Indian children has been given priority attention, not only in terms of dollars expended to quantify it but in terms of brainpower invested in giving it *quality*, from kindergarten to college. Hopefully there will never be another generation of Indians who suffer a kind of second-class citizenship because of their second-rate schooling.

Most important of all, for the first time in this century the Indian people have rediscovered themselves as a great people and have begun to reestablish cultural and historic identity. We are on the way once again to full command of our own future.

Now, I am providing you the first Commissioner's report to the Indian people. It is my fervent hope that this will set a precedent so that each and every Commissioner of Indian Affairs will come to you regularly and give an accounting of his administration. You are entitled to this.

Because you will have an opportunity to read this report at your leisure, I will not dwell upon it too much this afternoon. If you have any questions, comments, or criticisms, please feel free to write me. I want you to be fully informed and I hope satisfied that we are working together to achieve partnership in reality and in spirit. The spirit of true partnership is that spirit which makes us in the Bureau of Indian Affairs work in partnership with you because we want to and not because someone told us to.

Although we can develop the capability to meet your needs by providing opportunities for adequate food, clothing, and shelter, I feel that you will be satisfied only if you have a voice in the development of these opportunities. I promise you that as long as it is my honor to be your Commissioner, your voice will be heard.

I believe that our greatest progress has been in the changing role of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to meet the changing times. No part of my position gives me more difficulty or more pleasure than that of being your advocate in Government.

I am not unmindful of my obligations to the Federal Government as an executive officer, but I do find a lot of running room to advocate your interests and I use it. I am grateful that Secretary Stewart Udall has supported the Bureau in this role of advocate.

We cannot rest upon our record because we can never be satisfied as long as some of the people are without adequate opportunities to obtain food, clothing and shelter. We

can never rest as long as we are confronted with new ideas of concern.

For this reason in particular it is important that we spend time during this convention to analyze certain new issues in Indian affairs that will have a growing and lasting impact upon the ultimate destiny of the Indian people.

These three issues are: The rights of individual Indians under the Constitution of the United States; problems of Indians who are increasingly congregating in off-reservation communities; and, last but hardly least, the young among us.

Each of these issues is a reflection of the fact that the lives of Indians are becoming more and more enmeshed with society as a whole. It is a trend we cannot reverse; and therefore we must help ease the transition so we do not lose.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

The civil rights of American Indians under the Constitution of the United States have been won slowly but not easily. Citizenship has been guaranteed only since 1924. Until the Civil Rights Act of 1964, voting rights of Indians under various State laws were frequently questioned. Job discrimination against Indians existed in many areas of heavy Indian population until equalization of employment opportunities for minorities was further protected by recent Federal law. Most recently, the Civil Rights Act of 1968 gives further protections to the Indian citizenry of this country.

Under the 1968 Act are several titles—II through VII, to be specific—pertaining directly to Indians. Title II, for example, provides redress through Federal courts against arbitrary and capricious treatment by tribal authorities in violation of Constitutional rights. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act relates to the assumption by States of criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indian country. It makes a significant change in Public Law 280, 83rd Congress, by requiring consent of the Indian tribe before assumption of jurisdiction by any State not now having such jurisdiction; and it further provides authority for the United States to accept a retrocession of jurisdiction from States which have previously acquired it.

It would appear that the intent of Congress, under this new Act, is to assure uniformity of justice to all Indians while providing the means for a healthy strengthening of tribal law enforcement authority. It calls for a new model code for the few remaining courts under BIA jurisdiction and for the training of judges in such courts. Such a model code, and such professional training could well be applicable to tribal courts.

We hope that you will join us to render a service to member tribes—and, conceivably, to other tribes, as well—by providing leadership to see that in time existing tribal laws will relate to the requirements of the new Civil Rights Act. This concept has taken a long time to be supported by law and we must take the opportunity to make it meaningful.

This organization can also help member tribes obtain fullest benefit from other new legislation: The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act; and the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. Both of these laws provide funds for help in improving law enforcement services and in administering justice effectively. These laws qualify Indian tribes for direct participation.

The BIA is ready and willing to help you in this matter.

#### OFF-RESERVATION INDIANS

Another issue—one is which this organization and all tribes must move to find solutions—is the question of off-reservation Indians. Thousands of Indian people are moving away from reservation communities, sometimes to nearby towns, sometimes to cities some miles distant. Not all of the numbers who are now settling in such diverse

places as Rapid City, South Dakota; the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul; Chicago, San Francisco; and Los Angeles are doing so through the BIA's Adult Vocational Training and Employment Assistance services.

The BIA's mission has not extended to Indians who leave the reservation, except to the extent that it provides short-term services for those on reservations who seek BIA help in relocating.

Neither does the BIA mission extend to Indians whose reservation lands are not under Federal trusteeship control. Large pockets of Indian population in northern New York and Maine, for example, are beyond BIA's purview. So are smaller groups scattered along the east coast from Massachusetts to Georgia, and groups in California that have been "terminated."

Indian organizations, therefore, are the hope of these groups. Through your structure and that of your tribes, you can help them to rally public attention to their cause and public aid to alleviate their pressing needs. Through State and local governments, the Federal Government disburses billions of dollars annually for such services as public schooling, health and welfare, development of community projects, and manpower training. The question is: Are the off-reservation Indians, and the Indians on reservations not under trusteeship, getting a fair share of their community's total Federal outlay?

You need also come to grips with the problems which develop in relationships between those of you who live in Indian communities, and those who live away. We are all of one blood, we all have the same basic goals, we are too few to have any political voice unless we are united.

Indians in far away communities are proud of their Indian heritage, have organized themselves because of their common interest, and seek a meaningful relationship with those of you who are in positions of tribal responsibility.

We need to sit down and start discussions that will open the way for understanding between resident and non-resident Indians. I am sure we will find that we have much in common and that most differences can be resolved. We cannot afford the luxury of disunity, so I suggest that the NCAI use its good offices to bring about useful meetings between those who live in Indian communities and those who are away.

#### INDIAN YOUTH

As the forces of change are at work all over the world—and since the reservation is no longer isolated from the rest of society because of T.V., radio, and all communication media, Indian youth is in turmoil over what they see and hear. This turmoil is good if it is founded in the realities of the issues of today. And, the reality of the young Indian people in Indian country is—that they must learn to live in two worlds so as not to become the victims of both. My concern is that Indian young people not become diverted in their quest for meaningful places in society by those elements who are attempting to tear apart the fiber of American lifeways and who see this period of change as a means to achieve leadership through anarchy. Indian young people should not use their youthful energies to burn themselves out in hate and destruction as some young people are doing, but rather they should use these energies in the agonizing search for social justice. They need to look forward with goals in mind—and not backward in anger. To look backward in anger would only perpetuate discontent, provide no basis for revival of Indian spirit, and use of energies which are needed to build a better future.

We need to appraise our relationship with Indian youth before we find ourselves in treacherous waters—before passion replaces reason—before slogans replace issues—before carrying of signs replaces carrying of pride and dignity. We owe them our best efforts

because we look to them for the fulfillment of our dreams. They are our prime resources of vitality and new ideas, and our greatest resource.

How do we establish communication between them and us? We need to create an environment for them to speak out with a sense of responsibility and not of futility. We need to provide a forum by which they can make their voices heard on public issues. We need to talk and listen to each other with mutual respect, and the desire for understanding—and we need to make them feel comfortable in this dialogue, but we do not need always to agree with them. We need to understand them. They want to talk to you—the Indian leaders—and not to others. The reason I know this is because many, many young people in the last few months have told me this.

We should seek to build and not to destroy—because in seeking to destroy we become our own victims. We need to think and communicate in realistic terms with sincerity as its basis. And, we need to face life in our times. We need to draw upon the past—but not to rest upon it. We need to keep Indian heritage a living thing—and keep it from becoming stagnant. And the only suggestion I could make on the theme for this conference is to have the word "Living" before Indian Heritage because a stagnant or a dead heritage is of no value. Indian youth are coming on us very strong. They are coming on us in large numbers—they are coming on us better educated—they are coming on us more sophisticated. Fifty percent of the general population of this country is approximately 28 years of age and under. These young people as they come on can be a positive force for good, or they can be a negative force for evil—this is our challenge. Indian culture does not provide a place for the young person because in the Indian culture you went from child to man or from child to woman. Wisdom was related to age, and silence among the young was a virtue. But because the minds of our young have been stimulated by education and new experiences, more than ever before they want to know "why?" and we need to answer. They possess everything to build healthy personalities. They have heredity in which they want to take pride—they come from an environment with which they know they must cope—but they know that they alone must accept responsibility for how they respond to the situations that they will be confronted with in daily life. They will have to accept their heredity, cope with their environment, and say to themselves, "Now what shall I do with myself?"

The rate of suicides among younger Indians is greater than the young people in society generally. The rate of suicides among older Indians is lesser than that of older people in society generally. Young Indian people need to find and know themselves. If they don't find themselves they will not be any good to themselves or to anyone else. It could be that we have not provided them with the sources of strength, we have not helped them to see life in proper perspective, and develop values around which to build their lives. We have not taken them into our confidence to give them the recognition they so desperately want. We have not provided them a means by which they can see that they will ever derive a sense of fulfillment. We must see to it that they get the opportunity to build our Indian heritage anew and help keep it *living and great*; so they can live wholesome lives in the image of man and God.

But, we must start now, because today is already too late for some, and tomorrow will be too late for others. You can do this. In my experience, living on the reservation, going to school, with Indian young people, and 35 years of work among you I've developed an unshakable faith and abiding confidence in Indian people. I know you can rise to this

challenge as you have risen to challenges in the past. I look to you for ideals, for goals and for inspiration. I am proud of the restraint and dignity that you have shown in this period of our history.

I am very optimistic for the Indian future because of the leadership that we have and is currently emerging among Indian people both young and adult. I am proud to be one of you.

#### ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to congratulate the WAGL radio station in Lancaster, S.C., for the fine editorial on the antiballistic missile Safeguard system which was broadcast on May 7, 1969. The editorial is an excellent example of a great public service to keep the radio audience in the Lancaster area well informed on a vital issue affecting our national security.

It is reassuring for a responsible news medium to accept its obligation to the people to explain difficult and complex critical issues. It is especially important for a responsible medium to take a position on these issues. I commend Mr. B. L. Phillips, Jr., president of WAGL, for his outstanding editorial in support of the ABM Safeguard system. It reflects a wise understanding of what is involved and clearly presents the urgent need for this defensive protection of our Nation's nuclear deterrent.

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

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

#### WAGL EDITORIAL

Very soon in the Congress of the United States, our Representatives and Senators will be voting on whether or not this nation should build and deploy the Safeguard System, which is President Nixon's version of the much discussed ABM . . . Anti Ballistic Missile System.

WAGL would, for the following reasons, cast a ye vote on this issue in favor of construction and deployment.

First, the Safeguard ABM System would give creditability to the United States' retaliatory position in that it would protect our minuteman missile sites which are designed to deal a devastating retaliatory blow to any country launching a first strike against us.

Secondly, the Safeguard ABM System would be an effective defense against an accidental launch of one or two missiles by any foreign country against the United States through either human or mechanical error.

And third, while the Safeguard ABM System is not designed to be, and therefore would not be, an effective defense of our cities against an all out attack by the Soviet Union, it would be an effective defense against any limited attack Red China may be capable of launching against the United States for the next few years.

WAGL feels that in the face of the knowledge that the Soviet Union has built their SS-9 missile which is capable of delivering a 25 megaton warhead on target, President Nixon's strategy of deploying the Safeguard

ABM missiles around our Minuteman sites is a sound one since the Soviet Union's intention of such a powerful weapon can only be to destroy our retaliatory missiles in their underground silos making us incapable of retaliation to any first strike they may deal. Their intention is clear since our military minds tell us that to completely destroy a major city, only a one to two megaton weapon is needed.

Further evidence that the Soviet Union is placing itself in a position of first strike capability is their own ABM System, which is deployed to protect not their missile sites, but their cities. This would indicate that when this ABM System is called on to defend, their missiles having been already launched in a first strike will not be there to defend . . . rather it will be their cities that will need defending against the United States' retaliatory wrath.

There are those who would oppose the Safeguard ABM System on the grounds that it would be further escalation of the arms race. However, we point out that Safeguard is entirely a defensive system and is in no way offensive. It could not be used to attack, only to defend, and at that only to defend our Minuteman missile sites, not our cities. Opponents also say that to build an ABM System may be to risk offending the Soviet Union. Please remember, however, that the Soviet Union thought lightly of offending the United States when they built their ABM System. Other opponents say that the costs of safeguard may exceed the estimated 5 to 7 billion dollars and that this expenditure would cause social welfare efforts to suffer financially. WAGL would remind these opponents that if we ever actually incur a first strike from the Soviet Union so many American lives will be lost as to make our social welfare problem look indeed small by comparison.

The United States has depended in the past for its deterrent ace in the hole, on the fact that the Soviet Union knew that if they launched a nuclear attack against us, we both could and would launch a nuclear attack right back on them. Now with the advent of the Soviet Union's 25 megaton SS-9 missile, our ability to return a nuclear attack to them has been greatly diminished, and therefore nullifying our deterrent ace in the hole, leaving this country defensively naked before the Soviet Union. Remember that the leaders of the Soviet Union have repeatedly threatened to quote "bury us". WAGL says, let us not for one moment turn our back on the Soviet Union, lest we by so doing permit them to carry out their threat.

The Safeguard ABM System is the soundest insurance for peace and against war that the United States can buy in 1969, for the 1970's. WAGL urges each and every citizen to write their Congressmen and Senators expressing support for the construction and deployment of President Nixon's Safeguard ABM System.

#### ABM—A SENSIBLE SAFEGUARD

### HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the VFW magazine of May 1969, published an excellent article on the ABM, written by the VFW's Commander in Chief Richard Homan. Mr. Homan's article, entitled "ABM—A Sensible Safeguard," presents a logical and reasonable case for going ahead with the Safeguard program.

Having once served the Veterans of

Foreign Wars of the United States as commander in chief, I know this organization. The VFW speaks for grass-roots America. It represents a vast cross section of our society. It includes men who have fought to preserve the security of this country, and they want to perpetuate it. I am impressed with the position taken by Mr. Homan and the VFW. The VFW feels that President Richard M. Nixon should be given the tools he needs to achieve peace through preparedness. Because of the timeliness and significance of the ABM issue, I include Mr. Homan's article in the RECORD:

#### ABM—A SENSIBLE SAFEGUARD

(By Richard Homan)

A vital issue facing America and one on which hinges the future security and perhaps survival of the United States is the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) defense plan currently being debated.

While readers of the *V.F.W. Magazine* are familiar with the issues surrounding the Vietnam war, it is likely only a few are thoroughly cognizant of those involved in the ABM question.

In order to place ABM in perspective, it is necessary to review a few of the events leading up to the Safeguard Plan, which President Nixon recently enunciated.

Former President Johnson had chosen to proceed with the Sentinel ABM system, which envisioned the installation of ABM radar and missilery in such a way that the civilian population would be protected against an early Chinese Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) threat.

Under this system, incoming enemy missiles would be detected by radar. Defensive missiles would then intercept and explode them before they reached heavily populated areas of the United States.

Moreover, the Johnson Sentinel system could easily have been expanded into a heavier defense of American cities against Soviet missiles.

President Nixon's Safeguard Plan has modified Sentinel by emphasizing defense of missile sites, rather than major population centers, to guarantee nuclear retaliation against any nation that would mount a first nuclear strike against the United States.

President Nixon's plan also involves a carefully phased deployment, as he said in announcing it:

"Each phase of the deployment will be reviewed to insure that we are doing as much as necessary but no more than that required by the threat existing at that time.

"Moreover, we will take maximum advantage of the information gathered from the initial deployment in designing later phases of the program."

The V.F.W., therefore, is supporting President Nixon's Safeguard Plan because:

1. It is defensive and designed to protect the nation's capability to retaliate.
2. Deployment of an American ABM system strengthens this country's bargaining position in any disarmament negotiations with the Soviets.
3. Deterrence of a strike against this country is essential. As Secretary of Defense Laird said, "we must be in a position to convince them (Soviets) that a first strike would always involve unacceptable risks."
4. A hermetically-sealed defense is not needed to defend missile sites, compared with major population centers.
5. Defense of strategic forces is the best protection of populations because it will make an aggressor think twice before launching an attack.
6. China's irrational behavior indicates the possibility of dealing a first blow. By the middle of the 1970s China may have two dozen missiles.

I agree with the wisdom of reducing expenditures on defensive missile systems if

they have to be built at the expense of quality offensive systems which offer the primary deterrent to nuclear warfare. It seems fair to assume that any given offensive missile would have a better chance of hitting its target than a defensive missile would have to head it off.

In considering ABM defenses for the United States, more is involved than our own defense posture. We also must consider the security of our allies and friends, and we must consider what the Soviet Union and Red China are doing about their ABM defenses. Thus far, neither the Soviet Union nor Red China, nor any other Communist government has shown compassion for the weak and the meek. They have, on numerous occasions, shown their disdain for disorganized groups and their respect for boldness based on unity and strength. Thus, in recent years, the Soviet Union has shown a willingness to negotiate on certain aspects of nuclear weaponry.

Americans must face the fact that until an arms agreement can be made with the Soviet Union, both nations will continue to live with the possibility, albeit remote, of a nuclear war.

Some students of Soviet power and policy believe that relationships between the Soviet Union and the United States may have reached the threshold of improvement rather than further deterioration. This is because the Soviet Union has built a strong industrial base which Soviet leaders would not like to see destroyed. In addition, there is the spectre of Red China's hordes moving across the Soviet Union's boundaries to claim territories which have shifted ownership throughout the centuries. Soviet leaders also face numerous and complex problems among their satellites, some of which would like to become independent of the Mother Russia complex.

So, it may be that the Soviet government does want to negotiate some sort of a nuclear peace with the United States. If so, Soviet leaders are hard bargainers. We know this from experience after experience following World War II.

Not only can President Nixon offer better protection to the United States by offering another counter to ballistic missile aggression; but also, he can bargain for the United States and allies from a position of strength rather than weakness.

Soviet leaders evidently believe in an ABM system of defense. They have built ABM defenses around Moscow and it is highly likely that they are continuing to refine and improve the systems which they have built. Obviously, Soviet leaders regard ABM defense as added protection in a nuclear war.

The United States' construction of an ABM defense should encourage respect from Soviet military and political leaders and it should encourage their cooperation for realistic discussions on nuclear arms control.

Because of this and because the Veterans of Foreign Wars has always believed that the United States' security should be second to none, I commended President Nixon on the wisdom of his decision in a letter which appears on this page.

I urge our membership to reach out to all Americans in support of President Nixon's decision for the modified ABM defense plan called Safeguard.

As Commander-in-Chief, I urge our national, state and local leaders to follow the ABM discussions closely. Let us remember that the President has not placed our national feet in concrete on this matter. He has left room to make changes as conditions change. His decision on Safeguard was made in the context of today's conditions. It is not irrevocable. Should the situation change, the President has reserved the option to modify the entire Safeguard program, or eliminate it if it is not needed. Surely it cannot be said that this program will escalate the arms race, for the Soviets know, as well as we, that the entire system has no offensive

capability. The ABM decision deserves the support of all Americans. Let us hope that it will be the first of many decisions and efforts by President Nixon to reach a sane and peaceful world for us, and our children and grandchildren.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Writing in behalf of the 1,450,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I wish to congratulate you on your recent anti-ballistic missile (ABM) decision to proceed with this program in such a manner that you minimize the incentive for an escalation of the arms race.

Specifically, Mr. President, I commend your proposal for a modified Sentinel plan which is designed to protect certain of our land-based launching sites. This decision should make it plain to friend and potential foe that our government is determined to deter nuclear war, and that the best deterrent is a protective shield for our long-range missiles ashore and the vastness of the ocean depths for our Polaris-type missiles afloat.

Based on the technical knowledge now available to the public, it would seem patently impossible to prevent mass destruction to both sides in a massive exchange of nuclear-tipped missiles. Should the radars, ours or those of a nuclear opponent, become saturated by sheer numbers, the ballistic missile defenses—ours or those of a nuclear opponent—would probably become as futile and outdated as the Maginot Line of World War II.

I further commend you on your course of 'determination and restraint' in this highly complicated type of warfare. You have reserved the option to curtail or re-orient this program to reflect the results of international negotiations and technical developments.

In search for improved missile defense systems, it may be that you will run across some sort of a system which would make it possible to intercept the opponents' missiles on their way up rather than on their way down. Further, should you find a way to destroy them on their way up, any atomic explosions and contaminated fallout from anti-ballistic missiles would occur near the aggressor's launching sites and far away from U.S. shores.

Regardless of what the future brings, I know you are proceeding with a strong and urgent research program, and I am indeed hopeful that our talented teams of scientists and engineers will find some technological breakthrough which will minimize the danger and security risks to the United States' populated areas against any and all types of missile systems.

In summary, Mr. President, you have chosen the course on the ABM which tells both Red China and the Soviet Union that we are determined to remain up-to-date and push ahead in our research, and you have left open the pathways of negotiation should either the Soviet Union or Red China, or both, care to join us.

You have our support.

YEAR OF THE STUDENT—ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM WOOD, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

HON. TED STEVENS

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on May 19, 1969, I had the pleasure of attend-

ing the commencement exercises at the University of Alaska. Dr. William Wood, the president of the university, delivered an excellent address which is pertinent to our society today. I commend his remarks to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

YEAR OF THE STUDENT

Class of 1969, world-wide the months and days preceding this ceremonial occasion have been identified and tagged as the year of the student. The student as "revolutionary" has been analyzed, interpreted, praised, damned and publicized until the paying public is heartily sick of the subject. Thousands of pictures, millions of words, horrible facts and horrible lies, nonsense from the far left, equally nonsense from the far right, have created an ugly, at times obscene, image of youth in this year of the student.

One hesitates to add more words to the drive lest he increase the distortion. Youth is not ugly, not obscene, yet the calculated provocative acts and words of the few are increasingly so viewed by the many.

The disorders in some streets and on some campuses are real. There is violence. In our heart we may not believe, yet our ears hear and our eyes see militant against the system, against the Establishment (whatever it is at the moment said to be by the militant) man against man, student against faculty, against police, student against student. The confrontations are real. They happen on issues relevant as well as on issues meaningless. There are burnings and looting. There are wastelands of confusion and chaos around the globe.

Class of 1969, from 65 degrees North all of us this year have been privileged to take the cool view. For one I am deeply appreciative of your own constructive and responsible efforts to keep this oasis well-tended and productive as you seek with your vigorous young faculty new and improved ways to enhance the quality of learning and living.

Yet yours is the legacy of the Year of the Student. In our midst, perhaps in this audience, certainly in this community and in this State, are some entirely convinced of the non-existence of virtue of any sort in Youth. A student is bad, ergo all students are bad. With this attitude of distrust you must now contend, just as you must contend with the disorders of our time, and more particularly with the root causes of these disorders.

There is so little choice before you, before any of us. Together we shall still militant disorder or perish. Unless we are intelligent enough to recognize the root causes of disorder in our complex mixture of preindustrial, industrial, and post-industrial ways of living, there is little hope of confronting them successfully.

A "better way" for the subsistence man has for generations challenged the strongest effort of industrial man to produce in quantity goods and services desired by all, but not wisely distributed nor always wisely used. The amazing technology of production now brings within reach the means to eliminate ignorance and poverty and hunger and disease in near totality.

Especially in Alaska, not confounded by masses of people, but blessed with abundance of resources and the availability of the productive wonders of automation, the old dream of industrial man even now seems within our grasp. We can and shall eradicate illiteracy, unemployment, inadequate housing, and other hazards to health and well-being.

And then? What are the goals of the affluent, the post-industrial man? This enigma, also, you must confront. With this, too, you must contend. The outmoded philosophy of the radical right holds no answer. No matter how loud its proponents shout, it will not suffice for post-industrial time. The radical left have no clearly stated philosophy of their own and readily admit the fact. The proponents have no power to construct; they can only destruct. Affluence provides merely an outlet in violence, or in aimless avoidance of reality, for their frustrations and insecurities.

Youthful idealists proclaiming themselves the honest ones angrily denounce hypocrisy that so obviously exists on the other side of the generation gulch. The contention is neither self-perceptive nor honest. Can the weathered side of the shingle be blamed for not abating the storms that as yet have not touched the protected side? Can one without a philosophy in all honesty attack another for not living up to his own?

Beyond affluence, what? I see no final answer in protest as protest, in the use of violence to protest the use of violence by others, in indifference for the victim while exuding compassion for the criminal.

I see no final answer coming from the greatest concentration of power the world has known, that of the electronic communications media. If the input at one end of the tube specializes in disorder, the output at the other end will tend to disorient and ultimately destroy both the individual and the family.

If the family falls, can the schools be far behind? If the church is confused in purpose, can the community long survive?

Let us remind ourselves, as well as the media, that ideas and constructive happenings and persons merit publicizing, too. These are the heart of the enterprise that is higher education, the magnificent enterprise of freedom without which there is little hope for future man, affluent or not.

In this Year of the Student higher education, in part through its own inadequacies but only in part, has been shoved down in priority, vilified, slurred by insinuation and innuendo, the 91% tarred by association with the 9% in this nation as in other nations, and sadly, for we know better, by some even in Alaska.

Class of 1969, in the mirror of tomorrow the future facing you, is you facing the future. Meet the issues frankly and responsibly as you have done this year with me and with all your associates on campus, your colleagues, the faculty and staff.

Together you have not indulged excesses on the far right nor the far left but have involved yourselves intelligently along the path between the extremes where effort toward improvement in quality is most effective.

Let us remember the heart-warming occasions, the memorable moments we have shared at 65 degrees North during this Year of the Student: the splendid success of the delegation to Juneau, the exceptional academic achievements of Cynthia who never attended a high school, the stirring accomplishments of Milo as player and person, Barbara again winning All American, the successful steering of an evaluation of academic programs and instruction through the University Assembly, the acquisition of the Big Dome. Old fashioned? A bit corny? This is Dullsville for the modern media. A pot party around Wood's hole would attract more coverage.

Class of 1969, I am proud of you, of your mature outlook, your resistance to panic, your independence, your honesty with yourselves as well as with others, your non-conformity to the far-out lures of the times.

Best of luck to each of you. You will be missed on campus and welcome everywhere.

## ANDERSON PRAISES AQUANAUTS

## HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with all Americans in expressing pride in the Apollo 10 mission and in wishing the astronauts a successful mission and a safe return. At the same time, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American public the success of another mission which has received very little publicity of public attention yet has made an immeasurable contribution to science and mankind.

I am referring to Project Tektite, a 60-day underwater mission conducted by four American aquanauts off St. John Island in the Virgin Islands. Project Tektite is the longest underwater exploration to date and the aquanauts and their supporting crew deserve our highest praise and commendation. The four aquanauts are: Mr. John F. Van Derwalker of Washington, D.C.; Mr. Conrad Mahnken of Brainbridge Island, Wash.; Dr. Edward Clifton of Los Altos, Calif.; and Mr. Richard Waller of Oxon Hill, Md. Last week the aquanauts were presented with Distinguished Service Awards by Vice President AGNEW in his capacity as Chairman of both the Space Council and the Marine Resources Council. They were also honored on Capitol Hill in an appearance before the Oceanography Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleagues at that session.

The success of the mission is a real tribute to American ingenuity and the cooperative efforts of the public and private sectors. The underwater habitat was designed and built by General Electric and the project was jointly conducted by the Department of the Interior, the Office of Naval Research, and NASA along with the participation of the Coast Guard.

The purpose of the mission was twofold: First, to study man's behavioral and biomedical response to a situation of isolation and duration; and second, to conduct oceanographic research work. The results of the first study will make a significant contribution both to future space and underwater missions. And the work done on the marine life and environment will certainly further our efforts in the field of oceanography.

Two weeks ago I appeared before the Oceanography Subcommittee and expressed my interest in the creation of an independent executive agency to oversee our national ocean program. I think the concern expressed by the aquanauts that this type of work be continued speaks directly to the need for a national program for the oceans and the organizational means for its implementation. In the words of one of the aquanauts:

If we are to reap the wealth of the continental shelf, this type of work should be furthered.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the international decade of ocean exploration, I am most concerned that America is ade-

quately equipped and oriented to make a substantial contribution to this endeavor. Contrary to popular myth, the wealth of the oceans is not ours for the asking; its extraction and full utilization will depend on a national commitment and a positive program. Or, to rephrase that myth, the wealth of the oceans is ours for the acting.

I include in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, two interesting and informative articles describing the goals and accomplishments of Project Tektite:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1969]  
TEKTITE PROJECT POINTS THE WAY TOWARD  
EVENTUAL CONTROL OF THE OCEAN DEEPS  
BY MAN

(By Richard D. Lyons)

CHARLOTTE AMALIE, St. Thomas, V.I., April 19—Can man who evolved from the sea to dominate the land reverse the process by returning to the oceans and asserting his control over their depths?

In long-range thinking the answer would seem to be yes, with man's return to the sea not taking nearly so long as his evolution to land.

Yet it is highly doubtful that, in the short run, the answer can be so positive, although the scientific, economic and military rewards might be substantial.

Man is reaching these conclusions about the outlook for living and working in the ocean as a result of increasing exploration. The latest major effort concluded this week as four Project Tektite aquanauts emerged after spending 60 days on the ocean bottom, a record, off the nearby island of St. John.

That project and the Navy's Sealab 3 experiments are concerned with the question of living and working on the continental shelf.

Living in the ocean basins, those areas below 3,300 feet that cover more than half the ocean, appear to be beyond expectation for generations to come.

The immediate hope is to exploit the continental shelves vast plateaus that range downward in depth to 600 feet and cover 10 million square miles of ocean floor, an area three times as large as the United States.

## THRIVING MARINE LIFE

The waters between sea level and the shelves thrive with animal and vegetable life that could be used to enrich the diets of a world that is half hungry.

Mineral and petroleum resources of immense value also remain to be exploited, and will not be until the economic return more than balances the huge investments needed to develop these reserves.

Militarily, these areas could also be used as hiding places for nuclear missile emplacements or underwater tracking stations to monitor the movements of hostile submarines.

But at today's prices the cost of such undertakings would be staggering. One Federal oceanographic commission reported earlier this year that mounting a civilian program would cost about \$1-billion a year for the next decade. Then the price would double.

## DEEP DIVING IS COSTLY

"The seas are vast, complex, subtle and often hostile to men and his works," said the Commission on Marine Sciences, Engineering and Resources. "They will not yield their secrets in a decade or a generation."

Almost no amount of money will buy, at the present time, rapid advances in underwater technology.

Many small submarines capable of deep diving are being constructed at great cost. But these are mainly reconnaissance craft.

For commercial exploitation of the shelves, there would be a need for systems that would allow aquanauts to live under water for many

months, as well as range outside their living quarters to work on the sea floor.

Officials of the Federal Government and private oceanographic concerns have talked optimistically of routinely working at depths of down to 1,000 feet. Yet the three main ingredients of such an ambitious program are far from being perfected.

## BREATHING SYSTEM NEEDED

These are a simple yet effective breathing system for deep dives; a dependable habitat, and a rapid resupply system.

None have been achieved, and it will probably be years before these three major problems are solved.

The Navy's ambitious \$10-million Sealab project, on which hopes had been pinned for rapid advances in deep diving systems, had been stalled by the mysterious death of an aquanaut two months ago and repeated problems with the underwater capsule in which he and eight other marine explorers were to have lived at a depth of 600 feet off the California coast.

The Sealab 3 project was originally scheduled to start six months ago, but technical problems are likely to add up to a delay of at least a year.

The infant state of the undersea art and the problems with Sealab appear to have chilled, at least temporarily, the Navy's emerging interests in underwater research and development.

The Office of Naval Research was the managing agency for the Tektite project. While the project was largely successful, although limited in scope, the Navy went out of its way to hold down publicity about it, possibly because of the earlier problem with Sealab 3.

The Department of the Interior, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the General Electric Company were partners with the Navy in the Tektite project.

## BRIEF CONGRATULATIONS

Officials of these organizations were seen to seethe with anger when the Navy abruptly canceled several news conferences about Tektite, prevented reporters from conducting previously agreed-upon interviews with the aquanauts while they were under water, ordered photographers away from the site several times, denied newsmen access to telephones at a base camp set up on the shore, and eventually declared the camp off limits to the press.

Public relations officials with the space agency and to beat the drums for Tektite and harvest some publicity for the project and their organizations, but the Navy obviously did not.

Even President Nixon's congratulatory telegram to the aquanauts on the completion of their stay under water, at a depth of 42 feet, contained only 22 words, short shrift for a project he termed "a milestone in human achievement."

Tektite was hardly that, although it doubled the record for underwater living time. The program, which cost \$2.5-million, was designed mainly to determine if men could live and perform meaningful work for an extended period at a relatively shallow depth. It did prove just that.

With the exception of the specialty designed living quarters, called a habitat, most of the equipment was composed of items previously in use.

Tektite also proved the value of the so-called nitrogen saturation diving technique, a method that is far simpler and more economical than the helium saturation system employed in deep diving projects. The two saturation methods employ mixtures of the respective gases under pressure, plus oxygen to sustain the aquanauts' life support system.

## HELIUM GAS EXPENSIVE

Before the aquanaut enter their undersea environment, their bodies are saturated with one of these gases to counteract the extreme

pressures of the water on their bodies in the deeps.

The cost of the gas in the helium system is about \$5,000 a week for the Sealab 3 project. Pure oxygen itself cannot be used because under pressure it can produce convulsions in the diver.

At 600 feet the water presses in on the human body at a pressure of more than 18 times that of the sea-level atmosphere.

Helium systems also require the designing of electrical equipment, and complicate communications because of the so-called "Donald Duck effect." The human voice, when a helium-oxygen mixture is breathed, becomes distorted and squeaky. Therefore, nitrogen saturation is a simpler method.

Until Tektite it had been feared that physiological problems might arise through the breathing of massive amounts of nitrogen for many weeks. These fears proved unfounded.

#### FINDS VALUE PROVED

Dr. James W. Miller, the Navy's chief scientist on Tektite, said that the program had proved the value of the nitrogen system and urged a follow-on underwater program that would test nitrogen saturation diving at depths of 75 to 100 feet.

But beyond those depths, nitrogen narcosis affects the aquanaut. Under this condition, the massive amounts of nitrogen in the body cause a feeling of inebriation, giddiness and inattentiveness that could be disastrous under water.

Tektite's chief aquanaut, Richard A. Waller, an oceanographer, said that the program's most serious mistake had been not making use of "closed-circuit" breathing apparatus that employ supercooled gases. These systems are being built by the General Electric Company for the Navy and some of them are secret.

The closed-circuit systems not only provide the aquanauts with oxygen but also freeze his expended carbon-dioxide and retain it in the system.

Mr. Waller's point was that improved breathing systems would extend the range and flexibility of marine scientists exploring the continental shelves. Advanced closed-circuit systems such as the Navy's Mark 10 could allow underwater excursions of up to eight hours, compared with the one hour allowed by scuba gear.

Mr. Waller pointed out that the Tektite aquanauts were equipped with scuba gear originally developed a generation ago by Jacques-Yves Cousteau, the French underwater explorer.

In a congratulatory message to the Tektite aquanauts, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel foresaw the day of underwater resort areas and even cities. Such ambitious dreams, however, are far from being just around the corner.

After 36 hours at a depth of 42 feet, for example, 20 hours of decompression are needed to rid the body's tissues of the excess of nitrogen that could cause the bends.

This led Mr. Waller to comment that he did not think even underwater resorts would be practical "because commuting would be a real problem if you have to work for a livelihood."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Apr. 19, 1969]

#### AQUANAUTS SAY 60-DAY SEA STAY BECAME EASIER AFTER EXPERIENCE

(By Thomas O'Toole)

The four aquanauts who spent a record 60 days on the Virgin Islands ocean floor said yesterday that the longer they stayed down the better they could perform underwater work.

Their underwater stay went so smoothly, said Team Leader Richard Waller, 34, of Oxon Hill, Md., that they had more trouble with their support personnel on the surface

than with any equipment in their underwater habitat or with sea life they encountered outside the habitat.

The thing that bothered the aquanauts most, Waller said at a news briefing held on the island of St. Thomas, was the eavesdropping of surface-watchers on their off-duty conversations.

"We felt the best way to show our displeasure," said Waller, "was to turn off the microphones inside the habitat for two hours every day."

Waller, Conrad Mahnken, John Van der Walker and H. Edward Clifton, all marine scientists with the Interior Department, spent a record 434 hours outside their twin-tower structure, which was anchored in 50 feet of water in Great Lameshur Bay near the island of St. John.

The more they got used to living in their undersea habitat, the more daring the aquanauts became in their time outside the habitat.

During their first two weeks underwater, they spent 35 to 40 hours each week outside the habitat, never moving farther than 300 feet from the well-lit cabin.

But by the end of their stay, the four were averaging 70 hours a week in the water and were swimming out of sight of the habitat, as far away as 3000 feet.

The aquanauts also spent much of the time during their last weeks swimming at night, when the men watching their movements from the surface found it hard to see them.

Fully a third of the total time they spent swimming outside their habitat was at night.

In the entire time (they "spashed-up" last Tuesday) the four men were on the ocean floor, the most serious threat to their health was a transient ear infection, which struck all four men for brief periods, but never all four at once.

Outside the habitat, the only danger came when a five-foot moray eel swam into their shark cage on the habitat's front porch and refused to leave. The aquanauts were faced with only one choice: one of them swam into the cage and killed the dangerous eel with a knife.

While all four reported spotting barracuda near them in the water, none ever saw a shark.

One of the questions the Tektite experiment set out to answer was whether it is better to have men dive into the water to work or to have them live in the water while they work.

One official of the Office of Naval Research said he felt Tektite answered that question fairly clearly, while Waller himself said he was convinced "more can be done by men living on the bottom."

A combined venture of the Navy, the Interior Department, the Coast Guard, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and General Electric, Tektite cost an estimated \$2.5 million—\$500,000 of which was spent on the undersea living quarters.

#### NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

#### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Star of May 4, 1969; also an article dated May 2, 1969.

I wish to add my own personal tribute to Dr. Scott, who has been the heart and

soul of the National Collection of Fine Arts. David W. Scott is an extraordinary person. He is modest, quiet, almost retiring, but nevertheless has a will of iron in the cause to which he has devoted, and is devoting, his talents—bringing the world of art to play a meaningful role in our world. He is an expert's expert, as well as a layman's expert. He has an understanding for those qualities of art which make it grasp at the heart of the child as well as the intellect of the critic.

It is my understanding that Dr. Scott may soon move on to another task, having accomplished the seemingly impossible of making the NCFCA into, as the Washington Star says, "a remarkable phoenix-like achievement." We in Washington in particular, but also in the Nation for which Washington should stand as something special, have strong reason to thank Dr. Scott for what he has done, and to wish him well in his new and challenging assignment.

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

#### LOVABLE ART

(By Donnie Radcliffe)

Remember that agony of childhood—the warning "don't touch?"

Well, philosophies have changed a little over at the Smithsonian's National Collection of Fine Arts and in the newly-opened Junior Museum, the invitation is "do touch"—sticky fingers and all.

Yesterday, a vanguard of small fry, stuffed with punch and cookies, touched, hugged, squeezed and kissed nearly a dozen small-scale 19th-century animal sculptures to the smiling approval of mommies and museum officials.

The grown-ups knew, even if the youngsters did not, that the patina of each creation, many by Paulanship, was safely protected by a plastic wax.

"They still cannot touch things in the museum proper," said Director David Scott.

"But here the idea of touching is meant to be part of the orientation before they tour the museum."

It is an extension of the National Collection's highly successful concept of involving the child physically in art and sculpture rather than losing him in lectures.

Ann Glascock, in charge of the children's tours, calls the Junior Museum a "warm-up" or "exercise" room.

"We'll bring them here, tell them to become machines and then 'turn' them on. Next we'll ask them to be a statue and in that way begin to explain the difference between a machine and a statue.

"Finally, we'll work into color and texture and ask them to feel things."

From the Junior Museum, exiting by a diamond-shaped hole in an otherwise commonplace door (the entrance is through a circle), youngsters tour the collection where docents invite them to act out the paintings and sculptures they see.

"Can anybody find something to be?" one docent asked a group of small charges yesterday as she showed them an exhibit on the first floor.

"I need to go to the bathroom," piped up one wee voice while his companions silently transformed themselves into table legs and other nonhuman objects.

Not everything in the Junior Museum is in the readily recognizable shapes of turtles, deer, leopards and bears in bronze.

On one wall hangs the room's only painting, an 18-foot ceiling-high striped canvas by Gene Davis entitled "Raspberry Icicles."

There is also Lyman Kipp's specially-designed four-foot minimal sculpture called

"Salamanca" meant to be sat on or climbed up.

Richard Calabro's aluminum sculpture may be assembled and reassembled.

And Adam Peiper's "Astrolite No. 84," similar to those now in the private collections of Laurence Rockefeller, Otto Preminger, and John Hay Whitney is a mesmerizing glass ball filled with water and colorless plastic rings which, when viewed through a polaroid screen, turn into dazzling floating colors.

"I hope we may be able to designate this the Nancy Kefauver Junior Museum someday," said Scott, looking around at the children.

"Nancy's two great loves were art and children."

Yesterday, as the small guests left, each was invited to select a postcard reproduction of one of the National Collection's works of art.

Money for these gifts came from a fund established in memory of the late Mrs. Kefauver who was head of the State Department's "Art in Embassies" program.

#### NCFCA AT ONE

This weekend the National Collection of Fine Arts celebrates its first year in its handsome quarters in the Old Patent Office Building.

The location itself is worth celebrating. A few short years ago, this architectural monument was scheduled for destruction and was to be paved with asphalt for parking. The NSFA has revealed the gracious interiors in their elegant purity as they had not been seen in many decades.

The NCFCA itself is today a remarkable phoenix-like achievement. For many years it was a semi-moribund, little known division of the Smithsonian. Then, under the forceful leadership of director David W. Scott, the NCFCA came out from behind the stuffed elephant and has become an extraordinary center of art in Washington.

The collection has been reshaped as an assemblage of American painting and sculpture which grows before the eyes of the regular visitor. A brilliant series of special exhibitions has shown in depth the contributions of many individual American artists of the past and present. This nation's artistic heritage has been given a place of its own in the Nation's Capital.

May the extraordinary productive year now ending be the first of many for the NCFCA and Dr. Scott.

#### COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH ADAMS STATE COLLEGE

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in 1894, on a small patch of land in North Adams with a view of the beautiful Hoosac Valley and the impressive Berkshire Hills, a college was born. Over the years it has grown and continues to grow, and it can proudly take its place among the many fine colleges and universities that are found in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts. And so it gives me great pleasure to call to your attention that this year marks the 75th anniversary of the founding of North Adams State College.

In 1894, the Massachusetts General Court established the State Normal School at North Adams. It remained a 2-year college until 1932 when the name was changed to the State Teachers Col-

lege at North Adams and a 4-year course leading to a bachelor of science degree in education was introduced.

Thus, 1937 marked a memorable year in the history of the college, for in that year two important events happened. The college became coeducational and graduate courses leading to a master of education degree were for the first time offered. Improvement and expansion were the guiding words for the State Teachers College.

Many years ago, when I was a State senator from Massachusetts, I realized what excellent educational benefits the college was providing to area residents and I realized the crying need for expansion—so that more of these benefits could be provided to more people. And so when in 1956 an appeal was made by North Adams State Teachers College to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for approximately \$1,500,000 for construction of a new science-auditorium-gymnasium project. I fought long and hard to see that this money would be appropriated. I filed a bill to try to secure this money, but the bill was continually stalled in the legislature. But I would not give up, because I realized the great importance of this money for the future of the school and thus ultimately for the future of the citizens of the area. Finally, after almost 2 years of struggle, I could be happy to report that \$1,500,000 had been appropriated by the State legislature for the new building project.

In 1960, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts authorized the college to grant the bachelor of arts degree, and appropriate courses were then offered. A few years later, a new and special program was introduced. This program prepares men and women as medical technologists and it is run in affiliation and cooperation with Pittsfield General Hospital. And it was just last year that Hoosac Hall, an eight-story dormitory which happens to be the tallest building in all Berkshire County, was opened. For the future, new classrooms, a new library, amphitheaters, an administration building, and other structures are in the process of being constructed, and new programs and courses are being planned. It is apparent, I think, that North Adams State College has dedicated itself to expanding its facilities to provide educational opportunities to more people, and has dedicated itself to the continual improvement of those educational opportunities.

The college catalog lists the present objectives of the college:

To provide both a sound liberal and professional education on the undergraduate level, graduate study for teachers in service in both liberal and professional education, and to provide certain public services to the area, such as liberal arts evening courses for a degree or personal enrichment, consultant services, and a clinic for vocational testing and reading problems.

The North Adams State College is to be commended for all this. It has done in the past, and continues to do in the present, an outstanding job in all these educational endeavors. We are all very proud of the achievements of the college and proud to note today the 75th anniversary of North Adams State College.

#### INFLATION AND INVESTMENT

### HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, trying to cool our rambunctious economy is not unlike the effort required to break a wild horse. Each requires a great deal of patience and perseverance as well as a willingness to sustain a few bruises. Unfortunately, this current inflationary period has proven itself to be unusually high spirited, with the result that the American consumer is quickly turning a brilliant black and blue. Virtually all the economic indicators show that the current inflation is not being significantly abated, even in the face of stringent monetary and fiscal policies. Thus, time has long since past for urging continued patience and perseverance in the face of obvious failure.

In an address delivered before the New York Society of Security Analysts' Portfolio Management Seminary on April 17, 1969, Henry Kaufman highlighted with unusual ability and incisiveness the root causes of inflation and the methods which might be used to combat it. Mr. Kaufman acknowledges that we are now all victims of an inflationary psychology which, if not cured, will serve to further complicate any ultimate solution to the problem. He points to the fact that the bond market has recently shown an unsettling softness which he feels is directly attributable to inflationary influences. He also pinpoints certain new economic forces which have gained importance in the last 20 years and which have had the effect of propelling the economy forward at an accelerated pace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kaufman's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE CHANGING INVESTMENT CLIMATE

(By Henry Kaufman)

If it were in my power to wave a magic wand this afternoon and order up the perfect environment for institutional investments, what would be your wishes? What is it that you would like to assure a cloudless investment horizon and therefore an unusually profitable investment decision? I suspect that we would all agree on some very fundamental and important prerequisites. Probably most basic and crucial of all, we would favor peace because wars have such disruptive influences, especially on our economic aspirations. Concerning the state of the economy itself, we would probably all favor a backdrop of moderate assured growth, moderate unemployment, some unused physical resources and price stability. This setting would permit the normal economic growth rate plus some acceleration without bumping into economic and financial ceilings. Under these circumstances, the financing of our economic requirements would pose no problems to our monetary authorities and the international position of the dollar should strengthen. To these blessings, we might also add domestic, political and social stability, which Americans take for granted.

In looking back, we have never had a period of time in the post World War II years in which all of these perfect conditions prevailed. There has always been the absence of

at least one or several beneficial environmental forces. Immediately following World War II, we suffered from the war's inflationary aftermath, the adjustment to a peacetime economy, and the problems of fiscal and monetary management in the new environment. There was also the disruptive influence of the Korean War in the early 1950's. Perhaps the nearest we came to the perfect investment climate was in 1962-63. At that time, the economy had moved well out of a recession. The unemployment rate was falling but still at 5.5%. Plant utilization in manufacturing was slightly above 80%. The trend in wholesale commodity prices had been virtually flat since 1958. The dollar was still strong but admittedly was showing the first real signs of international weakness.

The current setting does not score high in meeting our test for a perfect investment environment. There is both economic and financial friction. There is a high utilization of labor resources, strong inflationary momentum and expectations of never-ending inflation. Interest rates are very high and the availability of credit is shrinking. To many, these economic and financial disequilibria suggest that we may again be at a cyclical turning point. While I do not entirely disagree with this kind of observation, I find it rather simplistic. There is a tendency in cyclical analysis to overlay comparable periods. This, however, is rather statistical and does not take account of some very fundamental structural changes which have been occurring. These changes have had a profound influence on economic and financial decisions and will probably continue to affect our future investment climate. Therefore, in order to fully understand the complexity of the changing investment climate, I should like to discuss some of these new forces.

#### INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

In the post World War II period immense strides have been made in bringing the people of the world closer together through technological, political, and economic measures. To be sure, we are far from a Utopian international arrangement, but think back to the days of Hitler, the 1930 depression, the feudal times of Europe, or even to the days of Alexander the Great, and ponder when was there a greater feeling of hope for man to break his bondage with misery and ignorance. Was it then or now? Of course, it is now.

Twenty years after World War I, we were at the brink of another war. Nearly twenty-four years have passed since the end of World War II and while there have been several limited wars, a worldwide confrontation has been avoided. Indeed, the ultimate weapons, the atom and hydrogen bombs, have become war deterrents instead of the final enticement to aggression.

The progress towards world integration is perhaps best visible in transportation and communication. There is hardly a spot left on earth that is not readily accessible or within range of telephone, radio or television. Travel has become a growth industry, and escape places for the venturesome are increasingly difficult to find.

The integration of the world has also been helped along through regional efforts such as the Common Market and through the growth of the multi-national corporation and through the stability of the international financial system. Admittedly, our international financial system has been battered and tattered lately but it has survived because of either enlightenment or self-interest, or both. This is in sharp contrast to the developments after World War I when currencies were devalued, gold was revalued, exchange restrictions multiplied and, eventually, trade contracted sharply.

In any event, all of these international developments and others not mentioned have on balance turned the world more to political stability than to instability and this in turn has been a powerful positive force for the investment climate.

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF SOCIAL DEMANDS

In the post World War II period, there has also been a great awakening to social demands. It is not that the need to alleviate poverty and to improve our health, education and welfare facilities weren't there before but rather that these needs attained a strong political voice. It was probably a culmination of events that contributed to this new force. The depression of the 1930's, the rapid rise in our standard of living, World War II, and the improvement in technology all seemed to have been contributing factors. All political platforms now recognize our social problems and requirements and our major parties are more closely united than divided in facing the social challenges of our times.

Many social aspirations have become realities in the past two decades. Many others are still to be fulfilled and new ones have emerged. The awareness of our Government of these aspirations has been a powerful influence on our investment climate. Let me illustrate this in two ways—one is the gradual abatement in the fear of another depression, which lingered for quite a while following World War II. The Government has, of course, instituted many important stabilizing programs and the fact is that there have been very few and only short interruptions in the growth of the economy.

My other illustration concerns the way we now view the period following the Vietnam War as compared with the attitude of our people as they looked forward towards the years immediately after World War II and the Korean War. At that time, there were generally fears of recessions and even depressions as military spending would be cut drastically and the magnitude of private economic demand was uncertain. In contrast, because of the greater recognition of the requirements of our society, we currently long for the post Vietnam years and the re-deployment of war capacity for productive civilian use.

#### THE NEW POPULATION

A third very powerful new force is our new population. Here I am referring to the increasing number of young people coming into our labor force. Their skills, their background, and their desires are in many ways different from young entrants into the labor force several decades ago.

This new population, having been reared in the post World War II period, possesses none of the economic fears so evident in earlier generations. Consequently, their traits differ. They spend freely and at an early age in their adult life. They do not generally possess a strong feeling about our Puritan heritage. It is nearly absent. Benjamin Franklin's saying, "Who goeth a borrowing goeth a sorrowing" does not apply to them. Generally, our new population has allocated an increasing percentage of earnings to debt service and has relied more on contractual than on discretionary savings for providing funds for that rainy day.

Another important characteristic of this new population is its drive to implement aggressive economical and financial decisions when put into leadership positions. The increasing emphasis on performance in portfolio management is the result of the initiative and prodding of the young. The conglomerate movement was surely given added momentum from the young, both in financial institutions and in business corporations. It is also no surprise to find that young people frequently dominate the rapidly growing new sectors of our private economy while the policies of stable and traditional industries are still set by an older generation.

In looking towards the future, I should like to make only a few observations on the significance to the investment climate of this new population. Their propensity to spend will probably increase and so will their reliance on contractual savings. Moreover, the new generation will be more highly skilled,

trained and educated than their counterparts several decades ago. Consequently, as they enter the labor force, they will be asking and indeed will be entitled to relatively high starting salaries and wages which will allow them a high standard of living at the start. They will also be moving into less cyclical working endeavors, which will also enhance their credit worthiness. From an investment viewpoint, it is also worth wondering as to what will happen when command of the traditional and stable business is relinquished to the young.

One factor frequently overlooked about our emerging new population is the influence of the underprivileged. As we strive to overcome our bigotry, the Negro and other oppressed minority groups will enter the mainstream of our economy. Their skills and educational background will be raised, enabling them to help man the machines, program the computers and even enter the management class of our society.

In turn, this newly emerging group will be entitled to a higher standard of living. Its demands for goods and services will increase and change. The "Ghettoed" man of today will be tomorrow's home buyer, summer vacationer, and Ph. D. Thus, we will also have new savers and investors. In essence, many of our social problems today actually enhance our future opportunities. As we meet these challenges, the economy will strengthen immeasurably and so will our democracy.

#### TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS

The most evident feature of our times, which has captured the imagination of all, is technological progress. The technological innovations thus far in this century are unparalleled in the history of mankind. We differ from the past in that we incorporate technological change into our thinking, our plans, and our decisions and we confidently look forward to rapidly increasing technological improvements. Contributing to this optimism is talk about a new leisure class and a post-industrial society. The romance of technology has generated tremendous optimism and hope in the future.

Our rapid industrial strides are quickly laying to rest one of the great fears of technological advances—namely, technological unemployment. It has been a myth all along because innovations and new processes generate new services and products and with them the demand for new skills and additional labor. In many ways, labor is in a more advantageous bargaining position in a highly mechanized and computerized business than in an industry still heavily dependent on manual labor.

Technology has forced us to accept another change. A wealth of a nation cannot be judged anymore merely by its natural wealth and resources or its total population. It is the skill of its people which is becoming an increasingly important determinant, particularly as industrial activity diminishes in relative importance and secondary activities gain in significance. Perhaps real wealth will be increasingly identified with knowledge, which it has always been anyway, but in the future it may have a higher market value.

#### PLANNING

One of the important by-products of our economic progress has been the advent of planning as part of an effective business approach. Today we have corporate long-range planning, product planning, investment strategies and market objectives, ranging from local to international in scope. Perhaps some of the plans may not materialize. Nevertheless, long-range plans help to define and clarify the future, add optimism to business objectives and therefore tend to strengthen the investment environment.

However, because of the increasing popularity of planning, the analyst is put into the difficult position of having to evaluate projections. Accurate judgments on future

plans are difficult to make. It often requires a look around the corner and not the extension of a trend line. We still have not developed adequate techniques for assessing the real risk in embarking on new programs. Unfortunately, there are no future facts but only past ones. For example, it has become highly fashionable lately to put in new plant and equipment quickly, in order to replace labor with machines and to produce in larger quantities. We hear that to some extent these decisions have been motivated by the rising costs of labor and equipment. Therefore, it is valid to ask to what extent do these decisions neglect the risk of obsolescence, particularly if rapid technological advance is a new feature of our environment and international competition can be expected to intensify. In other words, wrong planning decisions in our technological age are going to have a much more dramatically adverse impact on earnings than did the scuttling of a labor assembly line. The planning lead time in an advanced industrial economy tends to be long and thus enhances the risk in the capitalization of research and development expenditures and in huge expenditures for fixed assets.

Long-range planning, including the defining of objectives and the allocation of resources, has not been adopted by all sectors of our economy. Surprisingly, its popularity in the United States lies with the private sector, especially with business. In the totalitarian countries, it is the sport of Governments, which frequently utilize long-range plans for slogans and public relations objectives. Unfortunately, the lack of even intermediate planning by our Federal Government has often been a de-stabilizing influence on our economy.

#### THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF SAVINGS AND INVESTMENTS

On the financial side, the most significant development during the past two decades has been the institutionalization of savings and investments. It provided the means by which our enormous economic growth could be financed efficiently and accommodatingly by our enormous savings. It also gave our financial system additional depth and resiliency, thus providing institutions with broader lending and investing potentials and with the ability to adjust smoothly to new market conditions.

The enormous size of this institutionalization is staggering. Twenty years ago the net inflow of new funds to non-bank financial institutions totaled \$10 billion annually as compared with \$40 billion in 1968. In the early years following World War II, the annual increase in bank credit rarely exceeded \$6 billion, while last year it totaled \$38 billion. These large flows into financial institutions facilitated the financing of increasing credit demands. In 1968, the net demand for credit totaled \$84 billion as compared with only \$11 billion two decades ago. In 1968, the net volume of mortgage financing and net new corporate bond flotations was three times as large as in 1948, and municipal financing five times as large.

The intermediation role of our financial institutions has grown rapidly in the post World War II years not only because of our rapid economic strides but also because of our confidence in the dollar. Generally, savers have turned over their savings to financial institutions in return for a fixed compensation. In addition, most new funds of financial institutions have been invested in bonds and mortgages. In fact, over ninety-five per cent of the credit demands of our economy in the past twenty years has been financed through the issuance of debt instruments. Consequently, the ability to borrow has contributed importantly to the financing of our Federal and local Governments, of business, and of the household sector.

However, during the last few years our financial system has come under increasing

pressure from a surge in inflationary expectations. This development raises the perplexing question of whether our financial structure will survive in its present form if inflation is not checked quickly. The fact that our credit markets have survived a rather vicious battering thus far should offer little solace. The battering has inflicted scars deep enough to hamper the efficiency of the marketplace. Let me just recite a few of the problems that have surfaced in our credit markets:

In recent years, the net volume of home mortgage financing has made little headway while total credit expansion has soared. The net volume of 1-4 family mortgages, which reached a postwar peak of \$15.7 billion in 1963, fell to \$10.7 billion in 1966, recovered only to \$15.3 billion last year and, according to our estimates, should fall to about \$13 billion this year.

In the corporate bond market, it is virtually impossible for anyone but the highest-rated borrower to issue a straight debt bond. This has forced many medium and lower-rated borrowers to issue convertible bonds. For example, the net new volume of convertible bonds represented 33% of all net new corporate bond issues in 1968 as compared with less than 4% in 1963.

For the second time in four years, the tax-exempt market is unable to finance the demand as monetary policy is restrictive and the commercial banks, the largest buyer of tax-exempts, have no new investment funds.

The U.S. Government market has largely become a market of money market instruments. It has suffered not only from the problems associated with excessive private economic and financial demands but also from large financing requirements of the Federal Government itself.

The high level of market rates has repeatedly hampered our deposit institutions. Here, too, for the third time in three years a substantial slowdown in savings flows to these institutions is in process. Moreover, life insurance companies are again having to cope with an increase in policy loans which were already above average levels in 1968.

The shift in the portfolio preferences of institutional investors from bonds to equities and debt obligations with equity kickers is even more rapid and intense than the statistics suggest. For example, the annual net new purchases of bonds and mortgages by non-bank financial institutions accounted for 85% of their total new funds in 1958, 78% in 1963, and 70% last year. Thus, while their total new inflow of money has increased substantially, their commitments in mortgages and bonds have decreased percentage-wise and have been flat dollarwise. However, there is a gap in our information. We do not know how much of the volume of mortgages and bonds purchased by non-bank institutions contains an equity inducement. It has probably been on the increase and therefore the figures which I just cited to you are really too conservative and understate the shift away from the investment in fixed income securities.

#### INEPT STABILIZATION POLICIES

These financial distortions are largely due to inept stabilization policies, which is the responsibility of Government. Since the escalation of the Vietnam War, the record of stabilization policies has been very poor. The inflationary rate has been high. The timing and implementing of official actions has lacked the skills so widely heralded by the "New Economics." There was the failure to legislate tax increase quickly as the war intensified, the massive credit reflation in 1967 and the quick reversal in monetary policy from restraint to ease in mid-1968.

The complexity of this failure goes beyond a willingness by Government to accept moderate inflation as the price for fuller utilization of resources. Policymakers completely neglected the impact of inflationary policies

on expectations. An increasing number of participants in the private sector of our economy have become aware of the inflationary bias in national policies, have accepted it and are incorporating this bias in their own decisions. This, of course, tends to freeze the rate of inflation or increase it.

The most important deficiency in combating inflation is the failure to recognize the new forces which have surfaced in the past twenty years and which are propelling the economy ahead. I spoke of them earlier. If international cooperation (be it ever so inconsistent) is nevertheless fostering optimism, if social demands have attained a strong political voice, if our new population is aggressive and talented, if technological progress is capturing our imagination, if planning is spreading in the private sector, and if our savings and investment process is largely institutionalized now, then the inherent long-term strength of the economy is much greater than envisioned in the actions of our policymakers which have often been dominated by fears of "over-kill."

It therefore seems that two different strategies are at work. There is the strategy of the private sector, which is heavily influenced by intermediate and long-term factors. In contrast, there are the actions of official policymakers which are short-term and based on the feeling that the private sector is fragile and has fundamentally changed very little. The private sector is incorporating the basic changes into its plans but Government is not. Government also tends only to react and not to anticipate, and it therefore frequently lacks a planned strategy.

#### THE ALTERNATIVES

As we look ahead, therefore, the key question is whether our fiscal and monetary managers can formulate a stabilization strategy which takes into consideration our new environment. In this connection, there is some hope. In the last few months a new consensus has emerged to resolve our inflationary economic and financial woes and to return the economy to orderly and sustainable growth. The Federal Reserve has moved to monetary restraint and the new Administration has assigned a high priority to the fight against inflation. However, it is much too early to conclude that a return to anything but fleeting stability is assured.

If the Federal Reserve has adopted a new long-range strategy, it will require some time to become evident and to really convince the marketplace. The current restrictive credit posture of the Fed is not unusual. It is what we would typically expect when confronted with rampant inflation in a setting of high utilization of resources. This is a classical showdown in which the Federal Reserve will win this first round. It will continue to shrink credit availability until there is a sufficient abatement in the economic and inflationary momentum. It has done this before. However, whether or not the Federal Reserve has embarked on a new and more disciplined strategy will become evident only thereafter when the economic indicators begin to slide and business expectations turn somewhat hazy. This will be the time for the Federal Reserve to demonstrate that it will not repeat the mistakes of 1967 and 1968 and that it will not reflate the banking system quickly and massively. It will be a difficult task because the economic background will differ from the current exuberance, there will be more political opposition, and the Fed itself will have to be convinced that the economy is not fragile but has enormous underlying vitality.

Success or failure by the Federal Reserve will have very significant implications for the investment climate. Assuming that the Federal Reserve will persist with its new restrictive strategy, the consequences should be a very substantial slowdown in economic activity later on this year, the appearance of a real profit squeeze, a decline in interest

rates, followed in 1970 by a gradual economic recovery. A sharp de-escalation of the war effort would provide the opportunity to accomplish this transition without some very painful moments in our financial markets as well as dislocations.

These events would be a small price to pay for the return to stability. However, this view is not shared by all. There are some who would prefer to keep the economic throttle wide open and others who feel that the Federal Reserve will compromise its new strategy as soon as the economy slows down. Let us assume that the Federal Reserve will not succeed in curbing the current excesses. What would be the consequences? The current inflationary expectations would be validated. This would encourage more spending and less savings and therefore hamper the savings and investment process, a key determinant of economic growth. The flight from the dollar would accelerate both domestically and internationally. Protectionism and trade restrictions would appear again.

For business corporations, operations would become exceedingly difficult. The practice of financing nearly all external financing requirements through debt would quickly come to a halt because investors would insist on earnings participation. Therefore, the average maturity of corporate debt would fall sharply; straight bond financing would decrease and convertible and equity financing would increase, thus penalizing earnings per share.

Moreover, in an inflationary environment ready access to the credit market is not certain to the business corporations. This is because with continued inflation our Federal Government, municipalities and home owners would find it extremely difficult to finance their needs through the issuance of debt. Under these circumstances, it is highly likely that the Government would initiate procedures to allocate economic and financial resources based on some predetermined socially desirable objectives. Thus, institutional investors might be required to allocate a predetermined percentage of their net new funds for the purchase of securities, financing specific social projects, and only the remainder would be available for business. Furthermore, business pricing policies would come under increasing Governmental surveillance and wage demands could not be effectively curbed by Government.

For the security analyst, it should now be very clear that a flourishing fixed income market will be extremely helpful to stocks while the demise of bonds would be an ominous omen.

#### THE ABM AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 and May 6, 1969, the Los Angeles Times published editorials which I feel merit entry in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The May 4 editorial, "The ABM and the National Security," is not a defense of the ABM, but more of an appeal against the unilateral disarmament type of psychology which has been coming to the fore.

As the editorial highlights, the main purpose of the ABM proposed by the President is to insure the survival of a significant proportion of our land-based Minuteman ICBM's—and of our bomber forces—in the event of a first strike by

the Soviets. Safeguard is designed secondarily to protect virtually the whole country against the kind of smaller scale ICBM threat which Communist China will be able to pose in the 1970's. Finally, if a missile were to be fired accidentally in our direction from any quarter, Safeguard would enable us to shoot it down.

The perspective maintained throughout the editorial in discussing the arguments for and against the ABM, the Russian missile activities, and the usefulness of the proposed ABM is to be commended. It is this type of unemotional perspective that is critically needed in the current debates on the ABM.

The editorial follows:

#### VIEWPOINT OF THE TIMES: THE ABM AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY

President Nixon vows to fight as hard as he can for the proposed "Safeguard" missile defense system because he believes "it is absolutely essential to the security of this country."

ABM critics, in turn, deride the proposed system as a military boondoggle, and charge that its deployment will set off a new arms race, divert resources from badly needed domestic programs and "turn the United States into a garrison state."

The controversy, which turns on whether Congress will or will not vote \$900 million for the first phase of the \$7 billion project, is developing an emotional intensity of the same sort which caused the country to tear itself apart over Vietnam.

In a statement calling for rational debate instead of name-calling, Freedom House correctly observed that opposition to the ABM does not necessarily signify indifference toward the security of the United States.

But the moderate, nonpartisan society also warned that ABM supporters should not be dismissed as "bloodthirsty warmongers, tools of the 'military-industrial complex' or the like."

#### ARGUMENT HAS GROWN

If there is more heat than light in the debate, it is because the confrontation has escalated into much more than an argument over the merits of a specific weapons system.

Aviation Week, which is anything but hostile to defense spending, made precisely this point in a recent editorial.

The uproar over the ABM, the journal warned its readers, represents an "emotional explosion" against the growth of the military establishment into what many people see as a "vast octopus consuming enormous amounts of blood and money without producing very much security for the nation."

As a result, a jaundiced congressional eye is being cast not just on the ABM, but on military spending as a whole.

Some members of the Senate, in particular, are demanding slashes of a magnitude which would condemn the United States to a second-best military posture relative to the Soviet Union—a situation which most Americans, if faced with a conscious choice, are not prepared to accept.

#### MUST BE PUT IN FOCUS

If the new skepticism toward defense spending is to serve constructive ends, some perspective is needed, both in regard to the ABM itself and to the larger issue of allocating more resources to civil needs and less to the military.

#### What is Safeguard?

It is important to understand first what the ABM system, as announced by the Nixon Administration on March 14, would not do.

It would not protect the cities of the United States against the kind of massive missile attack which the Russians are capable of launching, nor is it intended to.

As the White House put it, "There is no

way of doing that. Even if we built a 'thick' defense around our cities at enormous cost, some attacking missiles would get through—enough to inflict extremely high casualties and damage."

To deter the Russians from launching such an attack, Mr. Nixon would continue to rely—as did his predecessors—on keeping the Kremlin convinced that we could absorb a surprise blow and still destroy the Soviet Union with what is left of our missiles and bombers.

As of now, there is absolutely no doubt but that the United States has this capability. The question is whether we will have it in the period from 1973 on.

#### Russian buildup

In 1965, the year of the massive U.S. escalation in Vietnam, the Soviet Union had some 200 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles in place compared to our 854.

As of last summer, the Russians had 800 ICBMs compared with our 1,054. Today, they have something over 1,000—and are still deploying more every month—while we have leveled off at 1,054.

The Administration readily agrees that, as of now, our superior bomber forces and missile-firing Polaris submarines give us a clear edge, despite the parity in land-based ICBMs.

The Russians, however, are not standing still.

If they continue to deploy ICBMs at the rate of 200 to 250 a year, while the United States indulges in a unilateral missile freeze, they could have twice as many ICBMs as us by 1973.

Furthermore, the ICBMs now being deployed are the big SS-9 or Scarp missiles which can carry single warheads up to 25 megatons or three smaller multiple-reentry warheads—each of which is several times larger than the warheads atop our Minutemen.

The Russians, meanwhile, also are building missile-firing submarines of their own, as well as killer subs which presumably are intended, in event of hostilities, to knock our Polaris subs out of action before they can fire their missiles.

Finally, they have already built a relatively unsophisticated ABM system around Moscow, and are known to be conducting research and development toward a more advanced system.

The Pentagon's best judgment is, as President Nixon told a recent news conference, that the Soviet Union may be "substantially ahead of us in overall nuclear capability" in 1972 or 1973, unless something is done now.

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird is convinced that the Russians are trying to build a "first strike" capability—that is, the ability to knock us out with a surprise blow.

There is no proof of that. But, as Mr. Nixon put it, "We have to base our policies on their capability"—and this capability is rising in an ominous way.

#### Enter Safeguard

The main purpose of the ABM proposed by the President is to insure the survival of a significant proportion of our land-based Minuteman ICBMs (and of our bomber forces) in the event of a first strike by the Soviets.

Safeguard is designed secondarily to protect virtually the whole country against the kind of smaller-scale ICBM threat which Communist China will be able to pose in the 1970s.

Finally, if a missile were to be fired accidentally in our direction from any quarter, Safeguard supposedly would enable us to shoot it down.

#### Negotiations

In announcing a proposed go-ahead on the ABM, President Nixon made it plain that he hopes it will not be necessary to build the whole \$7 billion system. Construction

can be stopped whenever arms control talks with the Russians produce results.

In the first phase, what amounts to prototype ABM installations would be built in the vicinities of two Minuteman complexes (in Montana and North Dakota) which are said to contain about 350 ICBMs.

Mr. Nixon is convinced that these two ABM complexes alone should, upon their completion in 1973, go a long way toward deterring a would-be enemy from the temptation of a surprise attack by the United States.

Whether the remaining ten Safeguard complexes would ever be built depends upon the progress of arms control talks with Moscow.

#### *The opposition*

One thing which makes the ABM debate so confusing to the ordinary American is the sharp disagreement among the so-called experts.

The Safeguard system, which has been likened to "shooting a bullet with a bullet," involves an extremely complex marriage of radars, computers and missiles.

Some of our most eminent scientists sincerely doubt that, if built, it will work—and they have mounted a vigorous and highly effective lobbying effort to impress their skepticism upon Congress and the public.

Other scientists, equally qualified and sincere, are confident that Safeguard will do the job it is designed to do, and believe it should be built.

Officials recall that both the hydrogen bomb and the Polaris submarine were developed—fortunately for the security of the United States—in the face of similar disagreement among the "experts."

Dean Acheson, who chaired a presidential advisory group on the hydrogen bomb question 20 years ago, says that "everything which is being said at the present time was said to me then." And he added: "Then, as now, scientists were acting as professors of morality."

#### *Calling Dr. Strangelove*

Assuming Safeguard will work, there are still a lot of knowledgeable people who argue that it will not really provide the protection advertised.

If the Communist Chinese were to decide to commit national suicide by launching a nuclear attack on the United States in the 1970s, it is argued, the existence of Safeguard would not stop them.

#### *AN EASY JOB*

They would need only to lob in a few short-range missiles from offshore submarines, or smuggle some A-bombs aboard freighters bound for Los Angeles, New York or other port cities.

In the event of a massive Soviet missile attack on the United States, ABM opponents argue that we could fire off our Minutemen before the incoming missiles arrived.

Even if we failed to do so, they insist, the Russians would still have to score near-perfect bull's-eye on virtually all of our Minuteman silos, bomber bases and Polaris subs—else they would face certain destruction from our retaliatory blow.

The survival of a substantial retaliatory force is best guaranteed, in the opinion of many experts, not by installing ABMs, but by building more offensive missiles, putting multiple warheads on them—and perhaps mounting some on hard-to-hit mobile platforms such as barges or railroad cars.

Surely, argue the ABM critics, a start on Safeguard can at least be postponed for a few months more. By that time, arms control talks should be under way, and we will have better intelligence on whether the Soviet ICBM buildup is aimed at achieving parity with the United States or an intimidating superiority.

#### *SOME ROOM FOR DOUBT*

The Nixon Administration has not, as a matter of fact, been entirely convincing in its

insistence that the country faces a now-or-never decision on the ABM. Even if one assumes the worst about Soviet intentions, a few months' delay does not have to condemn the United States to a position of inferior power.

The U.S. Senate, however, will gravely and irresponsibly imperil the security of the United States if it votes down the ABM without serving clear notice that the action is provisional—that the Soviet Union is expected to match our own show of good faith by stopping its buildup of offensive missiles.

If Moscow disappoints these expectations, the anti-ABM senators should make plain, they will support President Nixon in doing whatever is necessary to maintain the American nuclear lead.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the more emotional foes of the ABM are prepared to exercise that kind of statesmanship.

### THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State is one of the principal newspapers in the State of South Carolina, and enjoys an enviable reputation for its judgment and accuracy. In particular, its editorial page consistently shows thoughtfulness and vision. Therefore, I was particularly impressed with the State's recent editorial on the Vietnam situation.

The State comment on published reports that the United States may attempt to get Hanoi to agree to a mutual pull-out; and if this fails, the United States may order a unilateral pullout. The State points out that Hanoi has no reason to accept a mutual reduction of forces, leaving a unilateral withdrawal inevitable. This would be equivalent to abandoning the Vietnamese and all that we have at stake.

Mr. President, the State argues that this solution is not acceptable to the public's frame of mind, judging by public opinion surveys, and concludes that we must be prepared to buck the pacifist tide of minority dissent.

Mr. President, I commend these sentiments, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "Unilateral Insanity," published the State of Monday, May 5, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### UNILATERAL INSANITY

The Nixon administration, according to reports from Washington, finally has settled on a "solution" to the Vietnam war. The plan breaks down into two parts: (1) Paris negotiators will attempt to get Hanoi's signature to an agreement for mutual troop withdrawal, but (2) if this fails, Washington will order a unilateral pull-out.

Further details are unknown at the moment, Chalmers Roberts of the *Washington Post* says a new enemy offensive could gum up the schedule, forcing the Nixon administration to bring the troops home slowly. But the word is out that, whatever Hanoi does, President Nixon plans to begin scaling down American participation in the war effort, probably as early as this summer and no later, certainly, than fall.

Questions inevitably arise as to the wisdom of the plan. To begin with, a mutual reduction of forces seems highly unlikely, especially in view of Washington's intention to go it alone. Why should Hanoi de-escalate under these circumstances? In addition, it is foolish to suppose that South Vietnamese forces can take up the slack left by the departing GIs—or that the Saigon government will be able to survive the upheavals that are bound to occur once U.S. military support is removed.

In short, the plan seems to have been designed to accomplish a single purpose: to get America out of Vietnam, and never mind what happens once we leave. This was not the original objective, which was to preserve South Vietnam from Ho Chi Minh's troops and fifth columnists of the National Liberation Front. The original objective, in fact, is inconsistent with an American troop withdrawal. South Vietnam's forces, by common consent, are not yet up to resisting unassisted the Communists, who are well-trained, well-armed, fanatical and entrenched throughout the south.

There is this possibility, however: that the proposed backdown in Vietnam is a "trial balloon, hoisted in an attempt to define the limits of U.S. public opinion. How badly does the nation want peace? Badly enough to abandon Vietnam and, if need be, the rest of Southeast Asia? If this is the public's frame of mind, any political administration in Washington would want to know about it.

But it is not the public's frame of mind, to judge by polling results. Public opinion, every survey shows, is heavily weighted against a unilateral troop pull-out and in favor of military escalation if the Paris talks collapse. This is what the public wants and what national honor demands. The question is whether the Nixon administration, unlike its predecessor, is prepared to buck the pacifist tide of minority dissent.

### TAINTED GLORY ALWAYS EXPLODES

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, although Justice Fortas has resigned from the Supreme Court, I am sure we have not heard the last of this incident. Meanwhile, I noted an editorial from the May 16, 1969, edition of the *Peoria Journal-Star* which addresses itself to this and other similar problems during the Johnson administration.

I recommend it to my colleagues as a good example of how the folks back home evaluate and consider these issues which are often so close to us that our perspective tends to become somewhat blurred. I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

#### TAINTED GLORY ALWAYS EXPLODES

Lyndon Baines Johnson began his presidency with the Bobby Baker mess, and ends it with the Abe Fortas mess.

The irony is that after Bobby Baker and Billy Sol Estes, the American people in massive numbers and the commentators and entertainment figures and a massive swath of academia, persuaded themselves to believe Lyndon Johnson's campaign oratory.

They weren't interested in the "means" only in the "ends," themselves, for the practices and policies they had become enamored of—and they chose Lyndon Johnson as their "means," they thought.

He was a consummate politician, and they took pride in this. "He knows how to get things done," they said, and gloated at how he would "manage" affairs to the results they desired.

#### LBJ'S EXPEDIENCIES

Instead, of course, Johnson's presidency, after election, was a catastrophe from start to finish.

It required no great amount of brains, but just a small amount of balance, here in Peoria for us to comment just before that fateful election, that some of the statements by which Barry Goldwater was driving away votes were true, and that in any case, Goldwater was an honest man.

And it didn't take much brains, and only a little bit of maintaining one's balance, to comment that Mr. Johnson was making statements that were not true to attract votes, and pledging himself to policies that he could not perform.

It didn't take much brains to predict that Mr. Johnson would be elected, and that after election he would perform many of the things Mr. Goldwater had openly forecast and been derided for.

Can you imagine what might happen in this country if people with a lot of brains kept a little bit of balance? If they fore-sware such fanatic feeling for "ideologies" in favor of some old good-fashioned respect for honesty and honorable methods—instead of putting ends before means in their "morality"?

It is discouraging, and makes people bitter and cynical when a Bobby Baker affair explodes, and more so when an Abe Fortas comes tumbling down, from such a high eminence.

When I was new at newspapering, these things shocked, disillusioned and made me cynical.

Not any more.

For Bobby Baker's playhouse did come crashing down around his ears, and achieving Supreme Court of the United States has no honor or pleasure in it when it ends one's life career in humiliation and disgrace.

Indeed the presidency which Lyndon Johnson sought all his life became not only a hollow victory, but a shattering, bitter experience—tasting of gall and wormwood—and ending in humiliation. It did not produce the glories and the wonders and the satisfactions he expected, but the very opposite.

#### ABLE MEN BUT . . .

These were and are extremely able men. They had to be. They had unlimited possibilities and vast satisfactions open to them on their merits. They didn't have to apply themselves with extra drive, and cut corners, or disregard high ethical standards.

The moment they did so, rather than better assure their success, they built into that success a fatal flaw which no future performance could, in the end, overcome.

When such performances are repeated, it isn't difficult, even in a comparatively short life in this business to see people who seem to be doing very well, indeed, and whose methods are questionable—and to say, "He's riding for a fall."

After many such experiences, this newspaperman is no longer the cynic of his first experiences. I now look upon such without cynicism, but with patience and confidence, that such persons have compromised their ultimate chances of fulfillment, and already inflicted the wound on themselves for which the pain comes later.

And there is no vengeance sharper than for the man who reaches to within an inch of the final, topmost goal, and says, "I got away with it!", so that just at this moment, the prize turns to a burning coal in his hand.

That breaks something inside of a man that even physical direct punishment cannot.

Especially when, the rest of his days, he must say to himself, "I could have done it. I was good enough. I had the ability. Why did

I blow it all by wanting too much and being too careless how I got it?"

This lesson ought not be that people can get to such high places when engaging in some shady methods. The lesson should be that such attainment explodes in your face, if it is tainted.

The very hour of glory becomes the hour of the collapse, more often than not.

Integrity, a sense of honor, is still important—to this country, and its future, and to the individual human being who seeks a genuine fulfillment and satisfaction in his own life.

This is not a world of hypocrisy.

Honor exists. It needs to exist more widely, and to be more widely respected.

It is very "relevant" indeed to a "whole" life for the individual—and to society.

It's about time the "realists" quit treating honor as "camp" and started treating it as the realism it is in our supposed art, literature, humor, communications, and colleges.

#### PROCLAMATION IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S PEACE PRO- POSAL

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

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a proclamation which was issued on May 18, 1969, by the U.S. Jaycees in support of President Nixon's peace proposal.

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

#### PROCLAMATION

The official Jaycee proclamation presented to President Nixon by Smith stated:

"Whereas, The United States Jaycees stand in complete support of the efforts of President Richard M. Nixon in the quest for honorable and positive peace in the country of South Viet Nam as well as the rest of the world, and

"Whereas, we enthusiastically support the more than one-half million Americans in South Viet Nam and proudly salute and pay tribute to those 35,000 Americans who have gallantly and unselfishly sacrificed their lives in this quest for peace, and

"Whereas, we believe that the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnamese government should unquestionably understand the resolve of the people of the United States, not to crumble from within but to stand firmly and resolutely in support of our President in the quest for honorable peace and the right of self-determination in South Viet Nam;

"Therefore, be it resolved, that we, The United States Jaycees, encourage and solicit the support of every organization and every American in providing complete and positive unity in support of the President of the United States of America in his efforts to effect a lasting world peace and pledge to him our continued support for his endeavors in our behalf as Americans."

Some eighty-seven civic and service organizations have been contacted by the U.S. Jaycees and encouraged to adopt similar resolutions and forward them to the President.

Several times in the past, the Jaycees have endorsed national policies of the President of the United States. In 1940, the organization was the first group to give full endorsement to the peacetime draft. In 1965, the Jaycees adopted a resolution supporting the nation's Viet Nam involvement in defense of freedom throughout the free world.

#### THE CENSUS IN PERSPECTIVE

### HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss briefly another aspect of the decennial census which has been subjected to unjustified attack. This concerns its mandatory character—the requirement that people must be enumerated.

Now we all know that the most laudable endeavor can be portrayed in such a way as to make it appear deplorable. I suppose we could poison the attitude of a stranger toward baseball, the national pastime, if we simply asked if he approved a sport in which one player can injure another by hitting him in the head with a ball, hard as a rock and thrown at lightning speed. Something of this sort is taking place in connection with one of our oldest national institutions—the decennial census.

It almost defies response when a person asks a question like this: "Do you think you should be slapped in jail for refusing to tell the Government in Washington how you heat your house?"

Or like this: "Do you think it's right to take a man to court for refusing to tell the Government what kind of work he was doing last week?"

By the same token, it begs agreement when one person tells another he thinks it is terrible that some blabbermouth-ing bureaucrat demands to know how old you are.

These one-sided questions and comments not only miss the point, but they mislead the public. Let us analyze this kind of distortion from two points of view.

First, a penalty for refusal to answer the questions has existed since the census originated in 1790. Yet, in all these years very few persons have been fined. Very few cases have been taken to court. No one has ever been put in jail. The courts could impose a penalty of up to \$100 and 60 days in jail. However, I think it is worth noting that the census managed to get along from 1790 to 1920 with the courts empowered to levy only a fine and no jail sentence. The latter was added for the 1930 and subsequent censuses—not bureaucratically, keep in mind, but by the Congress itself to emphasize the need for all people to respond.

I trust that no one is under the impression that the census takers—or the courts, for that matter—are interested in flouting the rights vested in them by law. The record scotches any such notion. In 1970, as in every previous census, the people will be required only to answer the questions to the best of their knowledge and ability. The penalties were not conceived, nor have they ever been used, to embarrass anyone who does not respond with 100 percent, unequivocal accuracy. That should be clear. At the same time it should be remembered that no nation in the world can or does rely upon a voluntary census. And no Congress of the United States, from 1790 onward, has regarded the census as any-

thing except an obligation of citizenship. The law has always recognized what experience with many voluntary surveys has shown: that the returns from a universal survey such as a census, if taken on a voluntary basis in whole or in part, would be of such low statistical quality as to be meaningless for many of the small areas for which census data are needed, and for many of the uses to which census statistics are put.

Furthermore, the mandatory provision emphasizes the significance of the census and the importance of sharing this responsibility equally among all the people. It is indispensable to a successful census. Without it the people would in effect be told that they really do not have to respond, that they can do no great harm by throwing the form away. Millions would probably do so.

In these times many of us are understandably weary and sometimes resentful of so much paper work. But let us not choose the wrong target for destruction. Let us acknowledge the unique and vital role of the census. Let us accept the fact that full participation is imperative for a census to be effective. And let us view the penalty provision in that light.

So much for the background. Now to the current point.

Those critics who single out one question or another and link it with an extremely remote threat of punishment neglect the main consideration. The answering requirement was adopted to apply to the entire census—to the whole set of related figures that emerge from this nationwide canvass of the people. It enables the Government, acting in the broadest public interest, to collect sufficient data from which to draw a clear picture of our attainments and our needs.

I know from my years of experience as a member of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics that no item is accepted for the census questionnaire without the most careful evaluation. Each must serve a definite public and governmental purpose.

A question on heating systems, for instance, has been included in every census since 1940, the year in which the scope of the decennial canvass was expanded to cover housing as well as population. The type of heating equipment is a key indicator of living conditions. Local agencies use the data in appraising community health and safety standards. The question, incidentally, will be asked of only one in five households next year. It will not be asked, you may be sure, because some insolent bureaucrat wants additional grounds for putting innocent citizens in jail.

For a much longer period—back to 1840, in fact—census takers have been asking citizens about the kind of work they do. The census is the only source of data embracing all persons engaged in some form of economic activity. And detailed census tabulations provide the only source of information on occupational skills of the labor force in States and local areas. This reservoir of data has a multitude of uses—for example, to lay out economic development and manpower training programs. This inquiry,

I want to add, also will be made of residents in only one of every five households.

As for how old you are, I can assure you that no one involved in the census is interested in the age of any particular person. But since age is an important factor in examining the makeup of the population, the item has been included since the census began in 1790. It has many specific uses, too, in such program areas as social security, health, housing, and education.

So we see that if anyone chooses, he can hammer away at the census by taking a question out of context—by distorting its meaning—by exaggerating its language—or by spreading the idea that the census is an excuse for turning loose a posse of prosecutors against unsuspecting, law-abiding citizens. That kind of assault is as unreasonable as it is unfair.

The truth is that every question approved for the census is designed to fulfill a specific governmental need for information. It is important in itself. And it is an important part of the whole body of information which Americans are called upon to assemble only once every 10 years.

ESSAY BY MISS JANE E. O'LEARY,  
WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

### HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I have had correspondence with Miss Jane E. O'Leary of 79 Michael Drive, Warwick, R.I. She enclosed an essay that she had written, entitled "What It Means To Be an American Citizen," which I believe is worthy of the attention of Members of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that her essay be printed in the Extensions of Remarks, for it clearly indicates that this young woman has grasped the real meaning of citizenship in our great country.

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

#### WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

There is a Bill of Rights in the United States that guarantees every American citizen the right to freedom. The four rights below are ones that I have had first-hand experiences with. The people in some countries do not have the freedoms that we do. We are fortunate that the men who wrote the Bill of Rights realized what freedoms there should be.

Every American has the freedom of speech. You may talk to your friends in whatever manner you please. If people want to know what you think about this and that, you may tell them what you think without being afraid of being locked up. I wrote to the Editor of the Providence Journal and told him what I thought about the war in Viet-Nam. It was published on the editorial page for people to read if they wanted. And that is the freedom of speech.

There is a freedom of religion in America. If you do not choose to go to church, you do not have to; but that doesn't mean that you can't. If you like, you may visit a church once or twice to see what it is like. In some countries there is no freedom of religion. The Germans didn't like Jews and killed six mil-

lion of them. At one time in Russia the government closed all of the churches because they wanted to have more control over the people.

A right to own property is another of the many rights. You may put a fence around your yard if you don't want people in your yard. If you own something and someone tries to take it from you, you can get help from the police. Every American person has the right to buy property that he can afford—you may not be turned away because of your race or religion. We should be proud for this right because some countries are without it, for instance China.

There is one more freedom I would like to mention, called trial by jury. This means you have a right to go on trial and have a jury determine whether you are innocent or guilty. You are not punished unless you are found guilty. You may sue someone if they are doing something illegal against you or someone else. I have never been on trial but I visited a courtroom when a man was on trial for larceny. There were two sides with witnesses on each side. There was a lawyer on each side but only one judge. After they were through talking with the witnesses the judge made the final decision. He ended up letting the man go free because one person should have been in court to testify and he wasn't and a search warrant should have been issued. Trials are very interesting and I would like to visit another some time.

I had this essay finished but something made me change it. In the mail I unexpectedly received a letter and it was from Senator Pell commending me on a recent press release. That shows me that leaders, very busy ones, still find time to write to young people in our country. Where else could this happen but America—this land was made for you and me.

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN GEORGE BUSH, DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL SPRING DINNER OF THE NATURAL GAS MEN OF HOUSTON

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Hon. GEORGE BUSH, recently addressed the annual spring meeting of the Natural Gas Men of Houston, Tex. It was a speech in which Mr. BUSH made some very timely remarks on the oil depletion allowance, and on the emotional climate now attached to that particular issue. I wholeheartedly concur with his position and remarks. In light of the high interest now focused on this matter, I think it would benefit us all in our understanding of this situation to read excerpts from Mr. BUSH's address, which I now submit for insertion in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN GEORGE BUSH, DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL SPRING DINNER OF THE NATURAL GAS MEN OF HOUSTON

As much of the attack on the oil industry and oil taxation has been primarily emotional, I have urged that the intellectual level of the debate be escalated. The time is at hand for sobriety of judgment in this matter rather than additional excesses of argument based on emotional sentiment.

In reviewing the record now before the Ways and Means Committee, the evidence clearly reveals that:

(a) on total taxes, the oil industry does pay its share of taxes.

(b) the oil industry is not disproportionately profitable. Using return on invested capital as a yardstick, the industry ranks right in the middle of all other industries. It is not more profitable than most manufacturing enterprises.

(c) the price of petroleum products has not risen nearly as fast nor gone nearly as high as products of other industries.

(d) there is an acute need to find more domestic reserves; the ratio between proved reserves and consumption has declined rapidly.

(e) the gas industry picture is exceptionally perilous in terms of long-range supply and consumption.

The above points were not substantially challenged in our committee, and yet incessant emotion prevails—the myth continues of the “rich oil man” getting fat at the expense of other taxpayers.

Here is a key example of emotion on the question of oil taxation. You have all heard of the 154 cases of really rich people, non-taxable individuals who pay no tax year after year. If you ask the man in the street why these rich people pay no tax at all, they reply “They are rich oil people using that oil depletion allowance.”

And yet the figures provided to the Ways and Means Committee on these cases show that total income for these people came to \$112 million and depletion on their income came to less than 1 percent of the total. And yet the industry still gets blamed—depletion still gets blamed—depletion is still called a dangerous loophole.

I hope the committee will separate fact from fiction.

I am pleased that President Nixon one week ago reaffirmed his position that the depletion allowance must remain unchanged. This reflects Mr. Nixon's awareness of the eminent importance this provision has in relation to our nation's future.

I am pleased that the Treasury's tax recommendations did not contain suggestions for changing the intangible drilling charge—provisions of the tax laws. If these provisions were ever necessary, the time is now. Although these provisions are under assault in our committee, and in the Congress, I will continue to fight for their preservation. We must separate emotion from fact.

There is a widespread feeling around Washington that if we opened the floodgates to foreign oil there would be lower gasoline prices—lower fuel prices.

To this, I say you might see a temporary price reduction but our domestic industry would be driven to its knees and rendered impotent by a flood of foreign oil, and then the price of that foreign oil will surely rise. We'd be over a barrel and the Arabs would know it. Up would go our price.

NOTE.—Since Congressman Bush speaks from notes rather than a text, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Congressman will stand by the above quotes.

ADDRESS BY MRS. HENRY  
STEWART JONES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the delegates to the Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution recently received a warm and spirited welcome on National Defense Night from Mrs. Henry Stewart Jones.

Mrs. Jones' address was a fine example of patriotism and a noble expression of American ideals. Mrs. Jones maintained that patriotism “is not a matter of idle flag waving, but a most solemn and pressing duty.” This is a great and spirited sentiment.

Mrs. Jones argued convincingly to maintain our strong military posture. She praised Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird for his analysis of the Soviet threat, and warned of the dangers posed by godless communism.

Mrs. Jones also contrasted the moral basis of the American cause with the aggression of the Soviets. She said:

To us, National Defense represents something more than a strong military posture. We seek to preserve the moral, the spiritual and the Constitutional values which brought this Nation to the pinnacle of greatness and gave the American people a degree of freedom unparalleled in history. This is a positive program which can engage the mind and heart of every member.

Mr. President, I congratulate Mrs. Jones on her stirring message and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ONE NATION, ONE CONSTITUTION, ONE  
DESTINY

(By Sara Roddis Jones)

It is my privilege tonight to extend warmest greetings to you all—distinguished guests and Daughters of the American Revolution. I also want to extend special greetings to those Daughters who are attending a Continental Congress for the first time. One cannot leave these halls without deep pride that no Daughter has ever conceded that patriotism is old-fashioned. For us, patriotism is not a matter of idle flag waving, but a most solemn and pressing duty. Our first objective, therefore, is to do all in our power to help preserve our constitutional Republic, to keep America strong and free—in other words, to keep America, American.

To this end, we seek “to cherish, maintain and extend the institutions of freedom.” To us, National Defense represents something more than a strong military posture. We seek to preserve the moral, the spiritual and the constitutional values which brought this Nation to the pinnacle of greatness and gave the American people a degree of freedom unparalleled in history. This is a positive program which can engage the mind and heart of every member.

Here I want to pause a moment and express gratitude to the many Daughters who help promote these ideals by forwarding contributions to Dollars for Defense. These dollars aid immeasurably in carrying on the work of the National Defense Committee.

I also want to express appreciation for the fine cooperation given by our National Vice Chairmen and State Chairmen and Chapter Chairmen of National Defense during the past year.

I wish I could share with you all the many fine letters that come in from men and women from all walks of life thanking the DAR for its leadership and unflinching patriotism.

During the past year, our President General has had as her theme Daniel Webster's famous words: “One Nation, One Constitution, and One Destiny.” This theme is a timely reminder that the future of our Country lies in our hands. Either we love our Country and guard its Constitution—or one day we will lose both.

We speak of the DAR as a great service organization. What greater service can we

render our fellow countrymen than to hold aloft the principles which made this Country great, to do all in our power to keep America sovereign, solvent and free. We are unashamed in our determination to hang on to America. We do not propose to find ourselves a disarmed province in a godless and socialist, one-world government. We will not willingly surrender our present enviable status as “One Nation under God” for one world without God.

It is our purpose, therefore, to expose and oppose anything which threatens constitutional government or our own survival as a Nation. Through the years, we have expressed the belief that a strong military posture was the best guarantee of peace. So long as we remain free and strong, all the world can hope for ultimate delivery from tyranny. If we fail, the lights of freedom will go out all over the world.

With this in mind, during the past year we have expressed our grave misgivings over the recently ratified Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. We are not a political organization. At no time did we expect to succeed in opposing the Treaty, but we chose to take our stand on principles with the 15 courageous Senators who had the vision and intestinal fortitude to vote against it. And why?

Because the Treaty is aimed at nonnuclear nations! Actually the greatest threat of nuclear warfare stems from the Soviet Union itself, and ultimately Red China which is not a party to the Treaty.

Because the Treaty will not stop the arms race! It leaves the Soviet Union free to continue development and build-up of nuclear weapons, but will effectively prevent the modernization of armaments for the defense of Europe.

Because the Treaty denies and excludes the option of the United States to selectively proliferate purely defensive weapons to hard pressed allies! Thus, its main effect is to bind the nations of the noncommunist world and simultaneously to extend United States commitments to defend the free world.

Because the Soviet Union sacrifices nothing and has repeatedly shown itself no respecter of treaties! On January 8, 1969, at the very moment the Soviet Union was pressing for United States ratification of the Treaty, Moscow showed its contempt for the spirit of the Treaty by concluding an agreement with Cuba under which the Soviet Union undertook to help Cuba expand its nuclear program. There was no indication that this help would be confined to purely peaceful uses—and Cuba is just 90 miles off our shores.

These are but a few of the reasons why we fear the consequences of this Treaty. We deplore the fact that almost anything can be put over in this Country in the name of “peace.” But we have no peace—and not since we joined the United Nations have we fought a war we were allowed to win. First there was Korea, and now we are bogged down in Vietnam in one of the longest and most unpopular wars in our history.

The Soviet Union is not only supplying 80 percent of the military supplies to North Vietnam but is testing our will to win this or any other war. If the war in Vietnam is to be won, it must first be won in the United States. Our boys are committed to victory, but no army is stronger than the people behind it.

Here at home, the “disarmers” and the “doves” are gambling with our future by arguing about the wisdom of deploying an antimissile system. The Soviet Union has already deployed about 80 percent of its antiballistic missile system. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, who makes terrifying sense in his defense of a United States antiballistic missile system, has testified that the costly Soviet weapons programs are clearly aimed to gain nuclear superiority. The Soviets are spending billions to destroy our missile sys-

tems, yet the "doves" of this Nation argue that it is folly to protect our missile sites. We do not presume to know all the answers to this thorny problem, but we do know that events long have proved that the Soviets respect only strength. If we let down our guard, we can expect no sweet charity from the Soviet Union. How can this or any other nation sit idly by and fail to protect its defensive striking power?

In asking this question, it is not suggested that this Nation succumb to Maginot-line thinking. The best defense is still a good offense. But this Nation's leaders have announced that we will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. Shall we also deny ourselves effective second-strike weapons and retaliatory power?

These are grim questions. But we must find the answers if we are not to go the way of Carthage some 21 centuries ago. Here was a nation that so loved peace that no price to keep the peace was too exorbitant to pay. The people of Carthage disarmed unilaterally—exactly as we are doing today. They made endless concessions to Rome but, in the end, it was not enough. They lost everything—their lives, their homes and their wealth. A great civilization disappeared from the earth. May God forbid that we follow that same trail to oblivion in our quest for peace.

Here one must note that it is not just armaments which will save this Nation. If a man has nothing to believe in, he has nothing to defend. The communists long since have undertaken a systematic program designed to encourage disregard for authority and disbelief in values that we hold dear.

God and the doctrine of eternity, they say, are myths to perpetuate slavery, Cast off your chains, they cry, and follow the doctrine of reason, not religion. The tragedy of it all is that communism has made successful inroads in two-thirds of the earth's surface because it offered a new dedication to those who had none.

We must match that dedication with a renewed dedication to our own ideals and way of life, for where in the world are the most chains? In the communist world, of course. Ours is the authentic revolution! Ours was the revolution that made men free. In this Nation we have always believed that liberty was God-given—and our reward has been a degree of freedom that is the envy of the world.

Despite this, here in our own America, the communists have successfully involved themselves in areas of racial strife and student unrest, seeking not the benefit of the group they have infiltrated, but seeking rather to keep strife and riots going so that the ultimate beneficiary will be the communists.

Let us listen, therefore, to the warning of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

"Communism has hurled us a mortal challenge. Our response, and the response of free men everywhere, will determine whether or not freedom survives. It is no longer sufficient for us to adopt the negative approach of merely reacting negatively and defensively to every shift of communist tactics. We must place greater emphasis on the positive role which our democratic way of life can perform in this struggle."

A demonstrated faith in our great heritage is the mightiest weapon we have in the fight for freedom and against communism. The place to start is in our schools, in our churches, and in our homes.

Let us root out the permissiveness which becomes anarchy, a life without standards, a body without a soul. Let us substitute, instead, the ancient virtues of self-discipline, morality, honesty, patriotism, and, above all, love of God.

We need not sit forever idly by and permit the Supreme Court to deny our children simple prayers in our schools. The constitutional prohibition against state support of "an establishment of religion" was

never intended to obliterate all references to Divine power from public activities in which the State has a part.

Just recently it came to our attention that there was a plan afoot to remove all mention of God from the military. The emphasis was to be on morality—not God. But, and let us never forget this—every moral code has its roots in religion. Without religion, there is neither a moral code nor morality.

The first duty of education is now, and always has been, to build a responsible citizenry. We are presently engaged in a life-and-death struggle for our God-given liberty and against the dialectic materialism of atheistic communism. We will not win that battle by denying the Faith of our Fathers. There is no middle ground between communism and a freedom based on the self-discipline of religion.

Benjamin Franklin summed up this thought when he said: "Man will ultimately be governed by God or tyrants." Alexis de Tocqueville put it another way when he said: "Despotism may rule without faith, but liberty cannot."

Each of us has a part in defending the moral, the spiritual and the constitutional values on which our freedoms are based, and as we do so, let us remember:

I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something, and what I should do and can do, by the Grace of God I will do.

#### ROCKFORD SCHOOL BOARD HONORED

#### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, no one can question the unique and vital role played by the local board of education in American life. It is the epitome of democracy at work in our local communities and citizens who serve on school boards are entrusted with a great responsibility and a high honor. The school board in turn is entrusted with the responsibility to provide an educational program which truly meets the needs of the community and is responsive to the demands of our changing times.

It was therefore with a great deal of pride that I participated in an awards ceremony this past weekend honoring the Board of Education of Rockford, Ill., for its outstanding accomplishments in the field of public education. The occasion was the 1969 National Education Association-Thom McAn school board awards program held at the NEA headquarters on Sunday and Monday, May 18 and 19, 1969.

The Rockford Board of Education was awarded "National First Place for Systems Over 6,000 Enrollments." The award was in recognition of a unique program started in the Rockford district in response to parent dissatisfaction with educational opportunities provided for their children. The resulting program was a new communications link with the black community and a teacher academy that have nurtured many educational innovations in the Rockford School District.

I wish to commend the National Education Association and the Thom McAn

Shoe Co. for making these awards possible and I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations to the Rockford Board of Education for this outstanding achievement and the example they have set for other school systems in our country.

I think special recognition is due the former president of the Rockford Board of Education, Mr. Clifford Carlson; superintendent of schools, Dr. Thomas A. Shaheen; and Rockford Education Association president, Mrs. Bernice Domeier. Also on hand for the awards presentation was Mrs. Marcella Harris, a member of the Rockford School Board.

At this point in the RECORD I introduce a description of the Rockford program as it appeared in the awards brochure:

ROCKFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION DISTRICT NO. 205, ROCKFORD, ILL.: NATIONAL FIRST PLACE—SYSTEMS OVER 6,000 ENROLLMENTS

In the city of Rockford, Illinois, the Board of Education was confronted with two problems: a lack of communication between the schools and the black community and a lack of communications between classroom teachers and other educational innovators. As a response to parent dissatisfaction with the educational opportunities provided for their children, this Board of Education established the Washington Community School with Ombudsmen in the black community and a teacher academy.

The Washington Community School is a junior high school staffed only with those teachers who want to be there. A team of three Ombudsmen provides a communications link between school and community and works out conflicts that arise. Teams are being developed for the four feeder elementary schools and two receiving senior high schools of the area.

The Teacher Development Center has served as the proving ground for many educational innovations in the Rockford District. This center provides classroom teachers an opportunity to work with outstanding teachers and to learn about the latest methods and equipment. This enables them to incorporate their new knowledge into their own classroom teaching.

The Rockford Education Association points out that, though these unique and inventive school projects have been in existence only a short time, the results have already been felt by the lay and educational community.

CLIFFORD CARLSON,  
President, Rockford Board of Education.  
THOMAS A. SHAHEEN,  
Superintendent of Schools,  
BERNICE DOMEIER,  
President, Rockford Education Association.

#### THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

#### HON. TED STEVENS

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on May 19, 1969, the University of Alaska honored Robert O. Anderson by awarding him an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Anderson is a remarkable individual. He is chairman of the board of the Atlantic Richfield Co., chairman of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, vice president of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, regent of New Mexico State University, and trustee of the California Institute of Technology.

His deep understanding of the complexity of the individual as a whole being and his concept of the essential relationship of the arts and industry have exercised a stimulating, worldwide influence on educational and cultural affairs.

His address to the convocation dealt with the role of the individual in today's society. In an age of ferment fostered by just such a search by our Nation's youth, I commend his remarks to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Members of the Board of Regents, Members of the Faculty, Distinguished Guests, Candidates for Degrees: I am greatly honored to have been asked to address this convocation, and have looked forward to this day with keen anticipation, for it affords me the chance to appear before a group of men and women who will face unique challenges and opportunities in their lifetime. I say this in spite of the obvious problems that seem to confront the world on all sides today.

Your University is most remarkable. It has literally seen and been part of the course of Empire.

Since the discovery of the new world and the dream of a Northwest Passage from Europe to the Orient, men have sought, and died seeking, their fortune in the far North. Hendrick Hudson searched in vain during the early 17th Century. He was followed 160 years later by another ill-fated dreamer, Captain James Cook. Many more men with their same character and determination, together with a strong and varied native tradition have helped to form the vigor and character of you and your fellow Alaskans.

A scant century ago two incidents in history played a definitive role in determining the course of this country and the existing world balance of power.

The first was the death of Emperor Maximilian of Mexico many thousands of miles to the south. The other was the decision of Alexander II of Russia to sell a piece of land that at that time represented little more than a source of furs to the Russian court and nobility.

With the first event, the presence and ambition of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the New World came to a final conclusion. The second event a few months later saw the presence of Imperial Russia removed from the continent. Thus the year 1867 was truly a year to remember. The presence of two great European powers of the last century vanished from the American scene.

As difficult as it may seem, nevertheless, up until some 200 years ago, the idea that people could improve their life simply did not exist. Certainly, the hope of a better life is as old as mankind, but the exciting prospect of 18th Century political philosophy was that such a dream could be realized by free men working together for their common good.

Democracy was a new and revolutionary concept. For the first time, people realized they might look to the future with hope rather than fear and anxiety.

Here, in Colonial America, far from the tradition of England, scholars and students alike were largely free of political retaliation and enjoyed a level of academic freedom virtually unknown by their European counterparts. No wonder, then, that the concept and principles of a free society grew and were first realized in the birth of this nation.

The success of the American Revolution and subsequently the French Revolution came on the eve of the industrial revolution,

and thoughtful men quickly saw that the latter coupled with a free society offered the means to a better and more secure life. Unfortunately, the early years of the industrial revolution were largely years of disappointment, despair, and unforeseen difficulty for the European nations, difficulties that we in America were destined to escape.

As a new country, with vast resources and a seemingly endless frontier, we could welcome all, and each could find a life to his liking. The catalyst was the concept of the strong and reliant individual reacting to an endless variety of opportunities. These are the hopes and conditions of Alaska today. As a relatively new nation, we have been through many difficult periods, yet we stand today, the oldest revolutionary government in the world and the largest and wealthiest of the free nations—as such we have inherited responsibilities that we cannot ignore.

These are the responsibilities of leadership; they are the responsibilities that men and nations alike must accept as those that go with advantage or privilege. As a people and as a nation, we have advantages and resources heretofore unknown and, if we cannot use these wisely and well, we cannot expect more of others. As a nation, we must offer cooperation and assistance to the free world without injecting ourselves into the affairs of others. As individuals, we have to accept the responsibilities of citizenship and actively work for a better and fuller life. With technological advances, we continually exceed our goals in the manufacture of goods and our agricultural output continues to exceed our own needs. Coupled with scientific and medical advances, we can be virtually assured that in the coming decades, we will have the ability to produce material goods far in excess of our present consumption. Our problem will be to see that our vast ability to produce is distributed in such a fashion that poverty and suffering are reduced and eventually eliminated.

Although our country has succeeded in utilizing science and technology within the framework of a free society to provide a high standard of living, we must not forget that important as our material needs may be, they alone cannot provide a full life. Only the individual can achieve this. No amount of recreation or entertainment can replace or be an adequate substitute for personal intellectual enjoyment.

During the last twenty years, we have given greater and greater emphasis to scientific development—a need accentuated by a political war in which productive capability might be the decisive factor. Aside from our military needs, we have developed thousands of practical tools and aids that we use in our everyday life, and yet we are only on the threshold of scientific discovery and appreciation! Still, with all of this, we are a troubled people as we look at ourselves and the world around us. Even with the many accomplishments of recent decades, the majority of the world's people, and many of our own, are restless and confused. The major questions of our time center about the individual, his welfare, and most importantly, his relationship to society and his state.

Our entire political philosophy is based on the essential concept that the individual at all times remain sovereign to his government. We are governed by our own consent with our government subservient to its people. In order for such a government to function in an effective and orderly manner and provide an environment in which the citizen can retain his liberty and personal security, we as individuals consent to be governed by, and respect the decisions of, the majority.

In sharp contrast, the Soviet Marxists world believes that the individual is totally subservient to his or her government, and, as such, his individuality must be submerged or even denied. He or she is virtually the property of the state and the subservient

individual becomes the desired standard. In such a world, academic freedom along with personal freedom become dangerous and cannot be tolerated. The naked and arrogant display of power in Czechoslovakia last year was eloquent testimony to the fact that individual freedom cannot exist in a collective society.

Within your lifetime, a majority of people throughout the world will decide what their relationship will be to their government. This troubles them and it most certainly troubles us. If our way of life is to prevail, it can only do so if we continually exert ourselves to keep the individual in the proper perspective. We have the material means to provide an adequate standard of living, but that by itself is not enough. We must educate people, not only to earn a living, but how to live a fuller life.

To assist us toward this end, a vast array of all human knowledge has been directed towards helping man discover the all too often hidden potentiality of his own mind and spirit. Generally speaking, the group of scholarly traditions which focus upon this are described as the Humanities. Unfortunately, they have been somewhat neglected in our present pre-occupation with scientific inquiry.

The Humanities are usually considered to include the study of history, literature, the arts, religion and philosophy. The fine arts and the performing arts are modes of expressing thoughts and feelings visually, verbally, and aurally. The method of education associated with the Humanities is based on the liberal arts tradition we inherit from classical antiquities.—The basic attitude toward life centers on a concern for the human individual, for his emotional development, for his moral, religious, and aesthetic ideas, and for his goals, including in particular, his growth as a rational being and a responsible member of his community.

The classical concept of the Universal man is essentially that of a personal embracing of a broad range of interests, ideas and abilities.

Intellectual curiosity is a much better gauge of age than physical condition and we must continue to question and challenge ideas as we go through life.

You leave here today with various degrees, yet your true education can and should continue for your lifetime. Books and the country around you offer a lifetime of exploration into the ideas of man and the subtleties of nature. We humans have not been too kind to our planet, and I hope it receives more of your attention now that it has in the past. Reservation of our natural environment is as important as any intellectual achievement.

The wheel has been described as man's greatest invention, yet it is puny in comparison to the achievement of that first distant caveman, who, sitting in a group, said, "If we are going to get anything done, the first thing we have to have is a little order." At that point civilization was born!

Today, order and the personal security that goes with it are in serious jeopardy. This, and not the wheel, is the single greatest problem confronting us if we are to meet and resolve the many social and economic issues that must be resolved during the balance of this century.

While I personally come from the great desert country of our American Southwest, I have always felt an affinity for the North country. Aside from the obvious attractions for the fly fisherman such as myself, I have always admired the people themselves. Like our New Mexican, you see and accept people for what they really are. Character, rather than position and wealth are the basis of acceptance.

In a society which is becoming increasingly complex and urban oriented, I believe people like ourselves who live in the less populated areas enjoy a much greater chance

to know each other and particularly ourselves. I wish to emphasize the latter, as we cannot really know or understand others until we know and understand ourselves.

The vast majority of you are Alaskans and live in what I believe to be an exciting State. I can assure you that it will be even more exciting during your lifetime.

I know of no greater fortune than to be part of a developing country, and for you fortunate few, the opportunity for personal growth and achievement is at its maximum.

Alaska today is a new frontier for young people of the so-called lower '48 and many of the more venturesome and hardy will join you here in the next decade or so.

Together you cannot possibly become anything but a winning team. The resources and opportunities are limited only by the people who have the will and determination to resolve them.

The development of the Arctic is still in its infancy and what you have seen is only the start of a much larger effort. It is difficult to portray the great change ahead, but it will dwarf anything in the State's history.

Ironically enough, the discovery of large accumulations of hydrocarbons in the Arctic Slope, within sight of a range of mountains still bearing the name of the Russian royal family, occurs at the very time that Russia itself is facing impending shortage of petroleum that may very well adversely affect its own future for at least another decade or more. Their posture and position in the middle east may well be based on economic necessity rather than political expansion.

In closing, I would simply like to say I am optimistic about Alaska and its people. Problems abound and many more are yet to arise, yet we live in an exciting world and I am confident that this State and its people will measure up to anything that may be required of it.

Now I cannot resist passing along an observation or two on life that I believe stand out above all else I have learned in the 30 short years since I, myself, received my college degree. The first is simply the fact that life passes with extreme swiftness, and unless one is continually aware of this, much of life will pass you by. Maybe it is merely a foot race with death, but the satisfaction of achievement and accomplishment will go to those who run the fastest. The second, and possibly the most important is to try to see the world through the eyes of others. You will be surprised how much more you will see and find in life.

#### ABM: SHOULD THE UNITED STATES GO AHEAD?

### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I am entering the second part of two articles on the ABM, which the Los Angeles Times published on May 4 and May 6, 1969. I have already entered the entire May 4 editorial, "The ABM and the National Security," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and feel that the May 6 editorial deserves equal treatment.

The May 6 editorial, "ABM: Should the United States Go Ahead", explores the dangerous implications of a unilateral missile freeze and examines some of the current assumptions regarding "excessive" military spending.

The editorial points up the oft-overlooked facts that first, in 1960, long before the Johnson escalation in Vietnam,

defense spending accounted for 8.7 percent of the gross national product and 47 percent of the total Federal budget; second, in 1969, defense spending is \$35 billion higher than it was 9 years ago. But it still accounts for only 8.8 percent of GNP and 43 percent of the total Federal budget; third, during the Vietnam war years, spending for major social programs has more than doubled, while defense outlays are up only 52 percent. Moreover, while the United States has been involved in Vietnam, the Russians have been aggressively building their military strength.

The Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that total Soviet military spending is now on a parity with the non-Vietnam portions of ours—and as a percentage of GNP, is almost twice as large. More important, 4 years ago, we had a 4-to-1 lead in ICBM's. Today, the Russians have caught up with us and may be going beyond parity to superiority.

Because of its contribution to the ABM discussion, I am happy to enter the entire Los Angeles Times May 6 article in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### ABM: SHOULD THE UNITED STATES GO AHEAD?

Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) noted the other day that we were spending five times as much on defense against manned bombers at the end of the 1950s as we would spend on the "Safeguard" missile defense system proposed by President Nixon.

Why was there so little outcry then and so much now?

The answer, of course, lies in the rising resistance to military spending—the feeling among Americans that we have allowed our national priorities to get out of whack.

To keep the record straight, the polls show that the American people as a whole still favor a strong defense establishment. And, of those who have made up their minds on the ABM, over 60% are for it.

There is no question, however, but that sentiment for a tight rein on Pentagon spending is on the increase.

#### PAPER EAGLE

As far as the average citizen is concerned, the new resistance to military spending has many roots. These include frustration over high taxes, inflation—plus the seeming inability of the world's most powerful military establishment to defeat a rag-tag army of Vietnamese Communists, or prevent the kind of humiliation we suffered in the Pueblo incident.

#### CREDIBILITY GAP

Leaving disenchantment of that sore aside, the heart of the trouble is the growing cost and complexity of modern weapons systems.

During World War II, destroyers and submarines cost in the neighborhood of \$5 to \$9 million apiece; today, the going price is closer to \$200 million. Today's fighter planes can carry price tags a hundred times higher than the models which outfought the Germans and Japanese 25 years ago.

What particularly angers congressional critics are the cases where costs run 200% to 300% higher than estimated. The overrun on the big C-5A transport plane alone is now calculated at \$2.1 billion.

Even after soaking up enormous resources, the new weapons systems are sometimes a flop, the prime example being the Navy version of the F-111 swing-wing jet fighter.

#### PORK BARREL, 1969 STYLE

While all these factors are relevant, they are not the whole story.

#### WALK AROUND VIETNAM

In hard-rock political terms, what we are seeing is the opening round in a fight over the so-called Vietnam dividend—the billions

of dollars which will be up for grabs when the war ends or is drastically reduced.

In this context, the so-called military industrial complex is locked in a struggle with competitive power centers—made up of scientists, educators, anti-poverty warriors etc.—which want federal money for their own projects.

Since the end of the Vietnam tunnel is not in sight, these interests tend to favor a big slash in the non-Vietnam portion of the defense budget now.

The ABM, because of its controversial nature, makes an attractive target. If the first domino falls, reason the more zealous anti-Pentagon crusaders the political atmosphere will be conducive to congressional veto of other portions of the defense budget.

#### Fair is fair

There can be no question but that the attack on America's urban ills—poverty, slum housing, snarled transportation, environmental pollution and the like—deserves a far greater claim on the country's resources than it has enjoyed in the past.

If the new skepticism is to serve a constructive purpose, however, it is important to separate fact from distortion. And the facts are as follows:

In 1960, long before the Kennedy-Johnson escalation in Vietnam, defense spending accounted for 8.7% of the gross national product and 47% of the total federal budget.

In 1969, defense spending is \$35 billion higher than it was nine years ago. But it still accounts for only 8.8% of GNP and 43% of the total federal budget.

During the Vietnam war years, spending for major social programs has more than doubled, while defense outlays are up only 52%.

To cite specifics, the federal contribution to welfare programs is almost twice what it was six years ago. Outlays for education and manpower training have more than quadrupled, as has spending for community and regional development. Medical expenditures, thanks to Medicare, are up more than 700%.

#### Where to cut?

These statistics hardly bear out the picture, assiduously cultivated by Pentagon critics, of a country which has turned its back on human needs in the name of national security.

Obviously, however, the pertinent standard for "sufficiency" in the war on poverty and environmental blight is not the past but the future.

We can do better—if ways can be found to cut the military budget, which is the largest single category of federal spending. And given sufficient determination, ways can be found.

It is hard to believe, for example, that the United States really needs all the 429 major and 2,972 minor military bases which it maintains around the world. Surely a substantial number can be closed if U.S. overseas commitments are reviewed hard-headedly.

Another obvious target is the Pentagon's contracting and weapons evaluation procedures, so that the problems of cost overruns and "white elephant" weapons systems can be reduced to manageable proportions.

#### The Soviet enigma

Inevitably, such a tightening up means that more weapons projects must be vetoed before too much money is invested in them—and Safeguard, all things considered, is a borderline case.

What must be avoided, however, is the know-nothing approach which manages simultaneously to be against the ABM, advanced new bombers and fighters, modernization of the Navy and upgrading of our Minuteman and Polaris missiles—all without regard to what the Russians are up to.

And, the Russians have been up to plenty while the United States has been otherwise engaged in Vietnam.

In fiscal 1965, the last year before the massive escalation of the U.S. role in the war, our defense spending totaled \$50 billion.

As a result of war outlays, the total figure soared to \$80 billion—but the non-Vietnam portion of the military budget is still not much over \$50 billion.

The downhold in non-Vietnam spending was accomplished, to a considerable degree, by postponing or stretching out new strategic weapons projects.

As Sen. Jackson observed the other day, the budget for strategic forces is actually almost 50% less than it was in fiscal 1962, if inflation is taken into account.

While we were cranking down our side of the arms race the Russians have been cranking their side up.

The Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that total Soviet military spending is now on a parity with the non-Vietnam portion of ours—and as a percentage of GNP, is almost twice as large.

#### Beyond parity?

Four years ago, we had a four to one lead in ICBMs. Today, the Russians have caught up with us and may be going beyond parity to superiority.

We still have a big lead in bombers, ballistic missile-firing submarines and total number of warheads. But the Soviets are now building Polaris-type subs of their own, as well as submarines which could be used against our Polaris fleet.

As for the big U.S. lead in warheads, UCLA Prof. William G. McMillan, a longtime defense consultant, warns that the Russians may be using a different kind of arithmetic.

They may figure that one nuclear torpedo can destroy a Polaris submarine and all 16 of its missiles. One suborbital missile could take out a bomber field with a score of B-52s and a much larger number of H-bombs.

At this point, no one says for sure that the Soviets are shooting for an intimidating strategic superiority. But the evidence is too strong to be ignored.

#### Missile freeze

Both the Administration and ABM opponents agree that the best solution is a Big Two arms control arrangement which would effectively prevent either side from gaining a first strike capability over the other.

Mr. Nixon argues that an immediate start on Safeguard is essential to the U.S. bargaining position in such talks. Sen. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) charges that a start on the ABM would imperil the arms control talks and provoke the Russians to countermeasures.

Neither argument stands up to critical analysis.

The Kremlin, it turns out, has accepted President Nixon's announcement on the ABM with more equanimity than the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Arms control talks are still expected within a few weeks or months.

This is not surprising. After all, the Russians have 67 ABMs of their own in place around Moscow, and are thus in no position to argue that defensive missiles are provocative.

#### U.S. DETERMINATION VITAL

Beyond that, the Kremlin leaders understand, if Fulbright and like-minded senators do not, that deployment of ABMs around ICBM silos—as distinct from cities—is not the act of a nation which is thinking in terms of a surprise attack on the other side.

There would be little point, after all, in spending billions to protect empty silos against a retaliatory blow.

#### Compromise

It does not necessarily follow, however, that congressional approval of Safeguard is essential to success of arms control negotiations.

What is essential is that the Russians know that the United States is not prepared to indulge in a unilateral missile freeze while

the Kremlin indulges in a unilateral drive for strategic supremacy.

Unfortunately, the ABM opponents are coming perilously close to creating the opposite impression.

What, then, is the solution? Two alternatives suggest themselves:

Congress can approve a go-ahead on phase one of Safeguard—with language putting the Administration on notice that construction should be stopped if arms control talks show promise.

Congress can withhold approval—but with language putting the Soviets on clear notice that we are prepared to escalate our side of the arms race if the Soviets do not halt their own missile buildup.

The latter alternative is preferable.

If the lawmakers choose neither of these alternatives, but instead turn the ABM down in a euphoric atmosphere of unilateral disarmament, they will be not only wrong but irresponsible.

### VITAL PROBLEMS OF SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

#### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to invite the attention of Senators to three articles on Spain and Portugal written by Mr. Thomas Waring, editor of the *News & Courier*, Charleston, S.C. Mr. Waring recently returned from a visit to Spain and Portugal where he obtained firsthand knowledge for in-depth reporting.

I congratulate Mr. Waring for his outstanding articles on the vital problems of Spain and Portugal and the relationship of these problems to U.S. foreign policy. Mr. Waring presents a keen analysis of the issues involved in U.S. military bases in Spain and in Portugal's longstanding interests in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea. I commend these articles to Senators for a better understanding of these problems which are of great importance to the United States.

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

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

#### BULWARK OF WEST: PORTUGAL IN AFRICA

(By Thomas R. Waring)

LISBON, PORTUGAL.—While Portugal has many unsolved problems, Prime Minister Marcello Caetano's government sees new hope for restoring peace to the African provinces. Dr. Caetano has just returned from a visit to Mozambique, where joyous crowds welcomed the successor to Dr. Antonio Salazar. It was the first such state visit in many years.

Dr. Alberto Franco Nogueira, minister of foreign affairs, granted me an interview in his office near the waterfront of Lisbon's busy harbor. Earlier in the day, I had watched a military band at a pier, and a detachment of soldiers preparing to embark for service in Africa. Half of Portugal's national budget is spent on governing the three African territories of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea, and the drain on manpower as well as money is heavy.

"Much improvement has occurred in Africa," Dr. Franco Nogueira told me. "The terrorists have no hope of success. They lack support of the masses and some have joined

the Portuguese authorities in Mozambique and Angola. In fact they are going through a boom of industrial development. Many now realize Portuguese policies in Africa are more realistic, and that they can meet the problems of the people. Some other African countries are cooperating.

"In the United Nations and elsewhere, disillusionment, frustration and disappointment are appearing over U.N. policies."

For years, the United Nations, with support of the United States, has been pressuring Portugal to leave Africa—a contingent to which the Portuguese were the first to carry Western European civilization. The navigators and settlers went there before white men came to America. The Portuguese have no more intention of yielding the African provinces than Americans have of giving back their country to the Indians.

One of the incidents to which Dr. Franco Nogueira referred was the surrender of Chief Kavandame of the warlike Makonde tribe in Mozambique. This tribe, estimated by some at 200,000 in number, has supplied most of the manpower for the revolt against Portugal. The Portuguese say 60,000 Makonde warriors have laid down their arms—an estimate that some observers call an exaggeration. Time will tell whether Chief Kavandame, at 65, or younger leaders schooled by communists in terrorism carry more weight with the black masses. Without the Makonde, the main guerrilla organization called FRELIMO would be crippled.

Dr. Franco Nogueira declined to specify other African countries now cooperating with Portugal. Another source said that Dr. Hastings Banda, in Malawi, was showing interest in a hydroelectric dam on the Zambesi River planned by the Portuguese to serve that region. Zambia also looks to the Portuguese ports as outlets for its copper.

The foreign minister was asked to comment on his country's relations with the United States. He has just returned from Washington.

"It is no secret," he said, "that there has been strain and many difficulties in past years. We believe, with a change in views toward Africa and the reasons behind Portuguese policies which are in the long-range interest of the West, we can expect better understanding from U.S. public opinion.

He declined to elaborate on expectations from the Nixon administration. Earlier this spring, during the American Society of Newspaper Editors' convention at Washington, Nixon administration spokesmen declined to predict changes in U.S. attitudes toward the Republic of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal, the three leading governments controlling the Southern part of Africa. All three have been the targets of terrorism organized by communists from Russia, China or Cuba.

Southern Africa is a rich prize for whoever can hold it. In choosing sides, Western powers need to weigh their own strategic interests along with the current political fashions about independence and colonialism. The Portuguese believe they still represent Western civilization in clinging to their overseas provinces—last of the European empires.

#### THE SPANISH ATTITUDE: U.S. BASES IN SPAIN

(By Thomas R. Waring)

MADRID.—While doubts have been raised in Washington, about the whole system of strategic U.S. military bases overseas, a negative attitude prevails also in influential circles of Spanish opinion over renewing arrangements for U.S. Air Force and Navy installations in Spain.

The differences are much more complex than money.

Insofar as Spain is concerned, both national security and the dignity on which Spaniards lay such stress are big issues. A full understanding of all the factors would require a review of Spanish history and customs. More specifically, the current history

of this ancient nation, including the Civil War and 30 years of government by Generalissimo Franco, shape both official attitudes toward other nations and the temper of a proud people.

Isolated for centuries from the rest of Europe by the Pyrenees, and successively conquered by Romans, Visigoths and Moors, Spain then underwent the agony of a civil war that left the country exhausted. Franco managed to avoid entanglement in World War II, saving Spain from total catastrophe. Neither he nor others, who are looking anxiously to the future when this chief of state no longer governs, want to turn Spain into another battleground just as it is achieving a measure of prosperity.

Inside the country, various forces are jockeying for position: Labor unions, the new middle class, "liberals" of many hues, monarchists, restless students and as always the Roman Catholic Church.

As recently as 1953, when negotiations began for building U.S. bases in Spain as a deterrent to Soviet aggression in Europe, Spain and its small neighbor Portugal were very much alone on the Iberian peninsula. Both were virtually police states under one-man dictatorships. The peace they enjoyed entailed some sacrifices. Among these sacrifices was the esteem of other countries, absorbed with their own notions of democracy and individual liberty.

In some circles, notably in the United States, Spain and Portugal became pariahs—the object of contempt on the ground of "fascism." While communist powers wiped out both life and liberty wholesale elsewhere in the world, the Iberian countries bore the brunt of criticism in the "Free World."

The U.S. bases supplied the most important opening of Spain to the outside world in many years. Tourism blossomed and opened new windows for two-way vision. Foreigners learned some of the good things about Spain, and the Spaniards began to pick up pointers from the visitors, both military and civilian.

Meanwhile Spain began to achieve other measures of international "respectability", including admission to the United Nations. Spain now holds a seat on the Security Council. It yearns for admission to the European Common Market.

Since France dropped its military commitments in NATO, Spain has grown in importance as a European bastion against communist threat. Yet Spain is not a member of NATO.

Lack of recognition is painful to these people. While the United States "builds bridges" in the hope that more contacts will foster better understanding with declared enemies, it has seemed to Spaniards that the Americans are unaccountably cool toward their Spanish friends. All these and other factors too complicated for further discussion lie behind the reappraisal of U.S. military presence.

The five-year lease on three air fields and the sea base at Rota expired last Sept. 26, and a six-month grace period expired March 26 of 1969. Unless new arrangements are made—and not even the final deadline date is legally clear—the United States may have to remove its men, planes and ships from installations that it built on Spanish soil.

While the strategic considerations that prevailed in 1953 have changed, others have arisen that cause at least a preponderant military judgment in the United States to declare the bases essential for defense against the USSR.

Some Spaniards have a real anxiety about exposing their country to nuclear attack in the event of war between Russia and the USA. Such a view was expressed in an article in ABC, one of Spain's leading newspapers. ABC supports the monarchy. The author of the article, a supporter of Don Juan for king, is an old-line statesman who served in the

pre-civil war cabinet of Primo de Rivera. His name is Jose de Yanquas Messia.

After reviewing his reasons stated in previous articles as early as 1952 in opposition to the U.S. bases, Mr. Yanquas Messia noted recent statements about negotiations in the American press, including one attributed to "a Pentagon official." He quoted this source as saying the transaction was a simple military agreement between two countries: one pays to use the installations and nothing more.

To this elder statesman of Spain, whose voice still carries weight, this attitude is "nothing more or less than if one were handling the rental of a farm or city property."

The United States, he points out, no longer has a monopoly of nuclear arms. The magnitude of nuclear war is the chief antidote for avoiding it. Clear foresight counsels against the "uncontrolled risk" that would result, he said, from continuing to keep in Spain bases that would be prime targets in the event of war between nuclear powers—a conflict which we would have no part in initiating.

The matter, he concluded, should not be treated as a matter of "compensations." Rather he regards it as a matter of concession. I am an advocate of political friendship and economic cooperation with the United States," he concludes. "I am not, and I think I should say so, for renewal of the bases."

Whether this article is a trial balloon sanctioned by the government to help Spanish negotiators, a preparation of public opinion for departure of Americans or just another newspaper article is not clear. When the press is controlled as closely as it is in Spain, and when public officials are reluctant to be committed on pending matters, such an editorial opinion nevertheless is worth considering.

Fundamentally, the interests of Spain and the United States seem closely identified. It should be possible to fit them into common action if each side observes sympathy and forbearance in approaching the other. If friends can't get together, what hope is there for reconciling enemies short of annihilation?

#### LESSON FOR AMERICANS: WEAKNESS OF SPANISH REPUBLIC SPARKED CIVIL WAR

(By Thomas R. Waring)

MADRID.—While following news of civil disorder in the United States and reflecting on events leading up to the Spanish Civil War in 1936, some uncomfortable similarities come to mind.

From where I sit in a house on the outskirts of Madrid, I can see the Guadarrama mountains, still snowy on the peaks, over which Spaniards fought bitterly in that tragic conflict. In another direction I can see in the suburbs some of the angular apartment houses that monotonously gird all the bulging cities of Spain today. Though graceless, they represent peace and a measure of prosperity.

While campus riots, strikes and civil rights marches in the United States have not approached the excesses of agony that Spain endured, some of the angry words and brutal deeds being reported daily from America have an ominous resemblance to Spain's prelude to civil war.

Mobs inflamed by irresponsible leaders caused death and destruction throughout Spain. The republic, proclaimed in 1931 as a democratic way to freedom from monarchy and a means to substitute progress for decay, proved unable to govern. By 1936, anarchy was opening Spain to communism. It was a deliberate plot, according to some observers, for Russian conquest on the cheap.

The Nationalist Army, led by Gen. Francisco Franco, triumphed in 1939 over the republic and pacified the country. Thirty years later, though grumbling is heard about

oppressive control, people and property are reasonably secure and the country prospers.

Man's memory is short. It needs constant refreshing from the records of history. Americans have something to learn from this venerable land. Luis Bolin has provided a readable account in his book called "Spain: The Vital Years" (Lippincott, 1967). A journalist and Spanish patriot who had a key role in the nationalist movement from the beginning, he personally engineered the transfer of Franco from the Canary Islands to lead the uprising in continental Spain. As a press officer for Franco, Bolin had a front seat view of the times about which he writes. And he writes English better than most of his English-speaking colleagues.

While this comment is not intended as a review of Bolin's book, some excerpts from it are so timely in their phrasing that they might have referred to another decade and another country.

Among the leaders of the movement that established the Second Spanish Republic in 1931, and later one of its numerous premiers, was Alejandro Lerroux Garcia. Bolin lists Lerroux as one of the three men who deserve the most blame for failure of the republic. The others were Zamora, who gave Spain's gold reserve to the Russians, and Gil Robles. As a sample of Lerroux' philosophy, here is what he is recorded as having told his followers before he came to office:

"Pillage and sack this decadent civilization; destroy its churches and its gods, raise the veils worn by nuns and make mothers of them. Burn all the deeds to private property and elevate the proletariat to judicial rank! Do not hesitate before sepulchers and altars! Fight! Kill! Die!"

No public official has spoken like this in America, but others have—and Lerroux was not in office when he uttered his brutal counsel.

Commenting on the invasion of law courts at Salamanca by a mob bent on lynching magistrates, judges and lawyers, a "liberal" writer for whom these excesses had become sickening said:

"The horde was made up of mere boys who raised clenched fists, and filthy toothless harpies carrying a poster with the words, 'Long live free love'. This grotesque mob paraded the streets under the protection of the authorities. Our revolution is filling up large cities with human dregs no longer tolerated in smaller towns and allowing them to merge with the rotteness that already exists there."

Indalecio Prieto, a Socialist said:

"Spaniards have never, but never, witnessed anything so tragic as the spectacle their country now offers to the world. Spain is totally discredited abroad. Its lifeblood is being drained by strife and disorder devoid of any revolutionary purpose and the resources of government and national vitality are being worn down by a state of chronic unrest which is proving too much for the people."

Though this socialist saw no revolutionary purpose in such anarchy, the purpose must have been strong undercover. In an article Jan. 3, 1936, the year civil war began, the communist leader Joaquin Maurin said:

"Our revolution, which began by overthrowing Primo de Rivera" (the military dictator who had given Spain firm government prior to abdication of King Alfonso XIII) "is now in its seventh year, which may well be a decisive year for all. The Asturias affair was only a prologue, a dress rehearsal for much that is yet to come."

The Asturias affair concerns the wanton sacking of Oviedo, in which 4,000 were killed and much fine property destroyed by Asturian miners with dynamite. At the time of Maurin's statement, 60,000 children in Madrid were out of school, partly because many school houses had been burned, and unemployment totaled 900,000 in Spain.

Bolin lists three phases of the Republic: 1) unqualified zealots ignored rights and misused authority; 2) the will of the people at the polls was ignored and opposition quelled by violence and 3) the Popular Front encouraged terror and threatened to split the country into Soviet republics to make way for communism.

Answering critics of the use of force for peace and justice, Bolin quotes Lord Melbourne's defense of his handling of British labor riots in 1831:

"To force, nothing but force can be successfully opposed. All legislation is impotent and ridiculous unless the public peace can be preserved and the liberty and property of individuals saved from outrage and invasion."

Bolin also quotes the U.S. Declaration of Independence on the right and duty of the people, after long abuse, "to throw off such government and to provide new guards for their future security."

Though nothing so violent as the terror in Spain has yet occurred in the United States, some of the disorders in streets and campuses have been accompanied by startlingly similar threats uttered by militants and protesters against American society.

The spark that set off the Spanish civil war was assassination of Calvo Sotello, a member of parliament in opposition to the government.

When author Bolin told a British audience in 1936, he believed Spain was on the brink of revolution, he was not believed. He recalled the War of the Roses, and the American Civil War—then only 70 years finished. Forty days later the Civil War began.

After three years of bitter fighting, which cost an estimated 600,000 lives and untold suffering, Franco won. He has ruled the country ever since with a firm, sure hand.

As usual with a one-man government, orderly succession presents a grave problem. Spain is now a monarchy without a king. What happens after Franco? The best guess seems to be restoration of a king to the throne and selection of somebody in Franco's circle as a new chief of government.

The second republic, and an earlier disastrous experiment with democracy in the 1870s, have made "republic" a dirty word in Spain. Fortunately, Americans have long and successful experience with the republican system. They know how to make it work. They can save their republic from the wreckers if they follow the rules and act in time. They can avoid Spain's agony by studying the record of anarchy and revolution, and stamping them out before civil war and heavy policing are necessary to keep order.

**JOHNSTOWN JUNIOR FIRE DEPARTMENT AWARDS**

**HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for the 18th consecutive year, the fire department of the city of Johnstown, Pa., gave awards to the participants in their junior fire department program and to the winners of their fire prevention poster contest. To the best of my knowledge, this junior fire department program is the only one of its kind in the Nation and it deserves special recognition because of the impact on the community. More importantly, perhaps with recognition, other fire departments around the country might institute similar programs and thus multiply the awareness of home fire

prevention action throughout the Nation.

The 1969 program involved approximately 100 hours of instruction in fire prevention and resulted in finding and eliminating approximately 6,800 home fire hazards in the community with a total of 1,255 children from 19 public and parochial schools taking part in the program. The first is the "fire chief" section, wherein those children reporting and correcting the most fire hazards are made honorary chiefs of the department.

In the first category of the program where children reported and corrected the most fire hazards, Mark Spenger of Central Catholic School became the 1969 Junior Fire Chief of Johnstown, Pa. Also there were honorary district fire chiefs as follows: Becky Dull of the Chandler School for district 1; Joetta Kay Johncola of Tanneryville School for district 2; Roberta Wilson of Central Catholic School in district 3; Alan Balak of St. Patrick's School in district 4; and, for the first time in the years of the competition, there was a tie for honors in district 5: Kenard Pruey and Tim Cover of the Maple Park School will share the honor of district fire chief for 1969 in district 5.

The second part of the competition is the fire prevention poster contest. In this category first prize went to Mark Strandquist of Westwood School; second prize was awarded to Philene Weaver of Visitation School; with the third prize being given to David Condo of Westwood School. It is interesting to note than an estimated 90 percent of the pupils involved in the total program submitted posters on fire safety.

Mr. Speaker, I highly commend the Johnstown Fire Department and all the principals and teachers involved in this program for making fire prevention at home a concern of every child. I also extend my special congratulations to the new Johnstown Junior Fire Chief for 1969, Mark Spenger, and the district junior fire chiefs which will serve under him during the year.

**INTEREST RATES ON U.S. SAVINGS BONDS**

**HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received the following letter from a constituent of mine, Lester Wegrzecki, concerning the interest rates on U.S. savings bonds. His comments voice the feelings of many persons today, and I would like to place his letter in the RECORD for everyone to read. The letter follows:

DETROIT, MICH.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: During the last few years we bought very month one E-Bond, not so much as capital investment, as to prove my voluntary support for the monetary system of our government. E-Bonds pay 4.25% on maturity and do not bring any interest for the first 4 months after purchase. Recently, the Federal Government-Treasury Department started issuance of the new kind of notes with much better terms. It means 6.42% on maturity—after the same 7½

years—and interest payable with checks mailed to the owner every six months.

Do I have to drop my patriotic habit of buying E-Bonds, cash all my savings bonds and savings notes and switch to the new kind of notes? I feel rather bad about being cheated by our authority—myself and many of my friends and co-workers, and many more working people who trusted their small savings buying E-Bonds for security. Is there any legal way to protest such a practice, and protect E-Bond investors from that kind of disappointment. Can you do something positive about it.

LESTER WEGRZECKI.

**STATE OF THE COUNTY MESSAGE IN MONROE COUNTY, N.Y., REVEALS SERIOUS NATIONAL FISCAL AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS**

**HON. FRANK HORTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and fellow Representative of the county of Monroe in New York, BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., and I wish to call the attention of this body to a very timely and meaningful message. I am referring to the "state of the county" message, delivered to the Monroe County Legislature by County Manager Gordon A. Howe in January.

As the Congress begins to grapple with legislation that will attempt to deal with the great foreign, domestic, and fiscal problems facing our land, it is too easy to look upon these problems from a purely Federal standpoint. The Federal Government is not alone in having a critical shortage of resources needed to fulfill demands for programs and services. We are not alone in our temptation to look to other levels of Government to do what we cannot do.

Mr. Speaker, the budgetary and inflationary crisis we face, brought on in some measure by the Vietnam war, has brought on a crisis of astronomical proportions in State and local governments. We at the Federal level share the responsibility for responding to many new needs of this Nation in the past decade. We have set up new agencies, new programs, new goals—all in response to an increasingly urbanized and socially conscious America. In many instances, the Federal Government stepped in to fulfill needs, some local in nature, which State and local governments either could not or would not fulfill.

Slowly in many of these areas, the Congress has had to give way to resource realities, and to hold back on full funding of many authorized commitments. Within the Federal perspective, these moves were necessary, and are necessary. But we have left in the wake of reduced Federal help, State and local governments which are faced with catastrophic revenue problems.

At the same time they face heightened expectations for services and programs on the part of their constituencies.

As County Manager Howe ably points out, many of these problems, particularly at the local level, are brought on by

inadequate or nonexistent intergovernmental relationships. The Federal attitude has been one of coaxing and incentive—offering the lure of funds to States and localities that would adopt a worthy Federal goal as their own. These worthy programs have too often fallen outside the realm of budget planning and revenue availability; and their effect has too often been the creation of perennial budget crises at the local level.

Particularly in this difficult time, when the demands of a costly war and the effects of inflation limit our flexibility, we must take into consideration at every turn, both the benefits and consequences of our actions for the States and localities, and we must take bold initiatives to improve the fiscal picture for all levels of government.

Tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, a distinguished and unique delegation from Monroe County, N.Y., will begin a 2-day series of meetings with Federal legislative and executive officials, to point up these severe problems of local government, and to support Federal policies which would facilitate the solutions of these problems.

The arrival in Washington of 24 of Monroe County's 29 county legislators to plead the case of local government before the policymakers of the Federal Government represents a significant initiative in intergovernmental relations. They are making a positive and sincere attempt to communicate and cooperate with the Federal Government on common problems and goals.

The delegation includes the following county legislators:

Hon. Gordon B. Anderson; Hon. R. Graham Annett; Hon. Robert E. Cappon; Hon. Kenneth P. Courtney, president of the legislature; Hon. Joseph R. Esposito; Hon. Joseph N. Ferrari; Hon. Edwin A. Foster; Hon. Gerald Jed Hanna; Hon. John Richard Hoff; Hon. William C. Kelly; Hon. Frederick W. Lapple; Hon. Hyman T. Maas; Hon. Edward B. Mogenhan; Hon. Lucien A. Morin; Hon. Robert P. Neilon; Hon. Dorothy M. Riley; Hon. John J. Romano; Hon. Nicholas R. Santoro; Hon. Robert H. Scheerschmidt; Hon. Gary E. Smith; Hon. Peter J. VanderTang; Hon. Anna Mae Watson; Hon. Charles W. Westfall; Hon. Henry W. Williams, Jr.

Accompanying the legislators are several other distinguished citizens of the county of Monroe, all of whom have helped to organize and carry out this journey to Washington. Richard M. Rosenbaum, county Republican chairman, Mr. Joseph Bonavilla, Miss Josephine Lombardo, Mr. Walter Meunch, Mr. Alexander Peyton, Mr. Philip Profetta and Mr. Arthur Robinson, Mr. Michael Casella, Mr. William F. Dwyer, coordinator of the trip, and Mr. Alan Van Campen will also be attending the legislators' meetings on Capitol Hill, at the White House, and at executive agencies.

Both Congressman CONABLE and I are proud of this effort.

President Nixon, as one of his first official policies, announced redoubled efforts to cooperate and communicate with other levels of government. While our intentions at every level have been good,

we too often have begun needless competition for revenue, for programs, and for policymaking power. Competition between levels of government is just too costly to justify its benefits. We must all work together toward the goal of a better America for all our people. The need for renewed and expanded intergovernmental cooperation and discussion is well expressed in Mr. Howe's message. We implore each Member of this body to take a few minutes to read his message, as a means of immersing himself, if only for a few moments, in the detailed and difficult problems faced by a progressive metropolitan county.

The state of the county message follows:

STATE OF THE COUNTY MESSAGE, JANUARY 7, 1969

(By Gordon A. Howe, county manager)

Ladies and Gentlemen: While this day opens a new year, the final year of the 1960s, it also places us on the threshold of a new decade in which the challenges of public administration will be greater than ever before.

The public today is more conscious of the cost of government than at any time in many years. Despite every effort that could be made, it was necessary for the County of Monroe to join other units of government in increasing its tax rate for this year. The combined effect of the tax increase by the City of Rochester, the towns, school districts and special districts has been to arouse the public and focus public attention on the demands made today on local government.

Comparatively, the Monroe County resident still will live in a county with one of the lowest tax rates in the State of New York. The following table shows what the typical Monroe County taxpayer would pay in property tax if he lived in one of the other major counties of New York State:

*Average family's 1969 property tax bill*

County:	
Nassau	\$215.00
Suffolk	211.00
Westchester	200.00
Onondaga	177.00
Monroe	148.40
Erie	147.00

In noting the tax burden upon the people, it should be noted that the same family which has a county property tax in Monroe County of \$148.40 in 1969 will pay the Federal Government \$1,507.24 in Federal income taxes for the same period.

The fact that we have a comparatively low property tax here does not lessen our responsibility to do all in our power to operate government at the lowest possible cost as we have in the past.

The growth of this County and the accompanying growth of revenues will help ease the tax burden on county property owners in the 1970s. Expanding sales tax income, for example, will assure town residents that their property taxes will be lower in the 1970s than they are this year. The assumption by the County of millions of dollars of services previously financed by the City will mean that City residents should benefit by a lower tax load.

**COUNTIES TO LEAD WAY IN DECADE OF 1970'S**

County government today and in the next decade will be the major local unit of government. However, we have reached a critical point in our growth and development. While the County assumed major city costs, City taxes have continued to rise. When the County agreed to expand its aid to schools from the sales tax, the result shifted revenues from towns and villages and their tax

rates rose accordingly without any reduction in the school tax. Instead of recognizing these changes as benefits many taxpayers unfortunately seem to believe that the County alone is responsible for higher taxes. This is not the case. It will take a major public education effort to dispel such a belief and illustrate to the average citizen the vast range of vital services which his county tax dollar buys for him, his family and his community.

The environment in which we live is affected in crucial ways by County government activities. Clean air, pure water, open spaces for play, modern interurban roadways, protection from communicable diseases all are elements of modern life which are affected by County programs. The County of Monroe, in short, has a direct effect on the quality of our community. If most people believe we live in a pleasant community, the County can take credit for its important role in maintaining the environment.

The administration of justice is a large County responsibility—and a costly one. The court system and our system of justice are major services of county government. Few people stop to think of this benefit which is financed by their tax dollars.

**COUNTY MUST CARE FOR UNFORTUNATE**

Those who are unfortunate or unable to care for themselves are County charges. While there are many problems stemming from the welfare burden in this community, the fact is that the County is bound by law to provide food, clothing, shelter and medical, psychiatric, nursing, and many other kinds of care to the needy and the unfortunate who cannot provide for themselves. Without County administration of the social service program, the City of Rochester—the place of residence of 90 per cent of the welfare case-load—would be bankrupt and there would be no uniform system for caring for the needy, aged and infirm on a communitywide base.

No government is perfect. The County of Monroe in the decade of the 1960s has been singled out for praise across the nation on many occasions. We have high quality government that is recognized as outstanding in the nation. Nevertheless, the prospect of a new decade of the 1970s with new kinds of challenges places us in a period when reappraisal of the County's role is in order. We should not assume that our programs of the 1960s will meet our needs or serve our purposes for the 1970s.

**YEAR 1969 IS TIME TO REEVALUATE**

The year 1969 should be used as a time to re-evaluate our local government services and to set public policy goals for the 1970s. We need a framework of public policy which has the support of the public. We need guidelines for our operations. If we determine we no longer can afford all of the services of the past, we should make a solid determination that specific services are no longer to be County responsibilities.

The County Legislature is the policy making body of County government. It is representative of all of the people of the community. County legislators are the legislators closest to the people. Each represents approximately 22,500 persons compared to a constituency of nearly 75,000 for a district councilman in the City of Rochester. It is proper that your Honorable Body should undertake a reappraisal of the policies which guide this County.

The year 1969 will be patterned after policies determined in the adoption of the County budget. It is a year in which some County services were abandoned because of fiscal pressures. We will no longer have a mobile chest x-ray unit, a traveling library, an historian's office operating with a full-time staff, and there are severe personnel restrictions placed on the County government for the year.

## LEGISLATURE SHOULD SET POLICIES FOR 1970'S

County government will function better and will serve the public better if we establish clear guidelines within which we are to function in the 1970s.

There are numerous areas in which a new look at public policy can produce important results. This can be done through the medium of your own committees.

Following are some policy areas which should receive the attention of your Honorable Body in the months ahead if we are to set meaningful public policy goals for the 1970s:

**Social Services:** This has become a costly burden upon the County largely because of State and Federal requirements. Furthermore, the Federal portion of these requirements are decidedly unfair to the taxpayers of the State of New York and the County of Monroe. The needy in the community receive full support as defined under a very liberal policy mandated upon us by the State of New York. Moreover, this assistance has risen sharply. In 1963, a family of four—husband, wife, boy age 14 and girl age 8—received a payment of \$238.85 if they qualified for subsistence. Today, this is up to \$321.00 per month. In contrast, the same family would receive only \$253.59 per month if they resided in Ohio; only \$93.09 per month if they were Mississippi residents; and only \$89.00 per month if they resided in Florida. There is no question but that the national imbalance of standards has placed the taxpayer in this State and County in the position of paying a heavy premium in social services because of extraordinarily liberal conditions prescribed by the State under State and Federal financed social service programs.

Present regulations which mandate such an expenditure in the County of Monroe are unrealistic in the absence of fair and equitable national standards for subsistence payments. If the present unfair situation is to be changed, change can begin with a statement of policy and a petition to both State and Federal governments urging adoption of national standards.

## FEDERAL POLICIES ADD TO PROBLEMS

Monroe County taxpayers also have been victims of the failure of the Federal government to live up to its promises to combat poverty with federal funds. Although numerous programs were undertaken in good faith by local governments, the Federal government withdrew its support. As a result, the County of Monroe, in the recent past, has had to assume the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of programs which it did not originate and which it is doubtful it can continue to afford if the local tax rate is to be kept within reasonable bounds. At any rate, the entire package of programs from which Federal support has been withdrawn should be reviewed. It must be determined if these programs individually have sufficient value to the community to be continued along with the millions of dollars of County funds which are being funneled to the poor, the ill and the needy under County-funded programs. The County of Monroe for years has funded an effective program to assist the poor and even without the Federally-inspired poverty programs, the County still will be operating an effective and comprehensive program to help the needy of this community.

There should be a limit to the amount of money local taxpayers are expected to contribute toward programs which essentially are started by other levels of government. Programs which are worthwhile should be continued or possibly even expanded. Those that do no work or cannot justify their existence by showing positive contributions to people should be ended so available funds can support the effective programs.

## MONROE SHOULD LEAD IN WELFARE CHANGES

There are many State requirements that need intensive review. Numerous State man-

dates to Monroe County are needless or inefficient and the burden of both State and Federal social service programs has grown heavy enough that the entire field should be scrutinized. There is a definite need for major changes. Monroe County, based on our experience with the huge increases in social service costs, should be in a position to contribute recommendations for change which will benefit both the taxpayers and the people who need the social services.

**Intergovernmental Relations:** The failure of the Federal government to maintain support of poverty programs illustrates the need for the examination of intergovernmental relations and intergovernmental financing of public programs. The County has taken over both City of Rochester and Federal programs in the recent past. It has been suggested that the County take over additional City programs. There is logic to placing planning and traffic engineering on a countywide basis, for example. Whether these and other such consolidations are to take place is a matter of policy and should be discussed by your Honorable Body. The County also supports a number of activities through "authorized agencies." These are not strictly government services in every case and, as the tax load grows heavier, it should be decided as a matter of policy if the County's taxpayers are to continue to support these public-private partnerships.

## TOWNS, VILLAGES NEED VOICE

To preserve the voice of the towns and villages in the fabric of local government it would be timely to study the feasibility of a "Council of Governments" to provide a formal voice to these units of government in decisions affecting them and the county. Town supervisors, village mayors, and town, village and city officials have responsibilities which are affected in important ways by the actions of the County. It is appropriate that they should have a more formal voice in the affairs of local government than they do at present and possibly a "Council of Governments" could open up this line of communication in the public interest.

**Taxation and Finance:** In assessing our policy goals for the 1970s, no area is more important than the field of taxation and finance. The City Manager has suggested a countywide income tax as a means of generating revenues which the City cannot now raise to ease the City's budget problems and those of the schools. The census of 1970 will make a major readjustment in the distribution of the sales tax revenues which will help local governments meet the growing obligations upon them. Tax and financial policies for the 1970s can have an affect upon the economic growth of this community and this, in turn, can reflect itself in the employment picture. These are basic and important policy areas which should be given attention by your Honorable Body and its finance committee.

**Public Safety:** The burden of funding police services has grown to sizeable proportions in certain major towns. As a result, there has been preliminary discussion about possible establishment of a consolidated police unit to serve the entire community. There are Federal funds available for studies of such consolidation. The establishment of a countywide police service unquestionably will reach a point of decision in the 1970s. It is timely to begin studies of this area of government service and to determine County policy in relation to policing this metropolitan community.

## NEW DISTRICT COURT COULD SPEED JUSTICE

In connection with public safety, the load on our courts deserves consideration. The existing court structure is overburdened. This has a direct effect on the efficiency with which justice is administered. It is time to think in terms of relief of the courts possibly by establishment of a new civil court to operate on a district basis. Such a court

structure would handle important civil matters which now burden other courts. It could be established without upsetting the present court structure.

The cost of our courts and court-related services has reached above \$6-million per year. This is a large amount and, essentially, the County has little control over the courts operations but must meet heavy court expenses. Because of the State of New York's involvement in the system of justice in this State, these costs properly should be State expenses. Administratively, the State has the major voice in the operations of the Courts yet the main burden of expense still rests on the shoulders of the local taxpayer. This inequity already has brought about proposals at the State level to place the costs of the courts on the State. The County should encourage and promote such a step as a matter of justice to the taxpayer.

**Parks and Recreation:** During the 1960s, the County of Monroe embarked on a major land-purchasing program to preserve natural areas of the County for future parklands. Parklands are a resource which cannot be created once open spaces are urbanized. This program has been virtually without equal in the nation. We have sought to tailor our land purchases to known demand of our growing population. Land costs have soared during the 1960s and there is little doubt that this inflation will continue unabated or even at an accelerated pace in the 1970s.

## EXAMINATION URGED OF PARKS PROGRAM

It is appropriate for your Conservation, Recreation and Natural Resources committee to examine where we stand in order to develop a policy for the 1970s. We should decide on a recreation policy and determine the line between countywide recreational programs and those that properly belong with the City and the towns and villages. We should decide if park fees are to be designed to make park programs self-sustaining or at what level they properly can be subsidized.

**Public Works:** The County of Monroe operates a complex series of structures and services. These include the Civic Center and its 1,300 car parking garage, the Rochester-Monroe County Airport, the Iola complex of County buildings, the Community College at its new 4,000-student campus, the downtown County Office Building and the new 10-story Health-Social Services building on Westfall Road.

The 1970s will project the County further into the public works area if we accept the challenge to undertake a countywide refuse disposal district and if we proceed with development of a master drainage control program for the County. The "pure waters" program will involve tens of millions of dollars in construction of sewage treatment facilities.

We will need to review and determine new public policies in relation to many of our public works projects. For example, the future of the Port of Rochester is a current consideration and this service should be re-evaluated. The direction and control of our handling of drainage problems is another matter which is growing to serious proportions. We will face a question on the future development and expansion of water service to meet the total community needs as the City of Rochester's water service needs grow beyond the City's capability to produce water through its present system. It is possible that water demands will indicate the desirability of creating a countywide water district to provide the most efficient and workable framework to keep ahead of the rapidly expanding need for water both in the City and the suburbs.

The entire public works area involves major policy considerations. Public works projects are among our most costly and important operating programs. The policies which guide our operations in this field in the 1970s will help guarantee the public that tax funds are used on the most essential

programs for the benefit of the greatest number of people.

#### ROAD, RAIL NEEDS MUST BE MET

**Transportation:** The long-awaited metropolitan area transportation study now is in the hands of Monroe County's consulting engineers for review and recommendations. It has been the intent of the County administration and your Honorable Body to undertake a major cash expenditure on County highways year by year in the 1970s. This policy pre-dates, however, the most recent budget and the difficult fiscal squeeze upon the County of Monroe. Therefore, your Honorable Body should review the County's highway needs for the 1970s and set a policy on both cash expenditure on highways and the scope of a program undertaken with highway bonds. Also, the issue of expanded bus-versus-rail transit to serve our future needs should receive a critical review so the transportation program ultimately recommended will fit into policies set down for this county.

**Employee Relations:** There is continuing discussion at the State level and in other counties of major changes in the Taylor Law which gives employee unions the right to organize and negotiate with the County administration. Any proposed changes in this law must be studied to determine their effect on the excellent relationship which exists between the County administration and the employee negotiating units which were recognized in 1968 by your Honorable Body under the Taylor Law.

The County of Monroe is a large, dynamic and growing service business. We rank among the ten largest employers and our gross budget ranks County government well within the ten largest enterprises in the community. We serve a population which will reach 700,000 people in the opening weeks of 1970. Our rate of population growth is accelerating—Monroe County's population rose 8,700 people between 1960 and 1961 but between 1969 and 1970 it will grow by an estimated 16,000 persons. This places new responsibilities and challenges upon County government. In meeting our responsibilities, we must run County government on a businesslike basis within clear policy guidelines which reflect the desires and needs of the public.

#### LEGISLATURE SEEN AS BEST FORUM

In setting public policy goals for the 1970s, all segments of today's society should be consulted. You, as County Legislators, are the best channel of communications through which your constituents can express their views. Government will be stronger and more effective if the people have such a voice in the policies which will govern them in these changing and challenging times.

You can be assured of the complete cooperation of the administration in developing policy guidelines. Upon the request of your committees, you can receive thorough reviews of current programs and proposals for future policies.

We have both an opportunity and a responsibility to set before ourselves new public policy goals for the coming decade. This is a program worthy of our best efforts throughout 1969 so Monroe County can continue to occupy a position in the 1970s as one of the nation's finest, best governed counties. That must be our overriding goal for the future as it has been throughout our history.

#### ROTC VITAL TO DEFENSE EFFORT

### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent attacks made on

ROTC units at some of our universities I would like to make some observations in this area.

There are today some 353 colleges and universities that have ROTC programs. They represent a vital part of our defense effort. This June the Army expects to graduate a recordbreaking 16,606 new officers with ROTC commissions. By comparison West Point will turn out only 750 second lieutenants.

It is interesting to note that with all the concern about Vietnam, ROTC enrollment has been growing rather than declining. The Defense Department states that they have a backlog of some 335 petitions from colleges seeking either Army, Air Force, or Navy Reserve training programs.

This is not to say that there is not room for improvement. Secretary Laird has indicated that changes are to be made in the ROTC curriculums providing for more elective courses, greater local control over the programs, more university level training as well as less military drill.

Although it may appear that our ROTC programs are weathering their assaults, it is clear that the current activities to disrupt these programs at our colleges and universities are indeed serious and cannot be ignored, for our ROTC system with its reservoir of manpower is essential to our national security.

It is ironic that those who have sought to attack the ROTC programs on our campuses have failed to recognize the fact that these very programs have made our services virtually dependent upon the citizen-soldier, thereby helping to safeguard the country against the rise of a military elite.

Two recent editorials appearing in the State Journal, of Lansing, Mich., on Tuesday, May 13, 1969, and the Jackson Citizen Patriot, of Jackson, Mich., on Wednesday, May 14, 1969, discuss this situation particularly well, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, May 13, 1969]

#### COLLEGES SHOULD BACK ROTC PROGRAMS

Certain campus extremists who evidently wish to dictate just about every phase of university and college activities have now started, inevitably, to zero in on the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC).

Protests are spreading on various campuses with some of the more radical groups demanding that ROTC be abolished from the colleges entirely. Other more moderate organizations are arguing that ROTC should be a non-credit course.

The two views need to be separated to be clearly understood.

Those of the extreme radical bent, in calling for abolishment of ROTC, are following a familiar pattern of attacking any organization which stands as a potential barrier to their goals.

ROTC for decades has served the nation well in providing a ready officer reserve in time of national need. On a majority of campuses it is a voluntary program as far as students are concerned. There is no reason whatever why young men who wish to serve their country in this program should be denied that right by self-appointed groups who declare themselves as exclusive judges of what people can do or not do.

We are told by some of the radicals that

ROTC teaches and instills violence in the minds of young men. This has about as much credibility as saying that professional football makes killers out of fans or that a youth who reads Hamlet will become a murderer.

The other more moderate argument is that military credit courses should not be offered on campuses devoted to arts and sciences and where faculty does not control the content of the curriculum. It is said that ROTC should be extracurricular if it is to remain on campus.

While the second claim is more understandable, it could also be argued that no academic credit should be offered for students choosing medicine or law careers, since they, too, are controlled by agencies outside the university.

Throughout American history there has always been an anti-military undercurrent running through the land—a fear of making the military too attractive a life.

It would be ideal, indeed, if this nation could abandon military training and reliance on reserves. Unfortunately, and regardless of the rantings of the radical groups, there is no evidence that other major powers hostile to this nation have shown any inclination to reduce their armed forces or their reserves.

Most of those leading the protests today are too young to remember or perhaps care about the pre-World War II period when Adolph Hitler frequently boasted that soft American youth would never be able to stand in his way.

Only geography and the fighting delay provided by allied nations gave this nation time to disprove that claim.

History has never favored any country that abandoned its capacity for defense. It would be nice to believe otherwise but at this stage of history there is no evidence to support the hope that anything has changed.

Young men should have the right to serve their country as they see fit, including through ROTC, without dictation from those who have decided that they alone know what's best for the nation.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, May 14, 1969]

#### ROTC OPPONENTS PRESENT PARADOX

Secretary of Defense Laird has joined those who see campus protests against the Reserve Officer Training Corps as totally incongruous with resistance, from the same source, to the draft system.

Pointing out that ROTC is one of the "big building blocks" in the Nixon Administration's program to end the draft and establish a basically volunteer military force, Secretary Laird says, "you can't have it both ways."

The logic in Mr. Laird's argument is obvious. Since its inception the ROTC has, indeed, been one of the nation's guarantees of a military force, either volunteer or conscripted, which is primarily civilian in nature. The citizen-soldier concept has done well for America in all its history.

If the protesters are successful in killing the ROTC program the nation would have to fall back on a purely professional officer class, something the dissidents should fear even more.

The paradox of the protests, however, has an explanation, although one largely devoid of logic.

The ROTC is a handy, visible target for hard-core protesters who are seeking to discredit the American system any way they can. Currently they are making the system of higher education their target. Their aim is to disrupt and destroy it, even though they may have no plans for rebuilding it.

ROTC, being a part of the higher educational scene and having a direct connection with the military, is a target of opportunity.

The more moderate students who follow the New Left agitators against ROTC hardly are thinking the proposition through. They are unhappy about the war in Vietnam and

easily are led into attacks on the ROTC because it is of a military nature. Yielding by college administrators and faculties to demands to downgrade ROTC tend to give respectability to a cause which has its inception in the desire of the New Leftists to destroy America as it is.

The opposition to ROTC does not, as Secretary Laird indicates, make any sense. But neither do any other objectives of the New Leftists. The pity is that so many more moderate and loyal students allow themselves to be misled.

**A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATION BY CONGRESS AND THE FCC OF THE DENIGRATORY STEREOTYPING OF ETHNIC GROUPS IN MOTION PICTURES AND ON TELEVISION**

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I introduce this resolution in righteous anger. It is indefensible in the one Nation on earth where liberty is most cherished, where equality before the law is espoused and brotherhood advocated, that the mass media should continually and unabashedly produce and distribute material which defames ethnic groups, creates unrest, promotes discord, and foments bitterness in ethnic, racial, and religious group relationships.

Both the motion picture and television industries have codes which outlaw this type of denigration of minority groups, but these codes are flagrantly ignored. I am particularly aware of the portrayal of Italian Americans as shady, underworld characters, typically involved in the Mafia or the Cosa Nostra; but other groups are similarly defamed as ignorant, shiftless, cunning, rapacious, or drunkards.

With all our outrage against prejudice, fought with legislation that attempts to force its demise, we nevertheless continue, in this Nation proudly hailed as a "melting pot," to allow malicious stereotyping in the field of entertainment.

We all know that the way to end prejudice is to teach our children to view all people with an open mind, to judge each man individually on his own merits, and to make judgments unencumbered by the preconceived opinion known as prejudice.

As the song from "South Pacific" goes:

We've got to be taught to hate and fear.  
We've got to be taught to hate all the people  
our relatives hate.  
We've got to be carefully taught.

The children of today are influenced more than ever before by television and motion pictures. They are being taught, not brotherhood, but intolerance, not acceptance of human differences but hatred of their fellow man. We abhor the violence of the entertainment media for its effect on the young. We should be similarly aware of the corrupting influence it has over their minds in stereotyping ethnic groups. The entertainment media should not be permitted to exploit our children and our future by perpetrating lies about ethnic groups. These

media have a responsibility to the Nation to live up to espoused American values and to do their part in preparing for a better tomorrow.

That we continue to allow certain groups to be maligned, while espousing ideals of brotherhood and tolerance, is the worst kind of hypocrisy, and it has no place in America. It is time that the Congress of the United States investigate the flagrant disregard of the television and motion pictures industries' codes that ban this kind of defamation.

Italian Americans, German Americans, Irish Americans, and others who have contributed so much to the building of America, who helped settle her, who contribute to her industry, perform the obligations of citizenship with unquestioning pride, and fight and die for America—these decent and patriotic people deserve better. We are a nation of immigrants, and this has been our strength. It is contrary to all the cherished ideals of Americans that the defaming of these groups should be permitted to continue in films and on television, and to be allowed to poison the minds of our children. It is imperative that we take determined steps to investigate this matter and to set things right.

**NEW PRESIDENT FOR IOWA MEDICAL SOCIETY**

**HON. FRED SCHWENDEL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Medical Society recently chose as its president, Dr. J. H. "Jack" Sunderbruch of Davenport, Iowa. The doctors of Iowa could not have made a sounder choice. Dr. Sunderbruch is a man with a proven record of public service, and this new position is a continuation of the heavy contribution which we have come to expect from him.

Mr. Speaker, I include a newsclipping pertaining to this subject in the RECORD, as follows:

**HE'LL FIND THE TIME**

If you want a job done well, find a busy man to do it. So the saying goes, and Iowa Medical Society members apparently believe it.

Dr. J. H. (Jack) Sunderbruch of Davenport has been mighty busy, hereabouts, on a great number of worthwhile things. Now the state's medics have tapped him to head their organization.

This energetic general practitioner was city health physician here for about a quarter-century. He also has served as president of the Davenport Chamber of Commerce, the Scott Medical Society and the Mercy Hospital staff, and as secretary of the St. Luke's Hospital staff. He also was an unsuccessful candidate for mayor.

He's the father of six children and grandfather of 11. He's an avid sports fan, and an activist in political and civic affairs.

He is the first from Scott County to head the state medical unit since Dr. Gordon Harkness held the post in the early 30s.

The state society in honoring him salutes the medical profession in Scott County.

Dr. Sunderbruch simply hasn't time for another job—which is a way of saying he'll do the new one well.

**THE DALLAS JOB FAIR**

**HON. JAMES M. COLLINS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, early in 1968, Dallas business and civic leaders, under the energetic direction of Mayor Erik Jonsson and Morris Hite, became convinced that private enterprise represented the only long-range solution to providing meaningful jobs and opportunities for the underprivileged youth in the greater Dallas area.

Through their efforts they involved more than 500 Dallas businessmen who gave unselfishly of their time and effort to seek summer employment opportunities for Dallas area youth. That first year, 1968, the first Dallas Job Fair brought these dedicated employers together with more than 5,000 youngsters. By the end of the day over 3,200 young people could attest to the success of the 1968 Job Fair. The Dallas business community had employed the youngsters in a wide variety of occupations from construction and clerical help to defense contract plants and motion picture theaters.

Mr. Speaker, many of the youngsters employed that summer of 1968 used the money they made to further their education. And Job Fair, 1968, went down in history as a tremendous success—but Dallas had already begun plans for an even more productive second Job Fair to be held on May 15, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention this article entitled "National Officials Say Job Fair Great," which appeared in the Friday, May 16, edition of the Dallas Morning News:

**NATIONAL OFFICIALS SAY JOB FAIR GREAT**

The Job Fair in Dallas already has become more successful than similar programs operating twice as long in other cities, the deputy director of the President's Council on Youth Opportunities said here Thursday.

Howard Phillips said Dallas "has made great strides" toward solving the problems of youth unemployment through its Job Fair program.

"The Chamber of Commerce and business leaders work together here better than any city I have seen so far," Phillips said. "This is a must for successful summer youth hiring project."

Phillips and Andy Gallegos, southwest regional coordinator for the President's Council on Youth Opportunities, were in Dallas to observe afternoon Job Fair activities at Memorial Auditorium.

More than 3,500 young people were offered jobs during the day and approximately 1,500 more will receive opportunities later through the Texas Employment Commission placement service.

Phillips said 10 major cities utilize the Job Fair idea for summer work opportunities. Many have been in operation for five years, he added.

"President Nixon has often said that business leaders can do more than any federal office to overcome unemployment problems," he said. "We hope to encourage youth hiring programs such as this one any way we can."

Gallegos said a key problem of Job Fair is convincing employers that young people really are interested in getting and holding good jobs.

"Most of these kids are from slum areas where they've never been given a chance by

anyone," he said. "If an employer shows an interest, the youngster often proves to be his best worker."

Phillips said his Washington office presently is working with youth coordinators in 50 major cities to set up education and job training programs.

In addition, the President's Council supports efforts to provide a number of fine arts programs for youngsters in low income areas.

"We're pretty busy these days," the deputy director said. "But we can't do it all without the help of private individuals."

As these U.S. officials so aptly point out, the Dallas 1969 Job Fair was the most successful program of its type in the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Dallas has conclusively demonstrated that where there is civic and business imagination and leadership, there is no need to depend on the ever growing Federal Government to provide assistance. The Dallas Job Fair program speaks well for local leadership and determination, and should be considered an exemplary case study for our Nation's other metropolitan areas.

I would like to commend our Dallas mayor, Erik Jonsson, and our president of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Morris Hite, for the inception of this remarkable program.

In addition, the 1969 Job Fair attracted more than 8,000 youngsters, and found jobs for more than 5,000 on the very first day. The cochairmen this year deserve our thanks: Mr. Morris Hite, Mr. Billy Medina and Mr. Frank Clarke. No fair is a success without a successful job solicitation—and this year it was expertly handled by Mr. Sydney Peatross and Mr. Joe Kirven. And the youth participation was some 8,000 strong due to the leadership of Mr. Willard Crotty.

Mr. Speaker, most certainly the Members of Congress know that no large program can be successful without extensive and careful planning. The Dallas Job Fair had a logistics and systems committee, headed by Mr. Tom Mikulecky and Mr. Roosevelt Johnson, which was responsible for the smooth running of the entire operation. And Mr. Richard Moynihan, as executive director of the 1969 Dallas Job Fair, should certainly be commended for his outstanding leadership.

I know my colleagues join with me in praise of the city of Dallas, and its innovative approach to employment opportunities for our underprivileged youngsters of the Dallas area.

#### NATIONAL JEWISH HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH CENTER

### HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House, the outstanding scientific and humanitarian work which is being performed by the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center at Denver.

The National Jewish Hospital is a non-

sectarian treatment and research center for tuberculosis, severe asthma, emphysema, and other chronic chest diseases.

A testimonial dinner is to be held in San Francisco on June 18 for the benefit of the hospital. I could not let this occasion pass without noting with gratitude the over 189,000 days of free care which the National Jewish Hospital has provided to residents of the State of California.

I am sure my colleagues would wish to join with me in recognizing and paying tribute to this outstanding and selfless contribution to the health and well-being of others and to extend to the officers and staff of the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center our appreciation and best wishes for continued success in the struggle against chest diseases.

#### A BILL TO CHANGE THE DEFINITION OF "AMMUNITION"

### HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to remove the unreasonable and unnecessary restrictions on the sale of ammunition placed on our sportsmen, hunters, and businessmen. This legislation will change the definition of "ammunition" under the Gun Control Act of 1968, to exclude all ammunition other than that used in destructive devices.

By removing ammunition or cartridge cases, primers, bullets, or propellant powder from the law, would make it possible to make purchases without having to go through the complex registration and recordkeeping procedures now required. The adoption of this amendment would completely eliminate the burdens which the Gun Control Act places on our law-abiding citizens.

The present definition reads:

The term "ammunition" means ammunition or cartridge cases, primers, bullets, or propellant powder designed for use in any firearm.

The new definition in the legislation I am introducing reads:

The term "ammunition" means ammunition for a destructive device.

A destructive device is any explosive, incendiary, or poison gas; any type of weapon, other than a shotgun or a shotgun shell, which may be readily converted to, expel a projectile by the action of an explosive or other propellant, and which has any barrel with a bore of more than one-half inch in diameter; or any combination of parts either designed or intended for use in converting any device into a destructive device.

I think the provisions of the law concerning the sale of ammunition not only goes too far, but the intent of Congress has been surpassed by the regulations established by the Treasury Department under the Johnson administration.

The Gun Control Act, in section 922(b)(5), clearly states that the one selling or delivering any firearm or am-

munition must note the name, age, and place of residence of the person making the purchase.

However, in addition to these three questions, the Treasury Department has issued regulations that require: first, the date; second, manufacturing; third, caliber, gage, or type of component; fourth, quantity; and fifth, mode of identification. The issue here is not the questions, for they in themselves are meaningless, but the real issue is that a registration of any type is required of our honest hunters and sportsmen.

The forcing of this type of registration on all purchases of ammunition is, in my opinion, placing both undue and unnecessary restrictions on citizens. I feel, and I know that many Californians feel, the enforcement of such regulations will not be significant factors in reducing the incidence of crime. The harassment and inconvenience to both the buyer and the shopkeeper, who is required to keep such records, is not justified by a reasoning that this is a necessary crime control measure.

I envisioned when this act was being considered in the House of Representatives in October 1968, that the restrictions placed on the sale of ammunition would discriminate against and place undue hardships on sportsmen, hunters, and businessmen. This was one of the major reasons why I voted against the final version of the Gun Control Act when the vote was taken on October 10, 1968.

The legislation I am introducing today will correct the present injustices and will permit our citizens to once again buy ammunition without being intimidated or harassed by the Federal Government.

#### THREE MARYLAND SOLDIERS DIE IN VIETNAM

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Harry N. Stonesifer, Sp4c. Philip T. Regan, Jr., and M. Sgt. James G. Case, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

#### THREE MARYLAND GI'S, STONESIFER, REGAN, CASE, DIE IN VIETNAM

Three Army servicemen from Maryland, including a career soldier who was serving his second combat tour, have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Those killed were:

Spec. 4 Harry N. Stonesifer, son of Mr. and Mrs. Grayson A. Stonesifer, of 4208 Baltimore street, Baltimore Highlands.

Spec. 4 Philip T. Regan, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Philip T. Regan, of 2707 Hughes avenue, Adelphi.

M. Sgt. James G. Case, husband of Mrs. Patricia A. Case, of 81-A Shamrock road, Cumberland.

Specialist Stonesifer, 25, was killed April 30 when a military vehicle he was riding struck a mine during a combat mission.

He enlisted in the Army in July of 1965, and after extensive training as an armament repairman was sent to Vietnam in July, 1967. After his year-long tour of duty was over, he was sent to Germany, where he was stationed for about eight months. He was sent for a second tour in Vietnam on April 10.

According to his father, Specialist Stonesifer intended to make the Army a career.

Besides his parents, he is survived by a brother, Grayson A. Stonesifer, Jr., who lives in New Jersey; and three sisters, Mrs. Katherine H. Beech, of Pasadena, Mrs. Sylvia Fry, of Baltimore, and Mrs. Evelyn Shaffer, of Glen Burnie.

Specialist Regan was killed April 27 during a combat mission. He had been in Vietnam since July, 1968.

Born in Washington, he was a graduate of High Point Senior High School in Adelphi, where he was a member of the school's golf team that won the metropolitan Washington high school championship in 1966.

After graduation from high school in June, 1966, he attended the University of Maryland for a year and then volunteered for the draft.

His father said that letters home indicated that his son was in combat "almost the entire time he was there."

Besides his parents, he is survived by four sisters and a step-brother.

RESULTS OF 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform the House of the results of my annual questionnaire which I recently mailed to more than 138,000 families in the 30th Congressional District of New York.

As in the past, the residents of the 30th District responded enthusiastically to this request for their views and opinions on some of the most critical domestic and international issues of the day.

To date, I have received more than 27,000 replies to the poll, which I believe indicates an extremely high level of interest in national affairs, a fact that I greatly appreciate.

I know that my colleagues in the House will be interested in the results of my 1969 questionnaire. I therefore insert at this point in the Record the final tabulated results of my poll:

TABULATED RESULTS OF 1969 QUESTIONNAIRE  
[Results in percent]

1. Would you favor a resumption of all-out bombing of North Vietnam if the enemy continues to step up its action during Paris peace talks?  
Yes ..... 81  
No ..... 14  
Other ..... 5

2. Should tax incentives be granted to encourage private industry to help meet our social and economic problems?  
Yes ..... 65  
No ..... 28  
Other ..... 7

3. Do you favor converting the Post Office Department into a Government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis?  
Yes ..... 71  
No ..... 28  
Other ..... 7

4. Do you favor my bill to increase the \$600 Federal income tax exemption to \$1,000?  
Yes ..... 93  
No ..... 5  
Other ..... 2

5. Should young men who have avoided the draft by fleeing the country be given amnesty when hostilities cease in Vietnam?  
Yes ..... 10  
No ..... 86  
Other ..... 4

6. Should Congress take the necessary steps to correct deficiencies in the present electoral college system?  
Yes ..... 91  
No ..... 6  
Other ..... 3

7. Do you favor dismantling the Office of Economic Opportunity (Poverty Program) and transferring some of its functions to other departments?  
Yes ..... 70  
No ..... 20  
Other ..... 10

8. Should the income from investments of private foundations, religious organizations and social clubs be taxed?  
Yes ..... 77  
No ..... 19  
Other ..... 4

9. Should federal aid be denied college students who engage in disorderly demonstrations, disrupting the administration of our colleges?  
Yes ..... 93  
No ..... 6  
Other ..... 1

10. Do you favor continuing our Nation's space program at about present level of \$4 billion a year?  
Yes ..... 54  
No ..... 39  
Other ..... 7

11. Would you support an automatic cost-of-living increase for those under Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts?  
Yes ..... 85  
No ..... 12  
Other ..... 3

12. Do you favor extending the National Labor Relations Act to agriculture? (The NLRA authorizes elections to determine when a union is to be recognized as the collective bargaining agent of workers subject to the Act.)  
Yes ..... 41  
No ..... 42  
Other ..... 17

13. Do you favor lowering the voting age to 18?  
Yes ..... 41  
No ..... 57  
Other ..... 2

14. Would you favor legislation fixing the minimum wage at \$2.00 per hour?  
Yes ..... 52  
No ..... 44  
Other ..... 4

U.S. RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT ITS FISHERMEN

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which is intended to bring the Peruvians and

other Latin American countries that illegally seize American fishing vessels on the high seas to meaningful negotiations to settle this longstanding dispute.

This bill, authored earlier by our distinguished colleague, Congressman Tom Pelly, would prohibit U.S. imports of fish and fish products from these countries in the event of future seizures, unless the nations involved were negotiating in good faith with the United States.

Our fishermen, the boatowners, and those of us in Congress who have struggled so long with this frustrating problem recognize that a permanent solution can be achieved only through a negotiated settlement. Our frustration results from the fact that Peru, Ecuador, and Chile refuse to enter into meaningful negotiations on this fishery limit dispute. Just 5 days ago another of our tuna boats was seized on the high seas by a Peruvian patrol boat—less than 24 hours after a Peruvian delegation had returned from the United States where it had been discussing the problem of Peru's expropriation of American-owned oil properties in that country. Such acts of piracy make us wonder just how sincere Peru is about trying to settle the oil property seizure and the fishing limit dispute.

While Peru complains that actions by Congress are unwarranted and unfair exercises of economic pressure, Peru has failed to take into account that her own unilateral use of force to impose her position on the jurisdictional question is a far more unfriendly act since it involves the use of weapons by one country against the citizens of another country in waters accepted by nearly all nations as being the high seas.

Until Peru, Ecuador, and Chile sit down with the U.S. negotiators and conduct serious, meaningful talks to settle this dispute, the United States has every right, indeed a responsibility, to protect its fishermen in this matter, including the use of economic sanctions against any nations that continue to seize our vessels. Under this bill, the United States would shut off its market for these fish imports only if the seizing nation refused to enter negotiations. We recognize the economic hardship this could cause these Latin nations, for in 1968, the United States imported nearly \$65 million in fish products from Peru and more than \$12 million in fish products from Ecuador.

I am pleased that the chairman of the Fisheries Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has already agreed to hold hearings early next month on this legislation. And I hope that when the legislation is reported out of committee, the House will give it early attention and approve it.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF PUSSY-FOOTING AT HARVARD

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the continuing failure of many university au-

thorities to deal firmly, responsibly, and swiftly with outrageous insubordination on the part of individual students is approaching the proportions of a national disgrace. If it keeps up, the only thing to do is close the school long enough to get a new university administration that at the very least can keep its own house in order. A part of this package is a new contract with students on an individual basis in which it is agreed that expulsion will follow willful violation of university regulations, accompanied by forfeiture of tuition.

Students who take over a university building and refuse to get out upon request should be kicked out of school then and there. Students should know that if they do this, or engage in similar willful violations of university rules, they will be expelled forthwith. College administrators can make this clear merely by stating the policy to prevail at their college. Why do they not?

The state of approaching chaos bordering on anarchy prevailing on some campuses was predictable as infractions of the rules were blinked at or the other cheek turned by college heads who just would not risk the security and comfort of their jobs on a flat confrontation with the ringleaders. Well, that confrontation is here and it must be faced. Failure to face it at Harvard was the subject of an interesting and challenging commencement address at Franklin Pierce College in New Hampshire by Al Capp last month. The extent of the contempt with which many citizens regard the pussy-footing weakness of spineless university administrators is admirably expressed in Mr. Capp's address, which I am including in the Record at this point because of the serious importance of the subject.

A BLASTING CAPP IS TOUCHED OFF UNDER  
FAIR HARVARD  
(By Al Capp)

(Al Capp has always been outrageous. In the first place, he is an outrageously funny man, as the author of the zany cartoon strip "Li'l Abner." Then in the 1950s, his ideas outraged the political right. Today, he outrages the left, but he claims that the political spectrum has shifted, not he. In the following speech, delivered to the graduating class at Franklin Pierce College in Rindge, N.H., April 27, Capp outrages some people at Harvard. Franklin Pierce, incidentally, awarded him the honorary degree of doctor of humanities.)

I live in Cambridge, Mass., a stone's throw from Harvard—but if you duck you aren't hurt much—and I know you'll believe me when I tell you I'd rather be speaking here today. It's safer, and it's at your sort of college that I can use the commencement speaker's traditional phrase. I can say you're the hope of the future without bursting out laughing, as I would if I said it at a Harvard commencement—assuming, of course, that there will be a commencement there this year. They haven't heard from the Afros or the SDS yet.

Three or four of the Afros may decide that commencements are racist institutions, and then five or six SDSers may decide that commencements are a CIA plot, and then of course the entire faculty, administration and student body of Harvard, with the courage that has made them a legend, will replace its commencement by some sort of ceremony more acceptable—something they know the boys will approve of—say, a book burning; they loved that at Columbia, or a dean killing; they never quite accomplished that at

University Hall. Dean Ford let them down by having recuperative powers they didn't count on.

But the fact that you can have a commencement here without getting down on your knees to a student wrecking crew, or without calling up the riot squad, is mainly luck. You enjoy advantages Harvard doesn't.

For one thing, you have the advantage of not being so revered for the wisdom and courage of past generations of administrators that you haven't noticed the moral flabbiness and intellectual flatulence of the majority of your present generation of administrators and faculty. You show me any institution with such a glorious past that anyone presently employed by it is regarded as retroactively infallible, and I'll show you a collection of sanctimonious fatheads.

But the greatest advantage Franklin Pierce has over Harvard is that you are not rich enough to hire three such famous professors as Rosovsky, Galbraith and Handlin and not extravagant enough to waste the wisdom of the only one of them with guts and sense—Handlin. All three are world-renowned historians. All three this week have helped make history.

Prof. Henry Rosovsky was born in Danzig. When the young Nazis invaded the University of Danzig in the '30s and beat up its professors and disrupted its classes, Rosovsky's family gave up their citizenship and fled to the United States. In the '60s, Rosovsky was teaching at Berkeley. When the young Nazis invaded there, Rosovsky gave up his professorship and fled to Harvard. When the young Nazis invaded there the other day, Rosovsky gave up the chairmanship of his department and started packing.

Prof. Galbraith, as national chairman of the ADA, was the intellectual leader of the Democratic Party in the last election and one of the Nation's few political thinkers over 19 who mistook Sen. McCarthy's menopausal capriciousness for high-principled statesmanship.

Prof. Handlin has won the Pulitzer Prize and other honors for his histories of those groups who, so far, have risen from their ghettos by sweating blood instead of shedding it, by shaping up instead of burning down.

Although Harvard is the home of these three wise men and hundreds more, it was the only bunch in town that was dumfounded at what happened there. Everybody else in the community expected it. We had all watched Harvard for the last few years educate its young in the rewards of criminality. We had watched Harvard become an ivy-covered Fagin.

We saw it begin a couple of years ago when Secretary of Defense McNamara was invited to speak at Harvard. Now, it is true that McNamara was a member of a despised minority group, the President's Cabinet, but under the law, he had the same rights as Mark Rudd. Harvard's Students for a Democratic Society howled obscenities at McNamara until he could not be heard.

He attempted to leave the campus. The SDS stopped his car, milled around it, tried to tip it over. McNamara left the car. The SDS began to club him on the head with the poles on which their peace posters were nailed. If it hadn't been for the arrival of the Cambridge police, who formed a protective cordon around McNamara and escorted him through a series of interconnecting cellars of university buildings to safety, he might have been killed.

The next morning, Dean Monroe was asked if he would punish the SDS. And he said—and if you want to know where the malignancy started that has made a basket case of Harvard, it started with this—Dean Monroe said that he saw no reason to punish students for what was purely a political activity. Now, if depriving a man of his freedom to speak, if depriving him of his freedom to move, if damn nearly depriving him

of his life—if that's political activity, then rape is a social event and sticking up a gas station is a financial transaction.

Now, there's nothing unusual about a pack of young criminals ganging up on a stranger on their turf as the SDS ganged up on McNamara; it's called mugging. And there's nothing unusual about a respected citizen, even a dean, babbling imbecilities in an emotional crisis; it's called a breakdown.

Both are curable by the proper treatment, but there was something unusual, and chilling, too, about seeing the responsible authority, Harvard, treat a plain case of mugging as democracy in action and a plain case of hysterics as a dean in his right mind.

#### MEAT CLEAVER TACTICS

Well, after Harvard taught its young that the way to settle a difference of opinion is to mug anyone who differed with them, it was no surprise that they'd soon learn that shoving a banana into an instructor's mouth is the way to win a debate and bringing a meat cleaver to a conference is the way to win a concession. Because that's what's happened at Harvard in the last month.

When its militants stormed into the opening class in a new course on the causes of urban unrest and stopped it because they found it ideologically offensive, the instructor attempted to discuss it with them. So one of the militants shoved a banana into his mouth. This stopped the instructor, of course, he stopped the class and then Harvard dropped the entire course.

This week, the Crimson published a photograph of a black militant leaving a historic conference with the administration—historic because it was here that the administration granted black students, and only black students, hiring, firing and tenure powers equal to that of any dean. The militant was holding a meat cleaver. The next day, President Pusey said that Harvard would never yield to threats. Shows how silly a man can look when he doesn't read his local paper.

President Pusey said that, by the way, at a televised mass meeting advertised as one in which all sides of the question would be fairly represented. The Harvard student body was represented by a member of the SDS (numerically, they are less than 1 per cent). The average resident of the Cambridge community was represented by a black militant graduate student who lives in Roxbury and commutes in a new Cadillac. And anyone who'd call that unfair representation would have been mean enough to say the same thing about the Chief Rabbi of Berlin being represented by Adolf Eichmann.

And so when Harvard was raped last week, it had as much cause to be surprised as any tart who continued to founce around the fellas after they'd unbuttoned her bodice and pulled down her panties.

#### APING MAYOR DALEY

What surprised the world was Harvard's response. Nowhere in the world was Mayor Daley's response to precisely the same sort of attack by precisely the same sort of mob more loftily denounced than at Harvard. Yet in its moment of truth, Harvard responded in precisely the same way Daley did.

Pusey called for the cops just as Daley did, and the cops treated the criminals at Harvard just as firmly as they treated the criminals in Chicago. The Harvard administration applauded President Pusey's action to a man. There is no record that they ever applauded Daley.

That either proves that the Harvard administration believes in the divine right of kings to act in a fashion that, in a peasant, is considered pushy. Or it may prove that President Pusey is just as Neanderthal as Mayor Daley. Or it may prove that President Pusey learned how to handle Neanderthals from Mayor Daley. At any rate, if they're looking for a new president of Harvard, I

suggest they teach Mayor Daley to read and write and offer him the job.

Let's forgive the president of Harvard for not having the grace to thank the Mayor of Chicago for teaching him how to protect his turf; they aren't strong on graciousness at Harvard this year. But as a member of the Cambridge community, what alarms me is that Harvard doesn't have the brains to protect itself, and the community, from further, more savage and inevitably wider-ranging attacks. And I feel that I have the right to speak for some in the Cambridge community, possibly equal to that of any resident of Roxbury who parks his car there for a few hours a few days a week.

I've lived in Cambridge over 30 years. My children and grandchildren were born and raised in Cambridge. I help pay the taxes that support Harvard. I help provide Harvard with the police that it will increasingly need to protect it from the once-decent kids it has corrupted into thugs and thieves, and the worst kind of thugs and thieves—the sanctimonious kind.

I ask, and my neighbors in the Cambridge community are asking: If a horde of howling, half-educated, half-grown and totally dependent half-humans can attack visitors in their cars, and deans in their offices, and get away with it, how long before they'll widen their horizons a block or two and attack us in our homes?

If they can use clubs and meat cleavers on the Harvard community today and get away with it, who stops them from using clubs and meat cleavers on the Cambridge community tomorrow? Certainly not the Harvard community. If it was necessary last week for Harvard to organize a round-the-clock guard to prevent the untrained pups they've made into mad dogs from blowing up the Widener Library and the Fogg Museum, must we of the Cambridge community prepare to defend ourselves from the pack Harvard has loosed among us? Or should we all pull a Rosovsky and take off to safe, sane Saigon where it's legal to shoot back at your enemy?

#### A REPLACEABLE FEW

When the president of Harvard proved that, in a crisis, he was the intellectual equal of the Mayor of Chicago and called the cops, it was his finest hour. Although it was true that he had presided over the experimental laboratory that created the Frankenstein's monster that stomped mindlessly into University Hall, fouling everything in its path, he did, at long last, recognize what he had wrought and took the steps to rid his university and our community of the filthy thing.

After throwing the SDS out physically, the next sane move was obviously to keep them out officially, and expel them. And leave them to the criminal courts to educate, or to the Army, or to the gutters of Toronto, or to the rehabilitation centers and public charity of Stockholm. Their few score places at Harvard, and those of their sympathizers, could have been instantly filled by any of the tens of thousands of fine youngsters, black and white, they had been chosen instead of.

And Harvard could have gone on with pride and strength as an institution of learning, as an example of the vigor of the democratic process to other universities, instead of degenerating into the pigpen and playpen it is today. But after the president of Harvard made the one move that might have saved Harvard, the Harvard faculty, in the words of San Francisco State President Hayakawa, betrayed him.

#### RUN OR RESTRUCTURE

And that brings us back to Rosovsky and Galbraith. And to Handlin.

Rosovsky, whose family had given up and fled when the German Nazis invaded the University of Danzig, who gave up and fled when the California Nazis invaded Berkeley,

gave up the chairmanship of his course and started packing when the Cambridge Nazis invaded University Hall. And all over this country—at Cornell, in New York—other professors are using the Rosovsky solution: giving up and running away. The only trouble with it is that, sooner or later, you run out of places to run away to.

Now, the Galbraith solution is one that is bound to be popular with his fellow puberty-worshippers: those who have just achieved puberty, and those who worship those who have just achieved it as sources of infinite wisdom and quite a few votes. But I'm not criticizing Galbraith's religious convictions. What I say is, in this country, any professor who is panting to get back into public life is free to worship the SDS chapter of his choice.

Galbraith's solution is to promptly restructure our universities—and Harvard more promptly than any other, because, in Galbraith's opinion, those who administer Harvard have "little comprehension of the vast and complex scientific and scholarly life they presume to govern." Well, now, who does Galbraith presume to replace them with?

If those who created Harvard, and made it into the vast and complex scientific and scholarly structure it became, must be restructured out of it because they have too little comprehension, who has enough? The only ones who claim they have, and who will shove a banana into the mouth of anyone who denies it, are the student militants.

And so the Galbraith solution is a forthright one: Let the lunatics run the asylum.

Well, I'm going to tell Galbraith the news: they've already tried your sort of restructuring, Ken. They tried it at Berkeley; they tried it at Cornell; they tried it at Harvard all last week, and the result was that on Friday, a mob of militant students, of a Harvard frenziedly restructured to suit their wildest whims, marched into the Harvard planning offices.

They shouted obscene charges at Planner Goyette. When he attempted to answer, they shouted him down with obscenities. They demolished the architectural model of Harvard's building plans, they kicked over files, they hurled telephones to the floor. And while Goyette cowered and his secretaries screamed, they marched out, uninterfered with by the six policemen who were summoned there presumably to see that they remained uninterfered with, unrebuked and, of course, unsatisfied.

And they won't be satisfied until Harvard is restructured the way they restructured Hiroshima. They'll be back, on another day, to another office. Possibly Galbraith's.

Well, those were the voices that prevailed at Harvard, the resigners like Rosovsky, the restructurers like Galbraith\*. There was another voice, however, the voice of Oscar Handlin.

Prof. Handlin said he was appalled at the argument that the students' takeover of University Hall, their attack on the deans, their destruction of private property and their thefts from personal files were unwise but not criminal. It was criminal, said Handlin, by every decent standard.

If Harvard had not chickened out, said Handlin, if it had had the courage to recognize the criminality on its campus over the last few years, beginning with the beating up and silencing of McNamara and continuing through innumerable other incidents of the brutal deprivation by its mad-dog students of the rights of those who dared to dissent with them, it "would not be in the position it is in today—following the road that Berkeley has followed, following the road that has destroyed other universities."

\*Prof. Galbraith, it seems has decided on the Rosovsky method for himself. He has announced that he is taking off for Trinity College at Cambridge University for one year while the restructuring goes on.

#### A CIVIL RIGHTS REVERSE

Oscar Handlin urged Harvard not to go down that road. That was last week. This week, Harvard has gone so far down the road that it can never turn back. In this last frantic, fatal, foolish week, Harvard has reversed the civil rights advances of the last 20 years.

Today at Harvard, any student with the currently fashionable color of skin is given rights denied to students of the currently unfashionable color. Harvard, which educated the President who brought America into the war that defeated fascism, today honors and encourages and rewards its fascists. Harvard, which once turned out scholars and gentlemen, now turns out thugs and thieves—or let me put it this way: now, if you are a thug and thief, Harvard won't turn you out.

Once people were attracted to the Cambridge community because Harvard was there. Today, because Harvard is there, people are fleeing the Cambridge community, even Harvard's own.

Harvard's tragedy was that it was too arrogant to consider that it too might be vulnerable to the cancer that is killing other universities. And when Oscar Handlin diagnosed it as malignant, Harvard was too cowardly to endure the radical surgery that could save its life.

And that's why I can say that colleges like yours, as yet too unproven to have become arrogant, and too determined to prove yourself to be anything but courageous, are the hope of the future. Because I believe that America has a future.

It has become unfashionable to say this; it may be embarrassing to hear it; but I believe that America is the most lovely and livable of all nations. I believe that Americans are the kindest and most generous of all people.

I believe there are no underprivileged Americans; that even the humblest of us are born with a privilege that places us ahead of anyone else, anywhere else: the privilege of living and working in America, of repairing and renewing America; and one more privilege that no one seems to get much fun out of lately—the privilege of loving America.

#### UNIVERSITY OF IOWA MUSEUM OF ART

#### HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of April 3, 1969, featured a story on the new museum of art at the University of Iowa. It would be difficult to list the many persons who should be recognized for making this outstanding museum possible. Suffice it to say that they should all feel immensely proud of themselves for having a part in this magnificent gift to the University of Iowa, and the people of Iowa. There is, however, one person who should be singled out for his almost superhuman efforts to make the museum a reality, and that person is Frank Seiberling, director at the school of art. Frank is a tireless worker, and is certainly to be commended for his efforts on behalf of the museum.

The article follows:

#### IOWA'S NEW MUSEUM: AN "OPEN" PLACE FOR ART

(By Christopher Andreae)

IOWA CITY, Iowa.—The best way to describe the new Museum of Art at the University of Iowa is to say that the visitor intent on see-

ing the art it contains is unlikely to notice the building, except perhaps its central sculpture court—and, from the exterior, its attractive position on the west bank of the Iowa River.

Part of the growing Iowa Center for the Arts, the museum is the work of the New York firm of Harrison and Abramovitz. The architects have made the interior "open," with galleries differentiated by a variety of levels instead of connected by too many small openings. There is little or nothing about the building which seems to interfere with the easy circulation of people and the easy display of paintings and sculpture.

And the University of Iowa has a by-no-means miserable collection of these commodities to display. It first of all has the large and intense "Mural" which Jackson Pollock painted for Peggy Guggenheim, and which was given by her to the university. It has a small Miró, painted on burlap, an enigmatic thing of considerable delight as well as some dread that goes generally under the name of "Rosalee." Its full title, however, is possibly the longest of any painting and certainly one of the prettiest: "A Drop of Dew Falling From the Wing of a Bird Awakens Rosalie Asleep in the Shade of a Cobweb." But, in spite of its title, this purchase by the university in 1948 apparently produced in the Midwest recurrent ripples of aesthetic distress and rural contumely.

#### LIKE A DISCOVERY

"Carnival Triptych," by Max Beckmann, was another early purchase, characteristic of the German artist's work in its allegorical attack on violence and suffering.

The most recent large addition to the collection is a fountain sculpture by the Belgian artist Pol Bury. The work was commissioned to coincide with the opening of the museum, and is a permanent part of it.

Consisting of two stainless steel upright forms, curved back to back, "Kinetic Fountain" stands in water and has on each side numerous projecting elements over which water trickles from above. The elements are moved silently by a hidden motor, but their nervous motion is so slight that it has to be watched for; it is like a discovery that something which is presumably inert may in fact be alive. In this piece Bury has made a further variation on an idea which has occupied him since the early '50's.

The biggest private gift to the university museum (and the initial reason for its being built) is the Owen and Leone Elliott Collection. This almost entirely European collection of paintings, drawings, prints, and silver contributes very substantially to the size and quality of the museum's holdings. It includes small paintings by Picasso, Matisse, Léger, Braque, Gauguin, Kandinsky, Bonnard, Gris, de Chirico, Morandi, and Jawlensky (among others). The Jawlensky is a particularly proud, tough painting (of his wife) called "Spanish Woman with Mantilla"—magnificent evidence of the strength of this German expressionist's abilities with color and bold form.

This museum and its collection can hardly fail to be an asset to the university. Its directors, Ulfert S. Wilke (director) and Gustave von Groschwitz, are both men with no small experience in the museum field. Mr. Wilke (an avid collector, particularly of African art and artifacts) is apparently determined to keep the exhibitions in the museum continually changing, except for the core of major works.

#### MONUMENTAL

At present, to celebrate the opening, there is a showing of works by former and present teachers as well as graduates, of the university's school of art; a few sculptures on temporary loan; and a rather dull exhibition of prints by former students of a teacher in the school of art, Mauricio Lasansky.

Among the sculptures on loan are two large constructions by Mark di Suvero, one

of which is a supremely monumental sculpture consisting for the most part of a yellow snowplow (which is hung so that it can swing) and a gigantic tire from an earth-mover. It is an uncompromising, heroic, and—both by association and construction—an elemental object. If the university could find a way of acquiring it, this piece would be an admirable addition to its collection.

Among its former teachers, the art school numbers Grant Wood, Philip Guston, and more recently, the English artist David Hockney. Works by each of them are on show, together with that of many others, of varying interest.

A week-long celebratory festival begins this Sunday (May 4). It consists of almost anything appropriate from an ice-cream social to concerts, poetry readings, films, an extravaganza, a happening, and the first public marionette performance of Aeschylus's "The Libation Bearers." Participating visitors will include Hans Haacke, Allan Kaprow, Roger Stevens, and a panel of art people: Brian O'Doherty, Dore Ashton, Jack Burnham, Max Kosloff, and George Rickey.

### DIXIECRAT-CONSERVATIVE REPUBLICAN COALITION

#### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the United Association Journal in its May 1969, issue contains an article about the House coalition of Southern Democrats and conservative Midwestern Republicans. The article is written by the able and respected general president of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada—AFL-CIO—Peter T. Schoemann. The article is based on a study issued earlier this year by the Democratic study group. President Schoemann in his article quite properly points out that this political coalition is responsible in large measure for the dearth of effective and comprehensive legislation to remedy our domestic needs. It follows:

#### DIXIECRAT-CONSERVATIVE REPUBLICAN COALITION

(By Peter T. Schoemann)

In a city where initials are accepted as part of the scenery there's a set of capital letters that have gone mostly unnoticed.

I'm referring to the DSG—it stands for the Democratic Study Group. And that stands for some 120 dues paying members of progressive Democratic Congressmen, elected primarily from districts in the Northeast, Midwest and the West, all densely populated areas.

A harder working or more closely knit bunch of people you'll not find on Capitol Hill. And the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times attest to DSG muscle in stories they print every so often.

The public is not generally aware of the extraordinary efforts this group makes and also the good legislation this group helps to pass.

The DSG was organized in September of 1959 to counterbalance the power of the House coalition of Southern Democrats and conservative Midwestern Republicans.

Back in the fall of 1959 the Democrats had a clear and fat majority in the House, 283 to 153 and in the eyes of the voters the 86th Congress was indeed a Democratic-controlled Congress.

And the Democratic members from the big cities and industrial centers fully realized

they would have to run for reelection on the record of that same Congress.

These Congressmen were worried because time after time they were being defeated in their attempts to pass progressive legislation by a well-disciplined Dixiecrat-Republican coalition.

The final indignity was the successful passage by the coalition of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

Senator (then Representative) Lee Metcalf, of Montana was the guiding light of the DSG in those days and he was elected chairman by the 120 members recruited from 34 states.

Other officers elected by those DSG charter members were: Frank Thompson, Bill Green, Abraham Mutler, Sidney Yates, John Blatnik, James Roosevelt and Frank Coffin.

And in March of 1960 the DSG achieved their first notable victory when they successfully opposed a Treasury-backed bill raising long-term interest rates. They accomplished their objective by first delaying and then finally killing the measure after it had been reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

Since that time the DSG has grown from what was initially described as a "loose and informal" association of like-minded members into an elaborate organization with an executive committee, a full-time staff, a vote-rallying whip system, and a campaign fundraising committee.

#### NEW DSG STUDY

It does a good deal of research and frequently will hold chalk talks for its members before a crucial vote.

The DSG recently completed a study I found to be quite interesting and I want to share the contents of this paper with you because it spells out the very reason for the existence of the DSG and it brings us up-to-date on the condition of the Dixiecrat-conservative Republican coalition.

The study is based primarily on 30 key votes cast during the 90th Congress, selected to provide a representative picture of voting patterns based on four factors:

Liberal-Conservative Persuasion—The 30 votes include most of the major liberal-conservative tests of the 90th Congress.

Administration Support—The Democratic Administration took a stand on all but four of the 30 issues.

Support of Democratic Party Principles—Twenty of the 30 votes involved programs and policies advocated in the 1964 Democratic Party platform and many of the remaining 10 involved traditional Democratic policies.

Party Unity—On 27 of the votes a majority of Democrats voted one way while the majority of Republicans voted the opposite.

Therefore the gist of the study was to pinpoint support or opposition to the national Democratic Party positions, policies or programs.

The study was broken down into two parts. Part One examined the voting patterns of Democrats associated with the DSG as compared with non-DSG Democrats and Republicans. Part two examined the voting records of Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen.

In Part One it brought out that on vital humanitarian and social issues such as hunger, poverty, and education DSG Democrats voted 96% in support of Democratic programs and policies compared with only 38% for non-DSG Democrats and 36% for Republicans.

The national Democratic position prevailed on only 13 of the 30 key votes, and in the 17 defeats 76% of the non-DSG Democrats teamed up with 88% of the Republicans in opposition to the majority of Democratic members.

The non-DSG members included a total of 75 Democrats who voted against more often than in support of the national Democratic position on the 30 key votes in this survey.

All but two of these Democrats were con-

servative to ultra-conservative members from Southern and border states. Their opposition was directly responsible for two-thirds of the 17 Democratic defeats.

Part Two of the study showed that during the 90th Congress there were a total of 114 chairmen heading 21 standing committees and 141 subcommittees. The difference is caused because several members chaired more than one subcommittee.

There were 75 Democrats who voted more in opposition than in support of the Democratic programs, and Part Two records that 42 of the 75 were committee and subcommittee chairmen.

DISSIDENT CHAIRMEN

As a group these 42 Democratic chairmen voted an average of only 13% in support of Democratic programs.

This was almost exactly opposite the record of the other 72 Democratic chairmen who averaged 88% support.

So, on many of the most crucial votes of the 90th Congress, one-third of the Democratic committee chairmen voted against the Democratic Administration, Democratic Party principles, and the majority of their Democratic colleagues and were responsible for the defeat of many Democratic programs.

These 42 include eight of the 21 standing committee chairmen: Colmer of Mississippi; Mills of Arkansas; Ichord of Missouri; Rivers and McMillan of South Carolina and Poage, Mahon and Teague of Texas.

The extent of their alienation from and opposition to the Democratic programs can be seen in the fact that 34 of these 42 chairmen exceeded the average Republican in their opposition to the national Democratic position on the 30 votes in the study.

As a group these 34 chairmen voted only 8% in support of the national Democratic position on the 30 votes surveyed. The overall Republican record was 24% support.

The 34 included six committee chairmen, Colmer, Mills, Ichord, Rivers, McMillan and Poage whose average as a group was only 12% support.

A summary of the findings found that DSG Democrats voted 91% in support of Democratic policies and programs.

But non-DSG Democrats nearly equalled the Republicans in opposing Democratic programs, 69% to 76%.

The opposition of non-DSG Democrats was responsible for two-thirds of the 17 Democratic defeats on the 30 key votes.

Democratic committee chairmen and subcommittee chairmen alone were responsible for over half the 17 defeats.

One out of every three Democratic committee and subcommittee chairmen, 42 out of 114, voted more often against, than in support of Democratic programs.

Thirty-four Democratic chairmen, including six full committee chairmen exceeded the Republicans in their opposition to Democratic programs, 92% to 76%.

The other 72 Democratic chairmen voted 88% in support of Democratic programs.

OPPOSITION INCREASES

And finally the study shows that the number of Democrats voting more in opposition than support of Democratic programs has been steadily increasing over the past 16 years, from zero in the 83rd Congress to 53 in the 90th.

Eight of the 34 chairmen (including one full committee chairman, Colmer) voted 100% against national Democratic programs, and principles on the 30 key issues. Fourteen others voted more than 90% in opposition.

All but one (Baring of Nevada) of the 42 Democratic chairmen who voted more in opposition than support are from Southern and border states. However, analysis of their voting records would seem to indicate that the extreme opposition of these chairmen is not necessarily due to regional differences over race and civil rights, but involves in-

stead a basic disagreement with Democratic programs, policies and principles in general.

This conclusion is supported by the voting records of the 42 Democratic chairmen on non-civil rights issues in the 89th Congress as well as the 90th. In the 89th Congress, for example, three out of four of the 42 chairmen voted against such basic Democratic programs as Medicare, aid to education, model cities, anti-poverty, rent supplements, distressed area aid for Appalachia, and minimum wage increases.

THE POWELL CENTENNIAL IN GREEN RIVER, WYO.

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, today the attention of the world is focused upon our three bold astronauts who are speeding toward the moon in a final test for the journey that will allow man, for the first time in his history, to set foot upon another heavenly body.

They are in the truest sense the descendants of other equally bold explorers—men such as Prince Henry, Columbus, Copernicus, Kepler, and our American astronauts, beginning with Commander Shepard.

Therefore, I think it especially appropriate that we should think back 100 years to a man of equal courage; a man who charted a course through the least-known region of this great land of ours. That man, Maj. John Wesley Powell, set out from Green River, Wyo., on May 24, 1869, to run the Colorado River and its tributary, the Green River.

Many and fierce were the dangers his nine companions and four wooden boats faced. But Major Powell, undaunted even by four men who quit, conquered a truly hazardous and unknown land.

We are men who live by the promise of the future and the fulfillment of the past. In knowing that Major Powell succeeded, we can know man will set his foot upon the moon.

The great area that Major Powell opened up 100 years ago has truly become a land flowing with "milk and honey."

The sterile desert land made fertile by the hand of man, the settlements that have sprung up in the Great Plateau are all testimony to the foresight and vision of this man, John Wesley Powell.

Therefore, I think it fitting that a summer-long series of celebration and festivities in Major Powell's honor will be held by cities along the river.

On Saturday, May 24, on the 100th year to the day that Major Powell set out, a host of dignitaries will gather at Green River in my district, the great State of Wyoming, to recognize this man by a reenactment of the launch, an unveiling of the design for a commemorative stamp, and the dedication of a granite marker.

Because of the significance of the day, I include at this point an article from the May 18, 1969, Washington Star, entitled, "Celebration Will Mark Famous Powell Expedition," in the RECORD:

CELEBRATION WILL MARK FAMOUS POWELL EXPEDITION

(By Carrick Leavitt)

GREEN RIVER, WYO.—"The good people of Green River turn out to see us start. We raise our little flag, push the boats from shore, and the swift current carries us down."

It was May 24, 1869, and the man who wrote those words was to go down in American history as one of the bravest and best known of scientific explorers.

Maj. John Wesley Powell, a one-armed Civil War veteran, and nine other men floated down and charted the Green and Colorado Rivers from this Wyoming town through the awesome Grand Canyon to what is now Lake Mead in Nevada.

This year marks the centennial anniversary of the Powell expedition. A celebration will begin with the dedication of a national monument here May 24, on the shores of the Green River, and a centennial expedition will depart by boat to run the river using the same time table as the Powell expedition.

Among the groups to observe the centennial will be the National Geographic Society, U.S. Geological Survey and the Smithsonian Institution's bureau of ethnology, all of which Powell was instrumental in founding.

Cities along the rivers will hold celebrations throughout the summer.

"Our boats are four in number," Powell wrote 100 years ago. "Three are built of oak; stanch and firm; double-ribbed, with double stem and stern posts, and further strengthened by bulkheads, dividing each into three compartments. It is expected these will buoy the boats should the waves roll over them in rough water.

"The fourth boat is made of pine, very light, but 16 feet in length, with a sharp cutwater, and every way built for fast rowing, and divided into compartments as the others.

"The little vessels are 21 feet long, and, taking out the cargoes, can be carried by four men."

BRAWNY CREW

Questions of the unknown surging river gnawed at the men. Were there crashing waterfalls ahead that would hurl the frail boats hundreds of feet below? What of the foam-crested rapids? Would they become trapped within the towering canyon walls to face slow starvation? What of the fierce Indian tribes dwelling in the regions of Utah, Colorado, Arizona and Nevada?

"J. C. Sumner and William H. Dunn are my boatmen in the 'Emma Dean'; then follows 'Kitty Clyd's sister,' manned by W. H. Powell and G. Y. Bradley; next, the 'No Name,' with O. G. Howland, Seneca Howland, and Frank Goodman; and last comes the 'Maid of the Canyon,' with W. R. Hawkins and Andrew Hall."

Of this brawny crew only six would make the journey's end. Constant dunkings and sheer terror brought on by the swirling, rock-studded river dampened Goodman's enthusiasm and he left the party within a month.

Skeptical Indians along the way told Powell sections of the river could not be run. "Water heap catch'em," the Indians said.

And an old Indian named Pariats told the explorers of the fate of a member of his tribe who attempted the river.

Powell records the account: "The rocks," he said, holding his hands above his head, his arms vertical, and looking between them to the heavens, "the rocks h-e-a-p, h-e-a-p high; the water go h-oo-woogh, h-oo-woogh; waterpony h-e-a-p buck; water catch'em; no see'em injun any more! No see'em squaw any more! No see'em papoose any more!"

By the end of the first month the expedition had mapped about 300 miles of the Green River. They had sailed through the rapids of Flaming Gorge, Canyon of Lodlore, Whirlpool Canyon up to Split Mountain in Eastern Utah.

On June 9 the "No Name" was wrecked and shattered into pieces at a 12-foot waterfall Powell was to name Disaster Falls. A thousand pounds of supplies were lost to the river.

But the men continued. They wound through desolation and labyrinth canyons across the rapids pulling the boats over whitewater too rugged to ride.

Late in the afternoon of July 17 "the water becomes swift and our boats make great speed," Powell wrote. "An hour of this rapid running brings us to the junction of the Grand Green, the foot of Stillwater Canyon, as we have named it. These streams unite in solemn depth, more than 1,200 feet below the general surface of the country."

#### DOWN THE COLORADO

This confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers awed the expedition, and Powell noted in his daily log:

"Ten thousand strangely carved forms . . . a whole land of naked rock with giant forms carved on it; cliffs that cannot be scaled and canyon walls that shrink the river into insignificance with vast, hollow domes, and tall pinnacles and shafts set on the verge overhead. . . ."

On the group sailed, down the mighty Colorado, past the junction of the San Juan River, through colorful Glen Canyon and into the mouth of the untamed Grand Canyon.

August 13, and Powell wrote of the approaching ride through the roaring Grand Canyon. "We are now ready to start our way down the great unknown," he said.

"What falls there are, we know not; what rocks beset the channel, we know not; what walls rise over the river, we know not."

The frantic, bone-jarring ride was made through the roaring canyon and by Aug. 27 three men decided Powell's wild ride must end. The Howland brothers and Bill Dunn elected to abandon the party and hike overland to find a Mormon settlement in the north.

The three were reported to have died later at the hands of Indians.

A few days later the six men remaining floated around a bend and one of them exclaimed, "yonder's an Indian in the river." But upon approaching closer the explorers found the "Indians" were Mormon fishermen. The settlements of St. Joseph and St. Thomas were nearby.

The journey was over!

In the weeks and years that followed, Powell and his crew were hailed from coast to coast for their feats and for the scientific information gathered during the three-month expedition.

#### LAND POLLUTANTS

### HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in our country today, much attention is given the problems of air and water pollution. There is yet another pressing problem of pollution, however, which receives less publicity: this is the problem of "land" pollution. I should like to share with my colleagues the very interesting remarks of Mr. Fred S. Farr, Coordinator for Highway Beautification, Bureau of Public Roads, on the topic of land pollutants, when he posed the challenge of "cleanup" to the congressional breakfast of the Scrap Iron & Steel Institute on April 17, 1969.

The address follows:

#### LAND POLLUTANTS

(Remarks of Fred S. Farr, Highway Beautification Coordinator, Bureau of Public Roads, at the congressional breakfast, Scrap Iron & Steel Institute, Apr. 17, 1969)

Disposal of solid waste, as you gentlemen so well know, is a serious problem throughout our country. It is simply the question: can a highly sophisticated, industrialized society such as ours get rid of its own garbage?

While air and water pollutants are indeed a serious problem, so likewise are the land pollutants. What do we do with old stoves, refrigerators, washing machines, hot water heaters, and many other used-up, worn-out domestic appliances? The steel mills refuse to take this kind of metal for reprocessing, and the sanitary land-fill people don't want it either.

The most serious part of our solid waste disposal program is the scrapped automobile. It is estimated that there are some 30 million used cars lying around the countryside today—some on hillsides in Maryland, West Virginia, California, or Tennessee, where you will see two to five abandoned cars, and others in large automobile graveyards, and still others in scrap metal yards just sitting there rusting. Others, fortunately, are in metal salvage yards, working their way back into steel and iron production. To this natural junk pile, we add some one and one-half to two million additional scrapped autos each year.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965, which is concerned with the physical and aesthetic appearance of the highway corridor, addresses itself to one phase of the solid waste disposal, but is not intended as a cure of what to do with the basic problem of junked cars.

As you know, in 1965 Congress stated that the purpose of the Act was to protect the public investment in our highways, promote safety and recreational value of public travel, and preserve the natural beauty through the control of outdoor advertising and junkyards, the scenic enhancement of the highway corridor, through landscaping, acquiring scenic strips of land, developing scenic overlooks, and promoting safety rest areas and information centers for the traveling public.

The 1965 Act is concerned with the physical appearance of the roadside as well as the road itself.

Our Highway Beautification Act has had problems, particularly due to the strong opposition to outdoor advertising controls and the lack of money to accomplish its goals.

Congress, in the 1965 Act, provided for the control of auto salvage yards located within 1,000 feet of and visible from an Interstate or primary highway. Effective control for existing auto wrecking yards is accomplished by screening, through landscaping or fencing, or by removal where fencing is not possible to accomplish. Scrap metal processing plants located in industrial areas are not required to be screened or removed, although Federal funds are available for screening these yards in such areas.

The immediate impact of this legislation is to prevent the unchecked sprawl of visual blight along our highways. Auto salvage yards may no longer be established, outside of industrial areas unless they are screened from view or located so as not to be visible from the main highways.

Auto salvage yards as most people know were junkyards in existence on October 22, 1965, the date of enactment of the Highway Beautification Act, must be screened if possible. Otherwise removed, owners shall be compensated on a seventy-five percent Federal-25 percent State participation for screening or removal costs.

Thus far, 40 States have enacted enabling legislation and the program has received strong support from private industry. Nevertheless, we have made but a small dent in

the Nation's salvage yard problem. A 1966 inventory indicated that there were 17,500 so-called junkyards located along interstate and primary highways that would have to be screened or removed.

Although \$20 million was authorized for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 to carry out Title II of the Highway Beautification Act, only \$11,500,000 was apportioned to the States for these two years for salvage yard control due to the States' then inability to use more money. Early in the program most States needed additional legislation to perform this work off the highway right-of-way and they had not had time to act adequately in this area. Most States are now geared up to meet their obligation but Congress appropriated no funds for 1968 and 1969, and for fiscal year 1970 \$3 million has been authorized but not yet appropriated.

The 1966 estimate indicated that it would cost a total of \$121 million to screen or remove the 17,500 so-called junkyards scattered along 268,000 miles of interstate and primary highways. Of this cost, \$90 million would be the Federal share.

As of March 31, 1969, 110 of these yards had been removed, 1,443 had been screened; approximately 10 percent have been screened or removed.

While screening or removal bans the salvage yard from the motorist's view, the ideal goal is to recycle the steel scrapped autos back into the iron and steel industry. A number of Federal agencies have been working with private industry to find a solution to this problem. We in the Federal Highway Administration have received excellent cooperation from the Scrap Iron and Steel Institute. We have met with representatives of the steel companies, and, recently, Thomas Mann, President of the Automobile Manufacturers Association brought to our office some of his members from Ford, Chrysler, General Motors, and American Motors. We have asked the Automobile Manufacturers Association to help us set up a Government-industry task force to define the problem of where lies the bottleneck in getting scrapped cars back into the steel industry.

Just this week in Alexandria Bill Storey and I visited a scrap metal processing yard and saw automobiles being shredded up at the rate of one car every 27 seconds; some 700 cars a day or 250,000 cars a year are being recycled back into the steel industry by this one yard alone. Fortunately, there is a good supply of junked cars available, and steel mills are located within a range that makes shipment economically feasible for this scrap processor.

The majority of shredders are located in large population centers—not far from steel mills. However, there are many automobile hulks lying in auto graveyards where the owner, dreaming of the old World War II bonanza in junked cars, hangs tight and won't sell. Many other cars lie out in fields or beside roads or in gulleys, no one willing or available to haul them to a shredding plant.

The problem of the automobile recycling starts out with abandonment, pick-up, titling, disposal to an auto parts dealer—moving from auto parts dealer to scrap dealer, crushing and baling cars, transportation to scrap processors having available the proper type of equipment to cut or shred up the scrapped car, as well as having an available market for steel scrap. These are all part of the intricate problem of solid waste disposal. In addition, pollution control laws, while desirable, handicap the burning of auto seats and upholstery in many processing yards.

Somewhere along the line, we will find the answer to why these junked cars don't move—it will probably cost additional money. Before projecting as to where that money will come from—taxes, additional registration fees, etc.—we feel it essential to

find out what is the problem—identify it first, and then find out how much it will cost. That, we feel, is our immediate task.

I would be remiss in not complimenting the many communities that have gone out on a clean-up campaign of their own. Some of the States, such as Vermont, are making it attractive to bring in scrapped cars, and now Maryland is moving ahead in this important effort.

The Business and Defense Services Administration, of the Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of Mines, in the Department of the Interior, are making important contributions to the Government-industry approach.

The Highway Beautification Act will accomplish its goal when newer auto salvage yards are located so as not to be visible from the main traveled highways, and when the metal and other waste disposal plants along our roadsides are screened from the motorist's view. All of these efforts should contribute to improving the appearance of our highway corridor for the enjoyment of motorists and non-motorists alike, as well as contribute to the re-use of an important natural resource.

There is a big job ahead in cleaning up roadside clutter. Only by the best of effort by Government—Federal, State, and local—working with private industry will we be able to clean up our roadside garbage. The problem of solid waste disposal is with us and growing—if we don't lick it soon it will soon lick us. The task is there!

**LEICESTER B. YATES—IN THE BEST TRADITION OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION**

**HON. JAMES C. CORMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, an example of the most unusual dedication to the career of teaching has come to my attention. This concerns Leicester B. Yates, who is retiring this June after more than 30 years of teaching at the U. S. Grant High School, San Fernando, Calif., which is in my congressional district.

In the world today, where it would appear that there are tremendous problems at all levels of teaching; where the very relevancy of education itself has been questioned; and where, even at the starting point of elementary and secondary education, the quality of education in this Nation is at stake, it is heartening to know about Leicester B. Yates and how he has spent the past 30 years in discharging with distinction the responsibility and obligation to develop and train youngsters, and to provide them with guidelines essential for effective and creative progress into higher education and into society itself.

The colleagues of Leicester B. Yates have commented on what it is that has made Mr. Yates the best of the teaching profession.

I would like to share their comments with the Members of the House, and in so doing, to extend my congratulations to Mr. Yates on the excellence of his service to his students, their parents, the community, and to the Nation itself, and to wish him well in his retirement.

I quote his colleagues' letter in part:

The colleagues of Leicester B. Yates, who is retiring this June after more than thirty

years of teaching, at U.S. Grant High School in the San Fernando Valley, feel that Les has been in the best tradition of that oft-maligned and little acknowledged profession.

Thirty years of daily work with children of all ages and all backgrounds has not dimmed the enthusiasm with which Les has approached each day's task of helping to broaden the lives of his charges. His devotion to the needs of the youth of Los Angeles is legendary among the members of the education fraternity. He is on the job early and late. He shares his wealth of materials, painstakingly collected in his wide travels, with his colleagues. An acknowledged expert on the Civil War period, he shares his knowledge in speeches and lectures and enriches the lives of his students and the student body with the expertness with which he arranges displays about the school.

Feeling that the expression "a sound mind in a sound body" is more than a platitude, Les has encouraged participation, has coached, and has officiated for many years at school-boy, college, and Amateur Athletic Union events.

As preparation for his career as a teacher, Les started out in the field of advertising. He early discovered that he had something more important to sell and turned to teaching. He has taught high school students Government, U.S. History, California History, Economics, Contemporary American Problems, and French. In adult education programs he has specialized in Government, Citizenship, and American History. He has sat on Los Angeles curriculum and textbook committees; he has served the Board of Education as a consultant in Social Studies; and at the school level he has sponsored clubs, coached track and field, and been his department's chairman.

Leicester Yates has spent his lifetime in the service of the young people of our society. Many of our youth have benefited from his devotion and dedication. In this he is typical of the best of our nation's teachers who will be calling it a career this June. They give of themselves; they give of their time; they give their very lives for the benefit of our children. And all this for very little financial reward.

There are few occupations more demanding and more often condemned than that of school teacher. It is time that we recognized the efforts these dedicated people perform in our behalf. There is no more fitting time than now as the school year is approaching its end when many thousands are closing out a career and preparing for a well earned retirement.

Leicester Yates and his colleagues are deserving of our best thanks.

**GRATITUDE FOR OUR LAW ENFORCERS**

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, May 15 has been established as "Peace Officers Memorial Day" in legislation passed by Congress and signed by President Johnson. Those of us who serve or have served as law-enforcement officers appreciate the honor being paid our fellow officers who have died defending society against criminal activities.

As the principal defenders of law and order in our Nation, peace officers deserve our gratitude. They are daily faced with a perpetual and increasing stream of law breakers. According to FBI statistics, serious crime in the United States increased 17 percent in 1968 when com-

pared with 1967. Crimes of violence were up 19 percent, led by robbery up 29 percent, murder and forcible rape up 14 percent each, and aggravated assault up 12 percent. The crimes against property rose by 17 percent as a group. This alarming growth of crime in 1968—and throughout the 1960's—has been met by an almost static growth in police strength throughout the same period. This has caused a great increase in the pressure placed on our law enforcement agencies. Despite this handicap, our peace officers have done a remarkable job.

Efforts have been made by the police to improve the service they provide society. Innovations in training and technology are being sought. Much work has been done in an effort to improve police-community relations and to allow citizens to air their grievances.

In attempting to perform their lawful duties many of our law enforcers have risked their lives. An increasing number are being killed. In 1967, for example, 76 officers were killed by criminal action. This raised the toll of tragic deaths to 411 for the 8-year period from 1960 to 1967. In addition, 247 law-enforcement officers were killed in accidents during the same period. In 1967 there was an 11-percent rise in the rate of assaults on police officers. Nationally there were 13.5 assaults every 100 officers. In the face of this danger our police agencies have continued to fight crime and disorder to the best of their ability.

It is to these brave defenders of social order and stability that we pay our respect today. They need and deserve our support. This support would be of little value if it were maintained only on Peace Officers Memorial Day. In view of the increase in crimes both against the police and against society it is necessary for all Americans to help our police every day of the year. By helping the police we are protecting ourselves, our families, and our Nation from crime.

**I HAVE A DREAM**

**HON. JOHN J. RHODES**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by Dr. John F. Prince, president of the Maricopa County Junior Colleges District, on May 1, in Phoenix, Ariz., when 70 applicants were admitted to citizenship by U.S. District Court Judge Carl Muecke.

Dr. Prince, who received his undergraduate and Ph. D. degrees in philosophy from the University of Arizona, was the main speaker on this very special occasion. I believe all who read his remarks will agree with me that a man with a deeper understanding of the dreams and aspirations of all men, as well as of the very essence of America, could not have been selected to welcome these fine new Americans to our midst. Dr. Prince's remarks follow, and I am proud to share them with my colleagues:

## I HAVE A DREAM

A revered American a few years ago said with simple Biblical eloquence, "I have a Dream. . . ." And he went on to express the hopes for his people, using the age-old philosophical device of man—imaging the world as it would be: cutting away the dirt and ugliness, brightening the picture of life with warm, loving colors expressing man's hunger for the good life.

When a couple, warmed by love for each other, has their wedding day, joyous is the occasion and they have a dream in which the years ahead glow with the promise of the good life—the home, children to love, and success in their sharing the years.

When a child is born, the parents have a dream for him—that he will be strong, brave, and will lead the good life and enter into his manhood alert, educated, and his days will be rich in honors and sweetened by success.

The farmer plants the seed and in his dream he sees the brown soil greened by a rich crop that markets well and prosperity come through his efforts.

The merchant hangs out his sign and his dream has in part come true, and his single strength will strive to make the remainder of the dream come true.

The door opens and the newly hired man goes in to his first day's work on the new job. He has a dream that sees him rise steadily in the business or factory, his efforts bringing success and recognition.

So, important beginnings are often enriched by good intentions, brightened by a dream of what can come from this day on, the wedding, the christening ceremony, the grammar school graduation, the first job—the day a person becomes a citizen in a new country.

It is our privilege to share this memorable occasion with 70 of you—new citizens of the United States. You come from 19 countries. America has grown great on such as you—the bearers of old and rich cultures that in time blend into the American way of life. With few exceptions, each of us in the courtroom today either came or our early families came from the distant shores. We share like ancestors and like beginnings—all starting as new citizens. I don't think any of us forget our national origins. We liken ourself to the people of this or that nation. When I war within myself, I say, "It's the English and Irish blood of my ancestors locked in combat—North Ireland vs. South Ireland. When one of my children argues with me I remind her of the Irish blood she carries in her veins. Her behavior is to be expected. Hot-headed, freckle-faced Irish girl. The past is to each of us a matter of pride.

When you first came to the United States, it was a new beginning and you had a dream. It is our sincere hope that the dream is becoming a realization. It is our hope that this simple but most important ceremony renews your dream and re-invigorates your efforts to make it all come true.

One of our good New England writers said: ". . . if one advances confidently in the direction of his dreams, and tries to live the life which he has imagined, he will meet with a life unexpected in common hours."

And so each of us has a dream. As fellow American citizens, each of us has a hope for our Nation.

Would our mutual hopes for America be something like these?

That we can have peace with honor for us, our children, and their children down through the years. . . .

That every American can have equal opportunity to make his life meaningful and dignified in the manner deserved by man created in the image and likeness of God. . . .

That we will grow in wisdom, learning to live together in our land, and with all nations of the world in peace and mutual respect, because brotherly love is the highest wisdom.

Would these be the hopes we would have?

All of us American citizens can as Thoreau said make our dreams come true if we endeavor to live the life which Americans have imagined in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

We have the machinery to do it—the flexible government that can effect change. We have a body of law that is sensitive to the rights of the majority, the minority, the individual. In hundreds of courts, men work each day to find the just and fair way to resolve the problems of life.

We have the schools and colleges to train our minds and bodies for productive living, the doors being open for peoples of all ages.

Join the team! Live well your individual American lives so that you will meet with a success unexpected in common hours.

Join the team to make the United States the land we have dreamed it can be. Participate in the work to make the dreams for our country come true.

Welcome to the United States! Welcome, fellow Americans!

## TWO MARYLAND MARINES KILLED IN VIETNAM

## HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. John Linn and Pfc. Carlisle O. Wark, Jr., two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

## TWO MARINES FROM MARYLAND, BOTH 20, KILLED IN VIETNAM

Two 20-year-old Marine privates first class from Maryland were killed by enemy fire in Vietnam, May 11, the Defense Department announced today.

Killed while on search-and-destroy missions near the An Hoi combat base in Quang Nam province were:

Pfc. John Linn, son of Mr. and Mrs. Oscar D. Linn, of 9809 Telegraph road, in Seabrook, Prince Georges county.

Pfc. Carlisle O. Wark, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Carlisle O. Wark, Sr., of 1308 Popular avenue, Arbutus.

Marine Corps spokesmen were unable to say yesterday whether the two young marines were killed in the same action.

## BOTH IN SAME BATTALION

Private Linn, whose mother said he had just returned to combat action in Vietnam after three months in a military hospital in Guam after catching malaria, was assigned to H. Company, of the 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment.

Private Wark was assigned to L Company of the same battalion.

Both young men trained at Parris Island and Camp Lejeune, S.C., then went to Camp Pendleton, Calif., for final training before being sent overseas.

Private Wark, who was raised by his grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest C. Wark, in Cape St. Claire, Md., enlisted in the Marines last spring, then entered the service a few days after graduating from Severna Park High School.

"He enlisted because he wanted to be a United States Marine," his stepmother, Mrs. Carlisle O. Wark, Sr., said yesterday. "He was very proud to be a marine."

Private Wark, had no brothers or sisters, is survived by his grandparents, his father and stepmother, and by an aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Russell, of Cape St. Claire.

Private Linn, who went to Vietnam last October, two months before Private Wark, left a job as a gas-station attendant and mechanic last February to enlist in the Marine Corps.

"He thought that he might be drafted," his mother, Mrs. Oscar D. Linn, said yesterday. "So, rather than be drafted, he enlisted."

Besides his parents, Private Linn is survived by two brothers, Staff Sgt. Orin Linn, stationed in Washington, and James Linn, and a sister, Miss Frances Linn.

## THE ABM CONTROVERSY

## HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as with most Members of this House, I hope to maintain a flexible view on all matters of national defense, in order to respond appropriately to changes in defense requirements as reflected either from technological advances or diplomatic developments.

There has been called to my attention, however, a statement which I believe is significant in that it comes from an organization not known for any arbitrary position on a national policy decision in the field of national defense—the AFL-CIO Executive Council.

As I believe the statement is worthy of study in our consideration of a major defense commitment, I include it at this time under leave to extend my remarks in the Extensions of Remarks, as follows:

## STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE ABM CONTROVERSY

Last year Congress authorized and appropriated funds for the deployment of the "Sentinel" anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system designed primarily for the defense of our cities. The issue before the country today is whether the entire idea of an ABM system should be dropped or whether it should be deployed on a more limited scale.

The proposal for a more limited "Safe-guard" ABM system—primarily for the protection of some of our nation's retaliatory forces—was made by President Nixon, on March 14, 1969, when he declared "I am announcing a decision which I think is vital for the security and defense of the United States, and is also in the interest of peace throughout the world. . . . It is a safeguard of our deterrent system, which is increasingly vulnerable due to the advances that have been made by the Soviet Union since the year 1967 when the Sentinel program was first laid out." In his plea to Congress not to abandon but to proceed with the work on the deployment of an ABM system, the President emphasized his belief that "it is essential for the national security, and it is essential to avoid putting an American President, either this President or the next President, in the position where the United States would be second rather than first, or at least equal to any potential enemy."

The AFL-CIO Executive Council believes the above declaration embodies a sound doctrine of national defense for our country. While we recognize that there can be honest differences of opinion over a particular method of assuring maximum security for our country, we emphasize that there can never be a good argument for our country's not assuring itself the best available national defense.

From our founding convention in 1955 to

date, the AFL-CIO has consistently supported the goal of a strong national defense. We have never joined in attacks upon the efforts of any Administration to carry out this solemn responsibility, and we shall not do so now.

We have always underscored the urgency of acting to meet the pressing social and economic problems facing our country. We do not believe that the pursuit of either objective should be regarded as precluding the other. Both are essential to the security and progress of the nation and both must be faithfully and vigorously pursued.

American labor has always worked for peaceful solutions of international differences. We are, however, awake to the grim facts of international life today. The USSR has been expanding its military budget by at least ten percent annually. This mounting strength centers on missiles with multiple, independently targetable warheads of high accuracy. It constitutes a potential grave threat to our country's land based missiles, bombers, and bomber-bases. Since 1962, the USSR has been developing and deploying an extensive ABM system.

The proposed Safeguard system provides only for safeguarding American lives and defense capacities. It does not call for increased American retaliatory power.

More than two years ago, when questioned about the Soviet ABM system, Soviet Premier Kosygin himself declared that "a defense system which prevents attack is not a cause of the arms race but represents a factor preventing the death of people."

No expert can guarantee in advance how effective any weapon can be in defense or offense. The President's proposal calls for continuation of research and development and each successive deployment phase is to be constantly examined and reviewed annually in the light of technological advances and the international situation at hand.

The Executive Council does not join in any debate over how effective the proposed ABM system will actually be in action. We hope there will never arise the need for such a test. But certainly this nation must at least endeavor to protect enough of our deterrent force to enable our country to discourage any potential enemy from initiating a nuclear assault against the American people.

Under these circumstances, the AFL-CIO Executive Council declares that the President of the United States, as our nation's Commander-in-Chief and as the one primarily responsible for our country's foreign policy, should be supported in fulfilling his duty to determine—in consultation with scientists, military experts, the Congress and other Constitutionally appropriate authorities—the most effective ways of meeting the vital defense needs of our country.

Failure to be militarily prepared does not lead to peace.

#### CIGARETTE SMOKING

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a telegram from the Nassau County, N.Y., Medical Society that eloquently pointed to the health problems created by cigarette smoking. Because this subject is currently a topic of debate here in Washington and throughout the country, and because this telegram is so much to the point, I include it in the RECORD so that my colleagues will have an opportunity to read this message:

CXV—833—Part 10

GARDEN CITY, N.Y.,

May 7, 1969.

HONORABLE LESTER L. WOLFF,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

Strong congressional action is needed to prevent the insidious and persistent promotion of the public health menace of cigarette smoking. Unconcerned and physical promotion of cigarettes is direct conflict with indisputable medical proof that chronic bronchitis, lung cancer, coronary vascular disease and emphysema are directly attributed to cigarette smoking. The 2,200 divisions of Nassau County urge congress to take strong action to warn people, particularly our young people about the serious health hazards of cigarette smoking. This is a national problem. A manpower problem, a medical problem and, most important a problem effecting the good health of every potential cigarette smoker and every presently smoking American.

NASSAU COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY.

#### SCHILLER CORP. IS SUBCONTRACTOR OF THE YEAR

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the honor of presenting Mr. James R. Schiller, president of the Schiller Corp. of Warren, Mich., with the Small Business Administration's Small Business Subcontractor of the Year Award.

Mr. Schiller accepted the award plaque on behalf of his firm's subsidiary corporation, Speedring, which manufactures components for aircraft, space, and missile systems.

The Schiller Corp. was founded just 22 years ago by Mr. Schiller and a few partners who invested \$35 weekly to set up a machine shop in the rear of a Detroit service station.

Today the Schiller Corp. employs 425 people in the parent company and four subsidiary operations. They manufacture laser optical systems and ultraprecision navigation components for airborne vehicles including commercial transports and those in the Government's scientific research programs. Schiller components—some of them honed to a tolerance as fine as one-millionth of an inch—are aboard 75 percent of all our space vehicles.

Schiller components are responsible in great part for the navigational precision of all of America's space flights. Its laser optical systems have resulted in space photography whose precision and detail provide invaluable information to scientists above earth resources. And now the newest application of Schiller's laser scanning technology is in electronic data processing.

I also commend the Small Business Administration and other Government and private participants for their imagination in launching this program of recognition for small businesses. It has resulted in subcontracts to small firms throughout the country increasing from \$3.6 billion in 1964 to more than \$6.5 billion in 1968.

I want to point out, too, that Schiller won out in very tough competition. Thousands of firms throughout the Na-

tion, which employ fewer than 500 people, were eligible to be considered. The Schiller Corp.'s Speedring subsidiary was one of eight area winners—and then took top honors nationally among 150 nominees. The Schiller subsidiary earned a "superior" rating on all counts. The company was cited for product perfection, accuracy of cost estimates and delivery schedules, its valuable engineering studies, technological ingenuity, and management competence.

I include the press release from the Small Business Administration announcing the award and feature articles about the Schiller Corp. from the Detroit News and Detroit Free press in the RECORD, as follows:

[From a Small Business Administration press release]

Speedring Corporation, a Warren, Michigan firm, won the nation's top subcontracting award today, when it was chosen as the Small Business Subcontractor of the Year by the government-industry judges.

The competition, initiated by the Small Business Administration, involved approximately 150 small subcontractor-suppliers nominated for the award by major government prime contractors. Speedring won the top subcontracting honors for the firm's outstanding performance in small business subcontracting.

The firm manufactures aircraft components principally geared to ultra-precision, electro-optical work and assemblies. This includes inertial and celestial guidance subsystems and computer assemblies used in aircraft, space and missile systems applications.

The Warren, Michigan, firm employs 375 workers and has been in business 22 years. Approximately 60 percent of Speedring's work is in government procurement.

In announcing the winner Hilary Sandoval, Jr. SBA Administrator said that the little concern is extremely capable and has a superior production record with the nation's major prime contractors.

"Speedring's proposals are exceptionally accurate. Their anticipated costs are well within their projections," Sandoval said.

An honorary plaque will be presented at the Small Business Administration's Second Annual Subcontracting Conference and Workshop to be held in Washington, today.

While Speedring Corporation won the national award, seven runners-up were honored as "area" winners.

Judges for the national small business subcontractor award represented McDonnell Douglas Corporation, Hughes Aircraft Company, Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc., Martin Marietta Corporation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, General Services Administration and the Department of Defense.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Aug. 12, 1968]

MOONLIGHTER TO A MILLIONAIRE ON \$35

(By David C. Smith)

The trip from hard-pressed moonlighter to hard-working millionaire is a long one, but James (Bob) Schiller has shown it still can be made.

Schiller and five of his co-workers at Holley Carburetor Co. in Detroit decided 21 years ago that their regular jobs didn't provide enough income to make ends meet.

So each put up \$35 a week to start a new company which could be operated at night and on weekends. The only customer at the outset was Holley Carburetor.

Schiller later emerged as sole owner of the fledgling company, which today is Speedring Corp. of Warren, a producer of sophisticated

precision parts for the aircraft and aerospace industries.

In the process, Schiller has become a millionaire many times over. His stock interest in Speedring alone is worth more than \$11 million at present prices.

Last December 240,000 Speedring shares were offered to the public and the stock is now listed on over-the-counter nationally.

Schiller continues to hold some 560,000 shares, roughly 70 percent control. Eventually he expects to broaden the base of ownership in the company.

Like most founders, however, Schiller says he'd "like to keep 51 percent" control.

Speedring stockholders approved an increase in authorized shares from 1 to 2 million at the annual meeting in July.

Speedring today has 4,200 stockholders in all 48 continental U.S. states who received their first quarterly dividend—six cents a share—in March. Another six cents was paid in June. Schiller says this rate will not change during the foreseeable future.

From its meager start, Speedring's sales have risen to \$7.2 million for the fiscal year ended March 31, up from \$6.4 million the prior year and \$4.6 million as recently as fiscal 1963. Earnings for last fiscal year reached about \$505,000, up sharply from \$316,000 a year ago and only \$98,000 in 1963.

Although Speedring hasn't reported audited figures for the first fiscal quarter ended June 30, Schiller has estimated profits of \$180,000, or 21 cents, on \$1.8 million in sales for the period. This is up from \$172,000, or 31 cents (on a weighted average there were a greater number of shares outstanding) on \$1.7 million sales a year earlier.

Schiller has predicted "substantial improvements" for the full fiscal year ending next March 31.

Schiller, 48, dropped out of Northwestern High School in Detroit during his sophomore years after his father, a machinist, died.

He first served as an apprentice machinist at Congress Tool & Die Co. in 1937, rising to foreman and then plant manager. During World War II he served as a combat infantryman in Europe, returning to Detroit to manage several tool-and-die shops.

In 1946 he joined Holley—at a cut in pay to get into research work involving precision machined parts.

"I couldn't afford to work there without adding to my income, so I asked the manager whether he could give us (this five partners and himself) some work we could do at night," Schiller recalls.

Management agreed to give the group a subcontract for manufacturing governor systems for military aircraft.

"After this start we were able to get other customers in the same field," he says.

But not without a few trials and tribulations. When it came time to send Holley its first billing, the group realized it hadn't even adopted a company name.

"We sat around at lunch one day trying to come up with some names, but we couldn't agree on anything. Then one of the guys suggested we use the name of his squadron in the war—Speed-Ring. We liked it so we took out the hyphen and we've been called that ever since."

In those early days the six partners worked at their regular jobs from 7:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. six days a week, then went to their small machine shop behind a service station on Ford Road near Telegraph to put in another seven hours or so. They also spent all day Sunday at their "moonlighting" job.

Of the original six partners, two sold out within the first three months. Two more dropped out after two years. In 1955 the company became a corporation with just two of the original six partners still involved. Schiller assumed full ownership in 1958.

Only one of the partners—Arthur Brown has remained with Speedring since its inception. Two others, however, have since rejoined the firm. They are George Hill, now

vice president for engineering, and Robert Dopke.

A hard worker who boasts he can handle most of the complex jobs in Speedring's 55,000-square-foot main plant and offices. Schiller's ordinary work day begins at 7:30 a.m. and is completed nearly 12 hours later.

Except for an occasional round of golf and a few weeks each winter in Florida, Schiller continues to devote most of his time to Speedring. He is married, has two daughters and three grandchildren.

His "second family" is comprised of the 260 workers at Speedring who turn out complex parts precise to the millionths of an inch for use in government hardware and the commercial aircraft industry.

Close-tolerance Speedring components are used in the Polaris submarine and the Minuteman and Poseidon missile systems. Optical devices are produced for the Apollo, Gemini and Surveyor space programs. Speedring components go into the super-secret navigational system for the Air Force's F-111 fighter-bomber. The company also makes parts for the mammoth C-5A military transport.

On the commercial side, Speedring is making brake parts for Boeing's 747 airbus and parts for computers.

Schiller, fully aware of Speedring's dependence on the whims of federal budget planners, has pushed to win new civilian business. The company's backlog a year ago was topheavy with government work (95 percent) and scanty with commercial (5 percent). Today this has been narrowed to 65-35.

"Fifty-fifty would be a nice balance," he says, adding that two acquisitions are in the mill.

Speedring booked \$2,003,381 in new business last month, boosting its current backlog to \$5,790,001, more than double the year-earlier figure of \$2,684,192.

Speedring claims to be the nation's largest independent user of beryllium, a pure metal that weighs one-fourth that of steel. On the C5A alone Schiller estimates weight savings of 1,600 pounds per set of brakes.

By employing its own know-how in a variety of technical fields (chemistry, metallurgy, machining, hydraulics, electronics, coating) and by using a number of "exotic" materials, Speedring has capitalized on its ability to create unique products.

"We're like the Yankees," says Schiller. "Everybody is taking potshots at us." Unlike the now lowly Yankees, however, Speedring has weathered the "potshots" to retain leadership in its specialized field.

Maybe Schiller should have compared his company with the Tigers.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Sept. 13, 1968]

#### SPEEDRING HELPS SPACECRAFT SOAR

(By Edwin G. Pipp)

When American astronauts make the first flight of the Apollo spacecraft next month they will navigate with a star telescope containing parts built in Warren.

Astronauts who make the first landing on the moon will be relying on parts built by the same plant for navigation and for the blastoff from the lunar surface.

In fact, some 75 percent of all the nation's aerospace projects have some parts produced by Speedring Corp., with headquarters at 7111 East 11 Mile, Warren.

Speedring is the largest independent suppliers of precision components, assemblies and subsystems for the aero-space and commercial aviation industries in the United States.

Its products are built to tolerancy that only a few years ago were impossible.

"Mass production of items that have tolerances of two or three millionths of an inch goes on at the rate of two or three a month.

Some sub-assemblies for spacecraft are so

precise that contaminants as small as a grain of face powder would wreck them.

Workers worry about the heat of their bodies, sweat of their hands and even their breath which can change the dimensions of metal they are working.

Speedring was started 21 years ago by a group of "moonlighting" machinists employed by Holley Carburetor Co.

They rented the back of a garage and began doing work on a contract basis for their own employer. Holley agreed to the arrangement, because it would have had to pay overtime if the work had been done in the Holley plant.

Soon the moonlighters had more work than they could handle on this basis, and went into full-time business for themselves.

When they sent out their first bill for services, the machinists realized their partnership didn't have a name. They called it Speedring because that was the name of a Navy fighter plane squadron in which one of the group served in World War II.

For the first 10 years the company did an unspectacular business, making precision aircraft parts out of conventional metals such as stainless steel.

The business began to change dramatically in 1957 with the development of "exotic" space-age materials such as beryllium. These materials combine extreme lightness with qualities which make it possible to shape them to precise sizes.

Today about 60 to 70 percent of Speedring's production uses beryllium.

One of the machinists who \* \* \* James R. (Bob) Schiller, now 49. He was born in Smiths Falls, Ontario, came to Detroit as a boy, and ended his formal education with graduation from Northern High School.

Five years ago Schiller bought out his partners and became sole owner of Speedring.

He said the firm now has a "leg up" on other precision aerospace firms because of the wide variety of work it can do, not only with beryllium but with other metals, ceramics and oxides.

"Other companies can reach the same precision we can for parts of an item, but then have to go outside to get it completed," he said. "We can complete the job in our plant with the plasma coatings, or whatever else is required."

On a recent tour of the plant, which includes three "clean rooms" and a white tile floor in the main work area, he remarked often that "the cost of precision comes high."

He picked up one piece of beryllium about eight inches long and four inches in diameter, with a number of fine holes and a variety of angles.

"This is for an Air Force satellite. Its cost is about \$15,000."

For its precision work Speedring is permitted a 14½ percent profit, before taxes, by the government. This compares to 8 to 10 percent for other aerospace firms, he said.

Average pay for most of the 325 employees at the main plant is \$14,000 to \$19,000 a year.

Speedring operates a wholly owned subsidiary plant, Cullman Avionics Inc., at Cullman, Ala., near the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala., and several other small units at various Michigan locations. One location is secret, because the work involves atomic energy.

The firm recently established an Ultrasonics Division in Eaton, Ohio.

Frank Holmes, vice-president for marketing, said the firm now is getting into electronics and optics and expects to enter the oceanography field as the aerospace industry moves into this new field.

Last December the company made a public sale of some of its stock, and these shares are now traded in the over-the-counter market. Schiller still owns 70 percent of the stock.

In the fiscal year ended last March 31 Speedring had sales of \$7,194,922 and net profits of \$505,003.

Brian McMahon, vice-president for finance,

said the company is estimating that sales for the current fiscal year, ending next March 31, will rise to about \$9 million. He said profits are expected to be about \$650,000.

Based on the 800,000 shares now outstanding, last year's earnings were 63 cents a share and the projected figure for the current year will be 81 cents a share.

However, in its annual report Speedring based the per-share figure on an adjusted average of outstanding shares last year. Under this method, last year's earnings were 80 cents. Cash dividends of 6 cents a share.

WITHDRAW FROM GRAIN TREATY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the grim outlook for U.S. wheat exports, which in my view is directly related to our obligations under the international grains arrangement, is reported in the following article by Burt Schorr in the Wall Street Journal of March 12. It provides further reason for the United States to take steps to withdraw from the treaty, so it will no longer be handicapped by the international grains arrangement's inflexibility while other wheat exporters grab the markets.

The article follows:

ANALYSTS PESSIMISTIC THAT U.S. EXPORTS OF WHEAT WILL COME OUT OF SLUMP SOON

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—Agriculture Department analysts are increasingly pessimistic about chances that U.S. wheat exports will recover anytime soon from their current slump.

Foreign sales of U.S. wheat and flour in the crop year beginning July 1 at best will only match the depressed 500 million to 550 million bushels expected as the current year's total, department experts believe. Last year, exports totaled 761 million bushels. In 1965-66 a record 867 million bushels of wheat and flour equivalent moved out of the country.

In any case, barring massive crop losses from drought or other accidents of nature, U.S. producers and traders could well find themselves confronted by a near-billion-bushel carry-over of wheat stocks by July 1, 1970. Such a figure portends heavy Government storage expenses, which could prove unpopular with taxpayers lulled by the heavy drawdown of grain stocks during the mid-1960s thanks to heavy food aid and commercial export demand.

The pile-up of unsold U.S. wheat is only one aspect of a world wheat glut. Canada, for example, probably will begin its new crop year on Aug. 1 with a record 800 million bushels or so. Although close to the expected U.S. figure for the comparable period, this carry-over looms enormous when judged in light of Canada's relatively small national economy as compared with that of the U.S.

To grain traders and some Federal lawmakers, Uncle Sam's wheat-export troubles are greatly aggravated by the International Grains Arrangements (IGA) between wheat importing and exporting nations. The agreement, which took effect last July 1, was forged during a period of tight world grain supplies and threatened famine in India as a vehicle for orderly wheat trading as well as for cooperative food aid.

GOOD IDEA OF THE TIME

"It seemed the right thing to have at a time when we thought the world was going to starve to death," says an IGA expert in the department's foreign agricultural service.

Now, however, Agriculture Department of-

ficials openly concede that U.S. wheat export prices, aided by Government subsidies, have been consistently below IGA floors in recent months to meet world competition. There's general acknowledgment here, in fact, that only Canada scrupulously observed IGA price minimums, and Ottawa announced in March that henceforth it, too, would price wheat to meet world competition.

From the trade viewpoint, though, the department's export subsidy policy hasn't matched the aggressiveness of foreign wheat competitors. Moreover, the grains arrangement itself contains a built-in handicap for American wheat, grain handlers complain, because IGA prices largely are based on U.S. quotations at Gulf ports. "There's no way we can play footsy with our prices. They're visible to everyone," grumbles a grain company executive here.

The U.S. grain trade suspects that foreign competitors' price cuts may be even deeper than appears on the surface. A Telex message received in the Washington office of a major world grain company the other day seems to confirm trade charges that flouting the IGA pays off in wheat sales.

Sent by the company's man in Lisbon, the message reported on responses to wheat requests recently issued by the Portuguese government buying agency. U.S. soft red winter wheat was offered at \$63.33 a metric ton delivered, the communications noted—a figure about \$2 or \$3 below the IGA minimum. However, West Germany, France and Spain also IGA signatories, offered their wheat to Portugal at still lower prices. The Lisbon agent speculated that the Spanish price of only \$54.5 a ton would get most of the contract with the balance going to Rumania, which like other Communist-bloc nations is outside any IGA restrictions.

LOSING TRADITIONAL MARKETS

Because Portugal until recently depended heavily on U.S. wheat purchases, it's cited by IGA critics as further proof that this country is being shouldered out of its traditional markets. Australian sales to Peru and bilateral wheat agreements that Chile has signed with Argentina and Australia are other bits of evidence used in support of this argument.

Indeed, newly released Agriculture Department figures show that foreign shipments, excluding flour, by the five major wheat exporters—the U.S., Canada, Australia, Argentina and France—fell about 14% during the eight months ended Feb. 28, but the U.S. alone was down almost 40% in the same period.

Most of the reasons for this slide seem to have nothing to do with competition or the IGA, though. Pakistan and India, both massive consumers of American grain in past years, appear to have made permanent advances in their own production and have sharply pared their long-term credit purchases under the food-for-peace program. Shorter-term factors in the poorer showing were the temporary halt (since rescinded) that the Japanese ordered in U.S. wheat shipments when they discovered a dampness problem, and the dock strike earlier this year.

But then there's the problem of Brazil—a non-IGA member—whose American wheat imports slid to 21 million bushels in the eight months ended Feb. 28 from 38 million a year earlier. When Brazil sought 100,000 tons of wheat in March, it was deluged with some 75 offers and alternates aggregating 15 times that amount. It wound up taking 100,000 tons of Rumanian wheat plus another 50,000 tons from the U.S. (The U.S. purchase undoubtedly was influenced by Brazil's continued need for Public Law 480 shipments, one knowledgeable trade source here speculates.)

IGA GETS BACKING

For the present, the Nixon Administration is trying to keep the lid on anti-IGA senti-

ments. For one thing, most grower organizations, including the National Association of Wheat Growers and the National Farmers Union, continue to back the agreement. There is also the fear that dismantling the IGA might open the door to widespread commodity dumping, bilateral trading and other trade ills the U.S. has sought to cure since World War II.

"We must be patient" was the theme of Agriculture Secretary Hardin's reply to a recent suggestion by Rep. Findley (R., Ill.) that the U.S. quit the IGA. Speaking for the State Department, William B. Macomber Jr., assistant secretary for Congressional relations, wrote Mr. Findley that "the department believes that the arrangement has helped to keep (world wheat) prices higher than would otherwise be the case. . . . The (IGA) food aid convention has been helpful in diverting some foreign supplies from Commercial markets, thus making room for U.S. commercial sales."

This optimism could be sorely tested in the coming months if the continuing world oversupply of wheat continues to hold down U.S. exports as anticipated.

YOUTH SEES PURPOSE IN MILITARY SERVICE

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the following article "Youth Sees Purpose in Military Service" which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette of May 7, 1969, should warm the hearts of all of us who are exposed daily to the complaints, the criticisms, the rebellions, and the confrontations of many American youths of Luis Ortega's age. I am proud to claim him and his family as my constituents, and I hope the example they set will serve to strengthen our belief in our American way of life.

The article follows:

[From the Phoenix Gazette, May 7, 1969]

TEMPEAN "SAVING PEOPLE'S LIVES": YOUTH SEES PURPOSE IN MILITARY SERVICE

TEMPE.—A 20-year-old Spanish-American youth takes a vastly different view of his Army service in South Vietnam from that held by many his age in the United States. "I really don't mind being here and I like my job of saving people's lives," wrote Spec. 4 Luis Ortega to his brother, Eddie, 8.

LUIS, A 1967 graduate of McClintock High School and member of its athletics Hall of Fame, is serving with the 237th Medical Detachment near Da Nang.

In the letter to Eddie, the six-month veteran of the undeclared war in Vietnam, wrote of his job as medic crew chief recovering wounded troops from a battle area to the nearest hospital.

"We do all we can to help them and, Eddie, like they say at hospitals here, 'We treat them, God heals them.'"

"I've seen everything from a baby being born to bringing guys in with their arms and legs blown off and still alive.

"It's a wonderful thing to see a baby come into the world but I feel sorry for them because they are so innocent and don't know what is going on around them."

Luis told Eddie that he has seen some of his best friends die "and I guess that's why I'm writing you such a long letter." . . . "believe me, Eddie, it really matures you to be over here."

His mother, Mrs. Margarita Ortega of 1417 Newberry, said she prays daily to Santo Nino

(Baby Jesus) to bring Luis back safely . . . "the same as He did for John Bill Jr."

Spec. 4 John Bill returned in January after serving a year with Company A, 715th Artillery Battalion, and now is stationed at Camp Carson, Colorado. He is a 1966 graduate of Westwood High in Mesa.

Mrs. Ortega said she and her husband, a mechanic, are proud of their military sons and also of the other six boys and three girls.

In simple language and with undisguised patriotism, Mrs. Ortega said she and her husband "are trying to bring up our children to be good citizens and if our country wants our other boys they will serve, too."

## ETV—ITS PRESENCE AND POTENTIAL

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a review of community television broadcasting and the untapped impact potential of ETV in the State of Florida was presented in an eloquent address by the Honorable Floyd T. Christian, commissioner of education for Florida, on May 1 to the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate.

Commissioner Christian spoke out in support of S. 1242 which may be reaching this body in the not too distant future. Mr. Speaker, I commend the statement of the honorable commissioner of education to my colleagues.

The statement follows:

#### STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE FLOYD T. CHRISTIAN

My name is Floyd T. Christian. I appear before you as a member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, and as the Commissioner of Education for Florida, as well as a citizen extremely interested in the matters presently under consideration by this subcommittee.

I represent the following eight community television broadcast stations:

1. WTHS-TV, Channel 2, Miami.
2. WEDU-TV, Channel 3, Tampa-St. Petersburg.
3. WJCT-TV, Channel 7, Jacksonville.
4. WSRE-TV, Channel 23, Pensacola.
5. WFSU-TV, Channel 11, Tallahassee.
6. WMFE-TV, Channel 24, Orlando.
7. WUSF-TV, Channel 16, Tampa.
8. WUFT-TV, Channel 5, Gainesville.

These eight stations receive their financial support from State and local sources. In addition, channels 2, 3, 7, 23, and 24 receive gifts and donations from their community. The majority of our ETV stations have been in operation for ten years or more. The expenditure to upgrade our present stations to full power and to provide playback and minimum production of color would cost \$2,536,000. To provide a network which would interconnect all our ETV stations, and additional cost for construction would be \$3,498,000. Florida has two FM radio stations, WUFT, Gainesville, and WFSU, Tallahassee.

The lack of adequate resources of financial support for educational broadcasting has been an ever-present deterrent to the realization of the potentials for education inherent in this meeting.

During the past fourteen years there has been evidence of dramatic impact by the edu-

national broadcasting system as it now exists, and great strides in forming the kind of system that can readily distribute effective instructional and educational materials to all levels of our society. In a recent review of accumulated research concerning the use of instructional television for instruction, Godwin C. Chu and Wilbur Schramm conclude, "There can no longer be any real doubt that children and adults learn a great amount from instructional television. The effectiveness of television has now been demonstrated in well over 100 experiments and several hundred separate comparisons performed in many parts of the world, in developing as well as industrialized countries, at every level from preschool through adult education, and with a great variety of subject matter and method." (Chu and Schramm, *Learning From Television: What the Research Says*, page 1.)

In 1967-68 the Florida Television Committee under the State Department of Education sponsored two outstanding experimental programs. I think the two programs are worthy of mentioning because of the impact they had on educational television in our state. To make possible the political broadcasts, it was necessary to change the Florida statutes, and this was accomplished by the 1967 Legislature. In October 1968 the Television Committee programmed the first statewide hook-up on political candidates. We sponsored four one-hour programs for the two candidates running state-wide for the United States Senate. The candidates were provided free time on an educational network with a panel of distinguished newspaper reporters questioning them on the vital issues of the day. From the reports, telegrams, and telephone messages received we feel we had the largest listening audience ever obtained on educational television. Both commercial television and newspapers gave a large volume of space to these programs. In early November of 1968, the six candidates running for State Supreme Court were granted two one-hour programs that were also enthusiastically received.

A program that did not receive as much newspaper and television support as the political broadcast, but in my judgment, served a greater purpose for the community, was the Racial Tension Programming. The purpose of it was to "keep it cool." These were planned programs by the large cities over educational television stations. The community television stations in Miami, Tampa, Palm Beach, Gainesville, Pensacola and Tallahassee were given grants through the State Department of Education and the Television Committee. These were one-hour programs each week from members of the minority community and the disadvantaged group working with the power structure to prevent rioting and destruction of properties. The fact that these groups had an opportunity to have their grievances heard in a panel discussion prevented what could have been a "hot summer."

The United States Office of Education disclosed in a report of a survey conducted by its National Center for Educational Statistics in cooperation with state education agencies that there were a million more pupils enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools in 1968 than there were in 1967. (*New York Times*, Tuesday, April 15, 1969).

The population explosion and our commitment to mass education create a need for education to turn to techniques which facilitate the equalization of adequate learning opportunities for all citizens. This clearly indicates that technology must play a continuing role in the future. It is through the extension and improvement of our educational television and radio stations that we may create a basic backbone system that can distribute instructional materials to our citizenry.

The recently completed National Project for the Improvement of Televised Instruction, 1965-1968, conducted by the NAEB envisions and recommends in its final report, "Educational 'stations' could logically be developed into cooperatively supported, community communication resources that can house the staff and technologies for the proper structuring of many kinds of educational communications. They can serve as central "switchboards" to move experiences to appropriate places at appropriate times."

Pupils are being reached by television through closed circuit television, cable television, 2500 Megacycle transmission, and open circuit broadcasting. A comprehensive tabulation of the total number of student hours is not available. We do know, however, that the Lawrence McKune *Compendium of Television Education* (September 1, 1967, Volume 14) reported that 122 television stations had enrollments in excess of 6 million pupils; but perhaps even more significant is the inclusion in the report that some "99,107 teachers of Mathematics, Reading, Art, ETV Utilization, and Language Arts, in that relative order," receive training via television. (Foreword.)

For this system to mature in an effective manner, there is a need for continued stimulation with federal dollars. In many of the existing facilities, equipment, now obsolete after ten to twelve years of use, prohibits maximum effectiveness in instructional programs. Many stations are not able to transmit and produce programs in color; many stations are not currently broadcasting at maximum power; and yet, it is with these facilities that we might best approach some of the more serious problems confronting education today.

We need to apply television effectively to help the preschool child, to reach him in his home and bring him to a state of cultural readiness for the early school years. One notable demonstration of the application of television to this problem is found in the Children's Television Workshop, which will circulate via ETV stations extensive pre-school programming. Beginning this fall, this workshop is designed to stimulate the intellectual and social growth of approximately 12 million preschool children and prepare them for the beginning of their formal education.

We need to increase teacher productivity by extending our teacher training programs through television that can indeed reach our professionals effectively and efficiently.

We must assure that the instructional television materials reach the remote communities and segments of our population to whom quality instruction may not be readily accessible.

We must continue to emphasize the role of television in reaching the social problems in our urban areas.

The time is probably not far distant when academic buildings of every kind will be equipped with some sort of internal distribution of television and radio signals. Many are now. It seems essential that the experience with and knowledge about the development of materials for these systems be made available rapidly and effectively through a system of inter-connected broadcasting facilities.

There are noteworthy strides in many of our states to harness television's ability to provide instantaneous replicability and enhance the effective dissemination of instructional programs.

In the years to come, it is not unlikely that a greatly increased use of instructional technology will be applied to every level of education; and techniques developed may be applied to specific educational problems beyond the normal school day and outside the school institution as well as within. This development may help make possible higher

levels of instructional productivity and efficiency needed for a truly universal system of mass education.

I close these remarks with a final urging that this Committee treat favorably this bill for funds to serve as a continued stimulation toward bringing effective technology to bear on the critical problems found in education today, and which will surely continue to face us in the future.

**RUSSIAN AIRLINE OFFICIAL PREDICTS SST SERVICE TO NEW YORK IN 1970**

**HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, many times I have taken to the floor to discuss a matter of grave concern, particularly to the future of aviation in the United States. That is the lead the Soviet Union is building in the aviation field with their supersonic transport. And, we must not forget that the British and French have now flown two prototypes of their SST.

I have, over and over again, pointed out that Russia is swiftly becoming a fierce competitor in the airlines of the world, and most recently the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers newspaper, the Machinist, has pointed out that on the Moscow-New York run, Aeroflot, the Russian airline competing with Pan American World Airways, will have carried more than twice the number of passengers than Pan Am by the end of July 1969.

Mr. Speaker, this is dramatic proof that the United States must not fall behind in the prototype development of the SST, which already is sliding behind schedule. I urge the President to quickly recommend a solution to the financing problem facing the American SST, and to proceed swiftly with the development of this vital program to American aviation, to the American labor force, and to our delicate balance of payments.

For the information of my colleagues I insert this newspaper article from the May 22, 1969, issue of the Machinist at this point of the RECORD:

**RUSSIAN AIRLINE OFFICIAL PREDICTS SST SERVICE TO NEW YORK IN 1970**

A Russian airline official has given the first hint of a production schedule for the Soviet Union's supersonic transport, the TU-144.

The latest issue of *Aviation Week* magazine reports on a recent speech in Dublin, Ireland, by Gen. Leonid V. Zholudev, deputy chief of Russia's government-owned airline, Aeroflot. Zholudev predicted that the TU-144 would be flying commercially within a year.

Commenting on Aeroflot's success during the first nine months of Moscow-New York service, Zholudev commented that the Russian SST could be flying that route by the end of 1970. That timetable would put the TU-144 in service about two years ahead of the British-French Concorde and at least eight years ahead of the U.S. Boeing 2707-300.

As Aeroflot and Pan American World Airways round out their first year of air service between the U.S. and Russia, Aeroflot holds a big lead in passengers. Estimates are that during the first year, ending in July, Aeroflot

will have carried 10,000 passengers to Pan Am's 4,000.

*Aviation sources in U.S. and Russia agree that exclusive supersonic service on Aeroflot will undoubtedly increase tourism to Russia and give Aeroflot an even bigger lead in the passenger traffic.*

**VTOL deal**—In addition to its SST, the British aerospace industry is building its reputation in vertical take-off and landing aircraft (VTOL).

The Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1970 includes a request of fifty-six million, six hundred thousand dollars for the Marine Corps to buy 12 British-built Hawker Siddeley Harrier jet fighters. The Harrier now flying with the Royal Air Force, rises straight up like a helicopter and can fly at supersonic speeds.

In exchange for the Harriers, the Marines are willing to give up fifty-six and one-half million dollars worth of McDonnell Douglas F-4J Phantom fighters.

*Tipping the balance of trade scales by slightly more than one hundred million dollars with the Harrier may only be a sample of what's to come if the U.S. falls behind in other areas of aerospace technology. SST opponents, take note.*

**GRAPES, GRAPES, WHO IS BUYING GRAPES?**

**HON. PHILLIP BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the struggle to achieve social justice for those who work in the fields and farms of our Nation continues.

As one who is and has been vitally concerned for a number of years with this pressing question, I was most concerned when I heard a report on WTOP-TV Newsday on April 24, entitled "Grapes, Grapes—Who's Buying Grapes?"

I should like to place in the RECORD at this point the text of that interview for the benefit of my colleagues who may have missed this program:

**GRAPES, GRAPES—WHO'S BUYING GRAPES?**

**DAVID FRENCH.** The national boycott against California grapes has been going on longer than any other action of its kind, but the government isn't co-operating according to syndicated columnist Tom Braden.

**TOM BRADEN.** Did you think of the Department of Defense as a boycott breaker? Well, let's have a look at the record.

Out in California, Cesar Chavez has been trying to get the grape growers to bargain with his union. In most industries, collective bargaining is a matter of law, but not in agriculture. So Chavez has organized a nation-wide boycott to try to get the growers to come to the table. Privately the growers admit that the boycott is working. Grape sales in grocery stores across the country have been cut by as much as 20 per cent. But the grape growers have found a much easier way to sell grapes.

Where? Why, of course, to the Department of Defense. This year the Defense Department will ship eight times as many table grapes to Viet Nam as in any previous year. The figure is already 2 million and will reach 4 million pounds by the end of the year. That's eight pounds of table grapes for every American in Viet Nam. And the army at home is also doing its share. All in all, the Defense Department will buy 16 million pounds of California table grapes, up from 7 million pounds from last year.

So congressional critics will be pleased to know that, though our weapons systems may not be delivered on time, and there are complaints about helicopters and rifles, the vaunted U.S. delivery capability works in one respect. We can sure get the grapes there. And those Americans who have been supporting the grape boycott with their food budgets, are breaking it with their taxes.

**SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM AND THE CAUSE OF PEACE**

**HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in a May 17 speech before the North Dakota Motor Carriers Association in Fargo, N. Dak., our colleague, Congressman MARK ANDREWS, forcefully spoke on the "Safeguard ABM System and the Cause of Peace." Representing a North Dakota congressional district where one of the proposed ABM sites would be located, Congressman ANDREWS has taken the initiative in stating the need for the defensive missile system.

Drawing from his experience on the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. ANDREWS has carefully and thoroughly outlined his reasons for supporting the Safeguard ABM System. I commend Congressman ANDREWS for his timely and informed contribution to the current ABM debate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the text of Congressman ANDREWS' speech for inclusion in the RECORD:

**SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM AND THE CAUSE OF PEACE**

We have now entered an age of missilery, yet the basic fundamentals involved in our nation's protection are little different now from what they have always been. Some 194 years ago, a silversmith in New England named Paul Revere, mounted his horse one April night and rode, as history tells us, through "every Middlesex, village and farm", to warn his neighbors of military invasion. Our American ancestors were few in number in 1775 and not blessed with an abundance of worldly goods.

The colonists were obviously no match for the power of England with its enormous professional army and the world's largest fleet. You may well ask, "What was Paul Revere actually doing? What was the practical purpose of his famous ride?" He was buying time for himself and his neighbors to prepare. They had no way of knowing when the British Crown would turn loose on them a full scale military assault. They could not know whether they were inviting a new 30 year's war or a hundred year's war.

How could they be expected to fathom the intentions of an autocratic King. But knowing history, they were aware that the British Crown had always put down rebellion in its Dominions, and all the leaders were sent to London Dock to be hanged for treason. It was this knowledge which prompted the famous comment by Benjamin Franklin, after signing the Declaration of Independence, "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

So a few days or a few hours of advanced warning could make a difference between life and death for them, or between organized resistance and the need to disperse into the wilderness beyond the King's authority.

Reflecting on American defense problems and the cost today, one is struck with the close parallel between the situation facing the colonists of 1775 and our own uncertain outlook. We are a nation without imperial pretensions. We have no desire to occupy any other nation or to bend its people to our will. We have set up a vast establishment called the Department of Defense, and we insist that its mission be confined directly to the defense of this Republic. Even so, we find that billions each year must be applied to defense activities. Why is this so?

It is so mainly because we cannot know the true intentions of our enemies, and we must try to prepare for every eventuality. We must buy time for survival and response if such a situation is ever forced upon us. And, even more important, we must make sure that our technical knowledge is advancing at a constant rate so that we have available to our nation the latest in sophisticated know-how in this age of satellites, moonshots and many other advances that were only dreamed of a decade or two ago.

We cannot hope to match the manpower of the 1,300,000,000 persons behind the iron and bamboo curtains of censorship and secrecy. We have no means of certifying the true intentions of their leadership. We can only be guided by assessment of their past actions. The history written in the U.S.S.R. since 1917 offers small reason to place confidence in their good intentions. For over 50 years they have preached that an agreement with the capitalist is nothing but a chance to take advantage of a sworn enemy. During the same 50 years they have done everything in their power to weaken self-government anywhere in the world and to promote the creation of police states.

Their essential attitudes have not changed, but we must face each new day with the realization that they are in the world with us. They do have very advanced weaponry. Their commitments are unreliable. Their objectives are uncertain. Their good faith is obscured by regular planned actions which seem to support continuation of an international strategy of terror. And, worst of all, their interpretation of just what advantage may be gained from any given situation is unknown on this side of the ocean until after they have acted.

While we all hope for a mutual cutback in armaments, the cutback must be mutual, and verification by the U.S. must be assured, so that we can know for certain what is going on in the closed society of the Communist World. Unfortunately, the Communists have never been willing to agree to the kind of verification considered necessary for our safety.

So much for the past and the present. What, then, of the future. If the foregoing statements do not still hold—if the mission of our Defense Department therefore, is to be changed—then the people must so signify. If our people are willing to risk a little more on Soviet good intentions, if our people feel that we don't need to stay abreast of technological improvements, then we can spend much less on national defense. But a decision of that kind, with today's weapons and tomorrow's advancements, can involve the very life or death of the entire nation. It cannot and should not be made by the President or Secretary of Defense or the Congress alone. The defense of our nation is a decision that involves all of us and should only be made by all Americans. First, of course, we must have all the facts. Public Officials can only weigh the risks, make available information and offer suggestions for protection from those risks. If the time arrives when the people conclude that the cost of that protection is too high, then the decision to recede and accept the greater risks must be the people's to make, as the risks are theirs to shoulder.

And, let's look frankly at the American mood of today. First, we're approaching the

end, we hope, of a war—a war that has probably been the most unpopular our nation has ever been engaged in. Every time our nation has concluded a war there has been an overwhelming public opinion toward disarmament and against the military. It happened after the Civil War, after the Spanish-American War, after World War I, World War II and after Korea. Add to this feeling the fact that during the last few years the Defense Department has been less than prudent in many of its major contracts. The TFX scandal, for example, or the Sheridan tank case. Also, the draft, designed for the full mobilization of World Wars I and II, has been a bone of contention among our young men.

Thus, the situation is ripe for political opportunists who jump at the chance to exploit concern and seek headlines, rather than give the facts—self-seekers who fan the flames of discontent and attempt to cater to the mood and the emotions of the present, rather than the need, opportunities and obligations of the future.

It is easy to strike a responsive cord by saying, "Think of all the good things you can have by refusing to spend money for defense."—easy, that is, if you forget to add into your figures the cost of the risk of losing our freedom.

We even have a prominent politician in our own state who points out that the Minuteman Missile System was constructed to be impervious to nuclear attack. He asks, "What has changed that now makes it vulnerable?" This kind of statement certainly gains him the headlines he desires, but it completely avoids the obvious facts. He conveniently forgets that Soviet technology hasn't stood still in the last decade. Among other things, the Soviets have developed the SS-9 intercontinental ballistic missile, with a 20-plus megaton warhead, which is far more powerful than anything we have. With its payload equivalence of more than 20 million tons of TNT, if an SS-9 dropped anywhere near one of our Minuteman sites, the site would be totally ineffective. If we were to follow his logic, we would all still be driving around in Model T Fords and farming with horses, since there would be no such thing as obsolescence. The French would still be safe behind their Maginot Line which was built in the early 30's as totally impregnable. But, of course, technology caught up and passed them, and France was overrun.

The greatest need for President Nixon's ABM Program is not solely to deploy two sites or twelve sites or to protect us from a small Russian attack or a foreseeable Chinese attack, or a stray missile that may come in by mistake. The greatest need is to give continuity to the development of technology on our side of the iron curtain—technology that can give us the lead time we might so badly need in some difficult time in the future.

Roosevelt was told by many scientists that the atomic bomb would never work. President Truman had most of the scientific community in his time opposed to his go-ahead on the hydrogen bomb. President Eisenhower had the professors saying that we couldn't take accurate photos from satellites miles up in space to allow us to know what the enemy was doing. But, these Presidents all had the courage of their convictions. They all recognized that the military safety and thus the future of America depended on one thing—staying ahead in technical knowledge. Where would we have been during the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis if President Kennedy hadn't had at his disposal the lead in technology given this nation by the action and wisdom of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower.

I have no way of knowing who the President of the United States might be a decade or so from now sitting at a world conference table with the leaders of the other nations

that share this globe with us. But, whoever he might be, and whatever the time in history, it is vital to our best interests that he represent an America that is a first-rate power militarily.

When I was first elected to represent you some six years ago, the national budget totaled \$111 billion. This year Congress is asked to consider a budget in which the funds requested total \$192.9 billion. During the six years total spending by the government has risen almost 74 percent. Our Defense budget request this year, of course, is still the largest one in our budget. Yet, in the time that I have been privileged to serve in Congress, defense spending has actually dropped from 45% to 41% of the budget, even though we've been involved in Viet Nam. These actual budget figures certainly belie the argument that our nation's fiscal problems are solely due to "runaway defense budgeting."

Now, what of the Safeguard System, originally called the Sentinel, the very development of which has spurred so much dissension. The idea of an ABM System is not new. It has been the subject of research for over 15 years—15 years during which dramatic advancements have been scored in our knowledge and abilities in space. A decade ago there was little hope held for its eventual success, but within the past two years we have seen giant strides made that now indicate the state of the art has progressed sufficiently to justify on-site deployment testing of such a system.

So much has been said and written about the Safeguard System that mass confusion seems to have resulted. I believe, therefore, it would be helpful to summarize for you at this point first, what the Safeguard is designed to do as part of our Nation's defenses; secondly, the positions taken by those who oppose it; and, thirdly, the responses of those who support it.

First of all, about the Safeguard System itself. As now proposed it would include two sites being set up for in-place, functional testing. If, at the end of this testing, it was found that the system performed well the two sites would be expanded to twelve which would then give us coverage of our country.

As now proposed, it is designed to do three things, and President Nixon pointed out these three in his message to the nation outlining the deployment of this system and the significant changes made from the Johnson sentinel concept. Mr. Nixon indicated it should: first, protect our present landbased ballistic missile forces, which because of new developments in the Soviet Union, were no longer as secure as we once had reason to believe; secondly, the Safeguard System would be capable of intercepting a minor attack from new and emerging nuclear powers such as China; thirdly, and perhaps most important, the Safeguard System would give us the opportunity of intercepting and shooting down a mistaken attack by a handful of missiles launched in error from Soviet Russia or anywhere else.

With over 2,000 missiles on both sides of the world ready to go, the possibility of a circuit closing by mistake is always with us. At the present time our only reaction against a mistaken attack would be massive retaliation with our own missiles.

Yet, we've heard one of our state's prominent politicians state, ". . . Why do we now seek to protect, with an ABM system, silos whose retaliation Minuteman missiles should be long gone in event of attack?" (unquote) I think most of us feel that if our nation is to remain dependent on the sole alternative of massive retaliation and instant incineration for the world in case of a small attack, then we indeed have entered an age of nuclear madness.

A defensive missile system is a long overdue complement to our offensive missile system. The Safeguard system contemplates the

deployment of two units, one in North Dakota and one in Montana, to be constructed as research and development projects. The total cost is not tens of billions of dollars, as some would have you believe, but \$2.1 billion with an initial expenditure of \$900 million during the next fiscal year. These are, indeed, fantastic sums, but this expenditure next year represents slightly over one percent of our Defense budget. If for this we can gain a workable missile defense system and an alternative to massive retaliation, we will have made, I feel, a wise investment.

Now, just what is the Safeguard System. It is an interception and destruct system, utilizing both long-range and short-range radar identification of incoming enemy missiles, and long-range and short-range interception capabilities. The long-range anti-missile, the Spartan, can intercept at a distance of several hundred miles. The short-range missile, the Sprint, can intercept up to 25 miles traveling at unusually high speeds to meet any enemy missiles that may have avoided contact with the Spartan. The long-range anti-missile, the Spartan, has been tested on many occasions, as has the Sprint. The new radar with a 360 degree detection ability has been used in our moonshot. The computers are within the state of the art and have now progressed sufficiently to justify on-site testing. Thus, while all the component parts are in existence at present, the "entity" needs to be tested and certified for real reliability.

The main substance of the arguments of the opponents of the ABM System can be grouped in four distinct categories.

First, that this is being done to keep the pipeline of the defense industries full and is stimulated solely by the military-industrial establishment.

Second, that the installation would be obsolete before it is built.

Third, that it would cost far too much money—money much better spent for the domestic needs of our nation.

Fourth, that this would escalate the arms race and make even more difficult the anticipated strategic arms control talks with the Soviet Union.

All of these arguments have been repeatedly met and answered by the President and other proponents of the Safeguard deployment. No solution has been given by the opponents to the three needs that the President stressed in justifying the ABM deployment:

One, the protection of a portion of our retaliatory force against a first strike.

Two, a protection of our nation against a small attack from a lesser nuclear power such as China.

Three, a way to deal with a missile fired in error by malfunction from one of the major powers.

The philosophy behind the Safeguard decision is, of course, the conviction that first strike capability is a threat of nuclear war, while second strike capability is a deterrent to war. Our defense officials are convinced that the Soviet Union is attempting to maintain second strike or deterrent force against our ICBM weapons. If the ABM is effective and deployed, we will have an assured second strike deterrent—far better than depending solely on massive numbers of offensive missiles as at present. There is no serious doubt that the best way to deter a nuclear attack is to maintain the unmistakable ability to inflict unacceptable damage on any aggressor even after absorbing a first strike on our forces.

It is interesting to observe at this point that after the announcement of the Safeguard System there were no questions raised by the Soviets regarding our desire to maintain an ability to inflict second strike damage. Initial reaction by the Soviet Press indicated very little concern about the matter

because they feel it's proper for us to protect our defensive capabilities.

In fact, in a press conference in London on February 9, 1967, shortly after President Johnson announced the study of an ABM System, Premier Kosygin was asked: "Do you believe it is possible to agree on the moratorium on the deployment of an anti-missile defense system?" He replied in part:

"I believe that defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people. Some argue like this: What is cheaper, to have offensive weapons which can destroy towns and whole states or to have defensive weapons which can prevent this destruction? At present the theory is current somewhere that the system which is cheaper should be developed. Such so-called theoreticians argue as to the cost of killing a man—\$500,000 or \$100,000. Maybe an anti-missile system is more expensive than an offensive system, but it is designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives."

Kosygin's argument could well be used in our nation also. Moreover, it was after former President Johnson's announcement to proceed with the more provocative city-oriented Sentinel ABM System that the Soviet Union agreed to engage in strategic arms limitation negotiations. It is also significant that the Soviets are now on their second generation of deploying an ABM System, and that the British Government, as well as most of our NATO allies, have publicly supported the concept of the ABM. So much for the ABM System as military hardware and its effect on world opinion.

But, as I mentioned earlier, our people are suspicious of the expenditures made for defense. Who could help but be when one reads these stories in the newspaper about the TFX scandal. The plane contract was awarded, not to the low bidder, but to a company in Texas, which turned out a plane that not only cost three times as much as the original estimate, but has not been able to be used effectively yet by the Air Force. Also, the \$1.3 billion Sheridan tank fiasco, which has produced a tank that at present is almost as hazardous for its crew as it is for the enemy.

Actions such as these cannot be condoned by any American, regardless of political party, and we can only hope that the Defense Department, under new leadership, will see that this type of contracting is not allowed to continue. But abuses of the procurement system cannot be allowed to be used as the justification for America to cut back much needed defense system deployment.

Certainly, the President, who is hard-pressed today to start new programs he feels desirable for the internal growth of our nation, would like to avoid the funding necessary for weapons of this type and use the money instead for dams, roads, bridges, education, and anti-crime programs and all of the many other things that America needs. He knows, however, because of the information he has at hand, that this system is absolutely necessary and vital for our nation's future.

All the billions spent on national defense during the "cold war" years are nothing but a repetition of Paul Revere's ride—an effort to buy security for ourselves, and time for the world to mature and solve its most dangerous problems without resorting to nuclear warfare. We can even, in some ways, compare Paul Revere's horse to the scientist's laboratory. Both have the ability of giving us that extra time we need so desperately. Time to stay ahead while we attempt to resolve our differences peacefully.

Fortunately, many weapons have been purchased and deployed but never used; and on reaching obsolescence were consigned to the scrap heap—but they kept the peace while

they were on duty, and this is why they were developed.

Faced with all of these facts, what, then, will be my position as your Representative.

First, as of this time, I feel it is highly necessary to deploy—as research and development prototypes—these two Safeguard installations.

Second, it is important to know that despite what the confusers would have you believe, this is not an ongoing authorization to proceed. Anything beyond the original two prototype sites will take a new authorization and a new appropriation by Congress. I will not support further funding beyond the \$2.1 billion for these prototypes unless there is convincing evidence that the system does in fact work. Reliance on a faulty deterrent is more dangerous than no deterrent at all.

Third, I will not in any event base my position on blind acceptance of the good intentions of the Soviet Union. History forbids it. In the Cuban crisis we held a missile superiority of three to one and the showdown was resolved in our favor. But with all of the talk about our country being satisfied with parity or less in weaponry now, we must realize that the Reds might misinterpret and since they still do not understand free and open debate in an open society, may miscalculate our power. Hitler miscalculated and he confused himself into believing that America did not have the capability to resist and would not, in fact, resist. So, he took a chance and World War II resulted. Our apparent weakness invited that war.

Preservation of peace and avoidance of nuclear conflict has been a continuing effort. Our journey on that path has never been a partisan, political issue. It would be tragic if this tradition no longer holds. Perhaps many leading opponents of the ABM have always favored compromise at any cost. They fear confrontation. They fear the use of power by the American people. Yet, history teaches us that only evident military supremacy on the part of the free world can prevent war.

Fourth, I think it is a mistake to put the sole reliance on our nation's strategic defense in one system. We must face the fact that science is universal and holds no permanent secrets for exclusive use by any nation. Any weapon that can be built, will be built; but it might not be used. Such was the case with gas, and bacteria warfare weapons in World War II. Because both sides had them in quantity, they were not used.

It should be the function of diplomacy to concentrate on securing such international agreements as will encourage friendships among all nations and gradually make weapon building an expensive folly. Meanwhile, we have to remember that a police state will use any weapon if it can do so with impunity, as Hitler did with the V-2 rockets against England.

Fifth, I accept the definition of the Safeguard system as a wholly defensive weapon. A system with a range of a few hundred miles can hardly be an aggressors weapon, yet listen to the outcry from the same voices that always cry out in fear of any change on the chess board of world affairs—in the immediate postwar era when we decided to build a nuclear weapons force; next when we decided to build a hydrogen bomb; then when we decided to deploy an intercontinental rocket force; and again when we decided to construct the Polaris submarine fleet. Each time, the same people sang the same tune—we were aggressors, building weapons to blackmail the world.

Now by some tortured logic, these same people would tell us the system of rockets to cover a few hundred miles is escalation of the war threat because we are reducing the ability of an enemy to use his rockets

against us. And, if we have an enemy who worries about that point, then he must have aggressive intentions. Presumably they would have us trust the Russians' good intentions as did the people of Czechoslovakia.

Sixth, I am convinced that we must reduce our total defense spending, which now stands at 8.9 percent of our gross national product. I would like to see us work toward a figure averaging 7 percent or less if possible. This should be able to be done without compromising our basic and necessary research programs or our strategic deterrent. Some policy of this kind is required or we will be drawn into a permanent and continuing role as world policeman.

I have confidence in our technology and our ability to remain ahead of an enemy qualitatively for as long into the future as we must, but since 1954 we have virtually alone held together the ranks of the free world and communism has been exposed in all of its weaknesses. It is now time for other nations to exert and defend their nationhood, if they will, and to police their own areas. If they won't, our sons should not be offered as hostage for their failures.

We must move toward the conference table on disarmament, but we must also insist on verification of the other side so we can be sure that an agreement is not merely a worthless scrap of paper. The Kremlin has used our defense expenditures as an alibi for the obvious weaknesses of their political and economic system, their failure to unify their satellites, their failure to develop Russia internally, and their failure to meet consumer goods demand. It is to our long-term advantage to shatter that alibi and force exposure of their weakness in the eyes of their own people. We must do this by fostering the interchange of ideas and people between our countries, not by allowing an iron curtain to bar their peoples' eyes from what opportunities and freedoms exist in the rest of the world. We must move to have them understand us better, and we they. But, of course, once again let me add that in any dealings with the Russians, we have to make sure that all the cards are played face up on the table.

And, finally, let's not forget that the search for knowledge and the desire to broaden our technology must be a constant and sustained thing if we are to remain ahead.

Knowledge and design of this Safeguard ABM or any other weapons system is merely one more step in the drive to remain abreast or ahead of those who would oppose us and all we stand for. If, after site testing, it is a proven addition to the national security and if changing events in the world require it as a response, and if there is no acceptable alternative to meet the three identifiable dangers as laid out by President Nixon, then it certainly deserves support and deployment. That decision must be made in the 70's, but we will have the opportunity to make it only if we move ahead with test site deployment now. One very prominent and Senior Democratic Member of the House put it bluntly, "I'd rather not need it and have it than need it and not have it."

Actually, a decision in support of ABM is no different than the first great military decision of our country, when the Continental Congress started its own Navy by purchasing and arming the old French Ship "Bon Homme Richard", and directed John Paul Jones to patrol the Atlantic as a first line of defense for this continent.

In conclusion, I believe that the great majority of the people I have the privilege to represent in Congress—and, indeed, the great majority of the people throughout the nation, with their down-to-earth common sense, are having a tough time swallowing the so-called sophisticated arguments that conclude it is somehow bad to defend ourselves. Frankly, I don't understand those who

regard deployment of an ABM by our country as provocative, but not provocative of the Soviet Union to have already deployed two ABM Systems. Nor do I understand why it would be provocative of us to defend our Minuteman forces against a developing Soviet preemptive first strike capability, whereas it is not provocative of the Soviets to develop that destabilizing capability. We are told, if you pause to think about it, to stop our provocative action of punching the Soviets on their fist with our eye. I sincerely hope that such an inverted Alice-In-Wonderland view of the world will not be allowed to prevail.

In the context of the total picture of history as it has been written, I would consider support of continued ABM development to be the action of a dove, not a hawk, for history leaves no doubt that only the strong can discourage attack and bring peace to the world of men.

#### THE AFL-CIO COMMENTS ON THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

### HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, each day that passes bring the Congress closer to the day when it must decide whether to provide funds for the "Safeguard" anti-ballistic-missile system. The issue is controversial; we had debate on the subject even before President Nixon announced his decision.

The arguments pro and con have ranged from the logical to the scientific, to the philosophical.

The executive council of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, which represents the millions of Americans engaged in collective bargaining, has come forth with an especially worthwhile comment on the ABM controversy and I include it in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON THE ABM CONTROVERSY, MAY 15, 1969, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Last year Congress authorized and appropriated funds for the deployment of the "Sentinel" anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system designed primarily for the defense of our cities. The issue before the country today is whether the entire idea of an ABM system should be dropped or whether it should be deployed on a more limited scale.

The proposal for a more limited "Safeguard" ABM system—primarily for the protection of some of our nation's retaliatory forces—was made by President Nixon, on March 14, 1969, when he declared "I am announcing a decision which I think is vital for the security and defense of the United States, and is also in the interest of peace throughout the world. . . . It is a safeguard of our deterrent system, which is increasingly vulnerable due to the advances that have been made by the Soviet Union since the year 1967 when the Sentinel program was first laid out." In his plea to Congress not to abandon but to proceed with the work on the deployment of an ABM system, the President emphasized his belief that "it is essential for the national security, and it is essential to avoid putting an American President, either this President or the next President, in the position where the United States would be second rather than first, or at least equal to any potential enemy."

The AFL-CIO Executive Council believes the above declaration embodies a sound doctrine of national defense for our country. While we recognize that there can be honest differences of opinion over a particular method of assuring maximum security for our country, we emphasize that there can never be a good argument for our country's not assuring itself the best available national defense.

From our founding convention in 1955 to date, the AFL-CIO has consistently supported the goal of a strong national defense. We have never joined in attacks upon the efforts of any Administration to carry out this solemn responsibility, and we shall not do so now.

We have always underscored the urgency of acting to meet the pressing social and economic problems facing our country. We do not believe that the pursuit of either objective should be regarded as precluding the other. Both are essential to the security and progress of the nation and both must be faithfully and vigorously pursued.

American labor has always worked for peaceful solutions of international differences. We are, however, awake to the grim facts of international life today. The USSR has been expanding its military budget by at least ten percent annually. This mounting strength centers on missiles with multiple, independently targetable warheads of high accuracy. It constitutes a potential grave threat to our country's land based missiles, bombers, and bomber-bases. Since 1962, the USSR has been developing and deploying an extensive ABM system.

The proposed Safeguard system provides only for safeguarding American lives and defense capacities. It does not call for increased American retaliatory power.

More than two years ago, when questioned about the Soviet ABM system, Soviet Premier Kosygin himself declared that "a defense system which prevents attack is not a cause of the arms race but represents a factor preventing the death of people."

No expert can guarantee in advance how effective any weapon can be in defense or offense. The President's proposal calls for continuation of research and development and each successive deployment phase is to be constantly examined and reviewed annually in the light of technological advances and the international situation at hand.

The Executive Council does not join in any debate over how effective the proposed ABM system will actually be in action. We hope there will never arise the need for such a test. But certainly this nation must at least endeavor to protect enough of our deterrent force to enable our country to discourage any potential enemy from initiating a nuclear assault against the American people.

Under these circumstances, the AFL-CIO Executive Council declares that the President of the United States, as our nation's Commander-in-Chief and as the one primarily responsible for our country's foreign policy, should be supported in fulfilling his duty to determine—in consultation with scientists, military experts, the Congress and other Constitutionally appropriate authorities—the most effective ways of meeting the vital defense needs of our country.

Failure to be militarily prepared does not lead to peace.

#### OUR FLAG

### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an outstanding poem entitled, "Our Flag," written by Mrs. Vivian E. Bennett, Waltham, Mass.

This poem is very impressive, and very well done, and it is a real contribution to poetic expressions concerning our great flag of which we are all so proud.

OUR FLAG

(By Vivian E. Bennett, Waltham, Mass.)

Oh teach them the meaning  
and the reverence too  
Of our emblem of Liberty  
The Red White and Blue.

The Red is for valor  
To defend native sod,  
Blue is for Loyalty  
And reverence to God.

The White for truth  
And Hope for me and you,  
Each Star a State  
On the field of blue.

Teach them their heritage  
Why Freedom we enjoy,  
Make "Old Glory" revered  
By each girl and boy.

A real Patriot is proud  
to defend it away,  
So the pledge of Allegiance  
We recite each day.

This proud flag has flown  
On land and sea,  
A symbol of freedom  
For you and for me.

Teach them Freedom's not free,  
"Till we give it to others  
And in Peace we can live  
With all men as brothers.

In song and in poetry  
Long may it wave,  
O'er the land of the free  
And the home of the brave.

NOTE.—The meaning of the colors was taken from the book "Our Flag," published by Edward J. Cronin, Secretary of the Commonwealth, June 1949. He was the beloved Secretary of State for 10 years.)

HIS EXCELLENCY AUGUST ZALESKI

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I remind the Members that the Polish government in exile continues to function in London and the voices of its officials are far more representative of the people of Poland than the mutterings of the Moscow-controlled puppets in Warsaw.

Therefore, I insert into the RECORD the address of His Excellency August Zaleski, president of the Polish Republic in exile, May 10, 1969, at Caston Hall in London, at the opening of a new session of the Council of the Republic of Poland, which functions as a parliamentary body in exile.

The text of President Zaleski's speech follows:

"In opening this session of the Council of the Republic of Poland, the second of the present term, I have first to state with sadness that the political, as well as economic and cultural, position of the country has not improved. We note rather a worsening of the situation in various fields of the na-

tional life under the imposed Communist régime.

Since the March events of 1968, when Communist reprisals against students and writers reduced the Polish people to silence, almost nothing has remained of the illusory hopes of the "Polish October".

Nearly every field of activity is under control of the ruling Communist party which permeates and tries to mould in its own fashion every field of creative endeavour. Shortages in shops, defective supplies, an ailing industry—such are the results of the centrally directed so-called economic planning.

Particularly hard must be the life of Polish youth, the generation on which the future of the nation depends. So-called "socialist construction" has brought the youth into a cul-de-sac. School-leavers face increasing prospects of unemployment, all the more so that these are the numerically strong age-groups of the post-war population boom.

The despotic state is afraid of any independent opinion and tries to mould its citizens according to a single pattern. Centrally organised mass-meetings, demonstrations, false information, demagoguery in the press and radio, reprisals against writers and intellectuals—all these are daily occurrences in present-day Poland living under the yoke of Russian communism.

The Communist régime did particularly great damage to the good name of Poland in the world through its anti-Zionist campaign, which soon went over into anti-semitism, and through its participation in the invasion of Czechoslovakia undertaken in the interest and by order of Soviet Russia.

Only an imposed Communist rule could have forced Poland, a country with a long tradition of tolerance and freedom, to such heinous deeds.

The coordinated struggle against the Church and religion in Poland goes on. The Communist party and its territorial branches continue to harass the clergy and the faithful—an action which, incidentally, often leads to results diametrically opposed to those intended.

Also in the international field there is little ground for comfort. In the United States, after 8 years of Democratic rule, the Republican Party has come to power. At the head of the new Administration is President Nixon, who visited Poland in 1959. He has there enthusiastically received and he spoke many fine words. It is to be hoped that the new President will not follow into the footsteps of his predecessor President Roosevelt who in Tehran and Yalta has surrendered to Russia the entire eastern half of Poland and has accorded Russia such rights and privileges over the rest of the country that Poland has virtually become a Russian colony. Poland was not even admitted to the conference table where her fate was being decided, although there was in existence a Polish Government which was recognized by the Allies, and Poland had armed forces which with all their might had contributed to the Allied cause.

The changes which we are witnessing at the moment in France will undoubtedly have far-reaching consequences not only for France alone, but for the European Community as well. So far France has played a dominant part in this community. Now the crux of the matter is that Europe is facing a choice between a United Europe with Britain and one in which the most powerful state will be Germany. The German Federal Republic with a population of 59 million, with a huge industry and strong currency, is a power to be reckoned with. British membership would provide a certain counter-weight against a possible German attempt to dominate the Europe Community.

It has to be said that it is in the interest of Poland that there should exist a United Europe of which a free Poland would also be a part. The Polish claim to participation in a

grouping of Western European states is self-evident both for economic reasons and in view of her age-long association with Western civilization.

Russia, after a period in which terror was somewhat relaxed under Khrushchev, is now reverting to her traditional role of oppressor and suppressor of any deviation from the political line dictated by the Kremlin. Outstanding proof of this trend is the so-called "Brezhnev doctrine", the persecution of Russian writers who dare to vent views not quite in line with those of the rulers in the Kremlin, and the invasion of Czechoslovakia with the participation of some of Russia's satellites.

But the Kremlin has at the moment its own troubles. I mean the challenge to Moscow orthodoxy in the Communist camp, especially the ideological struggle with Mao Tse-tung which has recently taken the form of acute frontier clashes. This may have quite incalculable consequences, particularly in view of the fact that China increasingly voices her demands for the return of territories forcibly annexed by Tsarist Russia.

Thus the settlement imposed upon the world by the great powers after the Second World War, often in violation of law and justice, has failed to give the world the much desired peace.

Peace treaties envisaged in the Potsdam agreement failed to materialize, and there is no ground to believe that they would materialize soon.

The tasks of the Polish Emigration and the means at our disposal are different from those of Poles in Poland. We can and we should fully represent the full Polish *raison d'etat*. It is our duty to inform the world about Poland, to protect and put forward demands in a way in which our captive country can not.

A great source of moral strength for the Polish emigration is the presence in their midst of the rightful authorities of the Polish Republic. This is what the Great Emigration of 1831-32 lacked, as did the emigration after the January Insurrection of 1863. They lacked the continuity of legal state institutions, and this was their weakness, notwithstanding the high moral calibre of their leaders.

We are all aware what sort of Poland we want. We want a free and democratic Poland in which we shall be our own masters under a Government of our own choice, living in a system and with laws of our own making.

This year we celebrate the 400-th anniversary of the Union of Lublin, one of the few cases in history when many peoples became united of their own free will in a single Commonwealth. This act had the motto: "Let the free unite with the free, and equals with equals". It welded the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania into "a single indivisible body, a single Commonwealth which made two states and peoples into one".

I hope that Poles outside their captive Fatherland will duly honour this great deed of the past of which Poland is so proud.

The Government will put before the Council reports of their activities and will present their plans for the future.

I declare the second session of the Council of the Republic of Poland open, and pray that God may bless you in your deliberations.

VA PROSTHETICS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I in-

clude a most thoughtful and informative article appearing in the April 1 issue of U.S. Medicine, by Dr. Turner Camp, area medical director of region 5 of the Veterans' Administration's system of hospitals. Dr. Camp has served with distinction in the Veterans' Administration. He served in the medical corps of the Navy during World War II and the Korean conflict and is still a Reserve officer doing frequent weekend duty in the Washington area. The article which follows shows the great steps which the Veterans' Administration has made in this field which not only has helped the veterans of this country, but all who suffer any sort of disability:

#### VA PROSTHETICS

(By Turner Camp, M.D.)

Thanks to modern medical practice combined with the incredible teamwork of the front-line medic, the helicopter pilot and the military surgeon, today's combat casualty has a far better chance of survival, a much greater potential for faster recovery, and more complete functional restoration than ever before in the history of warfare.

This message, emanating from the prosthetic program at the Veterans Administration Hospital in San Francisco, is intended not only as a tribute to military medicine and its combat-zone medical teams, but also as a feed-back report of the VA's contributions to the field of prosthetic care.

On 24 November 1967, Tommy Eugene Raper, a 19-year-old Army private, sustained injuries resulting in amputations of all four extremities as well as a perforated eardrum due to the explosion of an enemy mortar shell near the Cambodian border in Vietnam.

That he survived at all is remarkable. It may be attributed to the elasticity of youth, to the availability of whole blood administered on the spot by the front line medic, to the helicopter pilot who brought him to a medical station within the hour, and to the skilled two-man surgical team, one working on the left side, one on the right. We hope this report will reach these men.

#### FOLLOWUP VISITS

Although he has been a civilian since 18 September 1968, Tommy has had some followup visits at the Army's Letterman General Hospital, Presidio of San Francisco, in regards to the Chopart's amputation of his left leg, which must remain in a walking cast for a while longer.

On his first visit to our prosthetic clinic on 6 December 1968, Tommy was wearing his bilateral arm prostheses previously furnished at Letterman Hospital. He came in a wheelchair only because the leg cast on his left precluded extensive use of his above-knee artificial leg on the right.

As usual at clinic sessions, all of the specialists were there to carefully evaluate Tommy's needs, including a prosthetically trained orthopedic consultant, physiatrist, a prosthetic specialist who coordinates this activity, a physical therapist, a social worker and several prosthetists representing commercial artificial limb companies under contract with the VA.

In Tommy's case it was immediately apparent that only minimal deliberations by the team would be required to take care of his immediate needs. His post-surgical fitting and rehabilitation training at Letterman obviously had been excellent.

All Tommy wanted now was "to get my artificial arms fixed as soon as possible."

This was understandable considering the evidence of hard usage and the resulting changes in his stumps. The need for a new left below-elbow arm and a new socket for his right above-elbow prostheses was indicated and prescribed together with a few

additional items that Tommy had not considered before.

#### POWER DRIVEN WHEELCHAIR

To provide unassisted mobility during occasions when his artificial legs are not in use, a power driven wheelchair adapted for control by use of his hooks was specified together with a lightweight folding wheelchair easily transportable in his car. A hydraulic lift was considered for installation by his bathtub but Tommy would have none of this, preferring to settle for a shower chair.

His lower extremity prostheses will await evaluation at a later date. At that time his upper extremity stumps should be sufficiently stabilized to then consider spare arm prostheses so as to provide uninterrupted functioning whenever his present limbs break down or need repairs since he lives a considerable distance from any limb shop facility.

Not too long ago, the harsh term "basket case," with all of its dour connotations would automatically have been applied, labeling this young man for life. Hopefully, the term is becoming obsolete. Certainly in Tommy's case it does not apply for even before our services have well begun, he is still a sure shot with a deer rifle as he was before his military service. He drives an automobile, rides horseback and even looks forward to resuming his favorite hobby—drag racing!

Important work remains to be done, nevertheless, and Tommy will make many trips from his ranch home in Dos Palos, California to the clinic, a distance of some 150 miles, with expenses paid by the VA. Some will be even farther since he has selected a prosthetist in Vallejo to fabricate his new prostheses.

#### FEWER CLINIC VISITS

His visits to the clinic will become progressively less frequent, however, due largely to the streamlining of the VA's administrative procedures. For instance, the numerous personal visits or writing of letters back and forth to request or approve needed repairs or adjustments have been virtually eliminated. Adoption of the credit card idea in the form of a prosthetic service card has made this possible.

His recurrent need for replacement of stump socks involves only the mailing of a postage free request card to the VA distribution center in Denver, Colo., where prompt shipment is made directly to his home.

Tommy's punctured eardrum fortunately does not present a problem yet. At this stage he does not consider his slight hearing loss to be a handicap.

Nevertheless, another aspect of VA's inter-service collaboration will be brought to bear if needed.

Audiology service will scientifically test his qualitative and quantitative hearing loss and determine specifications for an individually fitted hearing aid best suited to his particular needs. Prosthetic service will procure it and a spare if the need is indicated. His battery replacements will be provided in the same manner as his stump socks and he will use a prosthetic service card to obtain factory repair services whenever needed.

#### ARTIFICIAL EYE CLINIC

Despite his multiple injuries, Tommy will not require the services of our plastic artificial eye and restorations clinic, except for the possible future fitting and fabrication of ear molds for use with a hearing aid.

For many other veterans, however, this is an extremely important part of our prosthetic service program, including the fabrication and fitting of custom-made plastic artificial eyes, lifelike custom designed body and facial restorations, ocular implants, surgically implantable skull plates and a large variety of special devices usually not available from commercial sources.

With Tommy's permission we have used his story to illustrate some of the typical pro-

sthetic services being provided today for thousands of disabled veterans.

The same teamwork approach, involving carefully planned coordination with other elements and disciplines concerned, is similarly applied in serving all of our beneficiaries, regardless of the type of physical impairment involved. In this respect the term "prosthetic service" is at best a misleading one, but for lack of better terminology the VA "prosthetic service" encompasses a wide variety of benefits and services many of which are totally unrelated to the word "prosthetic" as it is generally defined.

To be more specific "prosthetic services" as used in the VA includes the furnishing, replacement, maintenance and training in the use of such items as the following: for the blinded veteran, special canes, Braille writing equipment, shatterproof dark glasses, portable radios, Braille alarm clocks and pocket or wrist watches, disc or tape type recording equipment, and standard or portable typewriters.

In addition to prostheses, it also includes all conceivable types of orthopedic appliances such as braces, elastic hose, corsets and belts, orthopedic footwear, arch supports, splint and shoe modifications.

Depending upon the disability involved, "prosthetic service" relates to such other items as standard or motorized wheelchairs, adjustable hospital type beds, invalid lifts, respirators, oxygen equipment, cardiac pacemakers, air conditioning units and even home installations of hemodialysis equipment.

In essence, whatever is needed to assist in the physical, functional or cosmetic restoration of the veteran can usually be supplied as a "prosthetic service," if it is obtainable and if it is medically prescribed as part of specific treatment authorized by the VA.

#### POSTWAR DEVELOPMENT

This report could not have been made prior to the end of World War II at which time the VA faced a chaotic situation and an organized prosthetic program as such did not exist.

In fact, some mandatory government regulations at that time relating to the procurement of prosthetic appliances, reflected far greater concern for short-sighted economy than they did for the welfare of the disabled veteran.

Additionally, sources of supply for many types of appliances and devices were inadequate, extremely limited or nonexistent. Artificial limbs, for example, were available from only a few hundred small shops and more often than not both the facilities and quality of product bore a striking resemblance to what, in earlier years, you might have encountered at "Ye Olde Village Smithe."

There was little in the way of theoretical knowledge and no standardization or quality control; each limbmaker being guided by his own pet ideas or "trade secrets" which were jealously guarded. In the words of a House committee publication issued during the 90th Congress, "The plight of the amputee became spectacular."

#### REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

To remedy this situation, in 1945 Public Law 268 was passed by the 79th Congress, granting new wide-ranging authority to the administrator of veterans affairs in fulfilling the needs of eligible veteran beneficiaries. This significant law not only defined the basic prosthetic services to be provided, but further stipulated that these services could be procured "by purchase, manufacture, contract or in such other manner as the administrator may determine to be proper without regard to any other provision of law."

Upon this foundation a "prosthetic service" was established as a separate entity in the VA's department of medicine and surgery and for the first time in our history, appliances and related devices and services could be furnished to eligible veteran beneficiaries, not

in strict accordance with rigid rule books but rather on the basis of sound medical judgment, professional advice and human considerations.

But the best medical judgment and professional advice available at that time left something to be desired, principally because of an almost complete lack of any basic body of scientific knowledge related specifically to prosthetic devices.

For instance, everything there was to know anatomically about the function and structure of human joints was known and yet no where in available literature could be found any comprehensive analysis of the principles of human locomotion and the application of these principles to the design, construction, and fitting of an artificial limb.

In response to the obvious need for basic research and development in the entire field of prosthetic and sensory aids, in 1948 a continuing annual appropriation was authorized by Congress to the VA for this purpose.

#### RAPID PROGRESS

The impact of the prosthetic research and development program during the past two decades is perhaps best expressed by quoting one of our severely disabled Spanish-American War veterans who recently observed, "It is evident to me that more progress has been made during the past 20 years toward improving the quality of prosthetic devices and services than was previously accomplished in the entire history of man."

Our job at the more than 80 prosthetic services established in designated VA treatment facilities throughout the nation, is to assure that every eligible veteran living within the jurisdiction is afforded the fullest measure of authorized prosthetic services commensurate with his individual needs.

The responsibility for fulfilling this objective on a day-to-day basis rests primarily on the shoulders of the VA's prosthetic representative. Each of these employees, in addition to his extensive training and experience in all aspects of prosthetic care, has personally demonstrated his own ability to overcome a major physical handicap, and because of these special qualifications together with personal dedication, is able to establish the kind of rapport with veteran beneficiaries that is so essential to the success of this type of program.

Referring back to our observation at the beginning of this report, we hope that the military surgeon and all of his colleagues, who are engaged in saving lives and bodies wherever they are being attacked, will take encouragement from this report. To you and to the disabled we mutually serve, we pledge a continuing effort toward an ever improving program of prosthetic services.

#### ARE WE ALREADY TOO LATE?

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many Americans, especially those who are learned in world conditions, are exasperated at the continued harassment and attacks against our military leaders charged with the security of our Nation.

We must remember that military men win wars—they do not start them. Overwrought pacifists and blundering diplomats bear that responsibility.

Having made every diplomatic blunder possible even before World War II, our

leaders should not be discussing preparedness and defense—they should be moving forward with all dispatch at their command motivated by the urgency of survival: Are we already too late?

Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial from the Daily Oklahoman for May 13, and another newsclipping following my remarks:

[From the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Daily Oklahoman, May 13, 1969]

#### ARE WE ALREADY TOO LATE?

The Communist conquest and domination of the entire world has been the unswerving ambition of the Soviet Union since the days of Lenin. Russia now has an army more powerful than any three other nations combined. All it needs to attain its goal is a navy which can overwhelm the navy of the United States.

With this in mind, for the past several years, Russia has vastly enlarged its ship building capacity and this year will turn out 28 new submarines to the United States one or two.

At the present time, Russia already has 250 attack submarines compared to the United States 105. Of this number, 100 are missile launching submarines compared to only 41 of the United States. Of surface to surface missile carrying ships, Russia has 25 and the United States has none.

Of mincraft, Russia has 300 and the United States only 86. Of missile patrol boats, Russia has 150, the United States none.

Of destroyers, the United States has 177, of which 163 are more than 20 years old. Russia has 86 destroyers, all of them less than 20 years old.

Of the attack submarines, 60 of the 105 in the United States are more than 20 years old. All of Russia's 250 are less than 20 years old.

At the present rate of construction, within four years Russia can have more than three times as many attack submarines as the United States and they will be armed with bigger missiles than the Polaris and their estimated range is 1,500 miles.

For years many of our defense experts have talked about intercontinental missiles to be launched by Russia from within the Soviet Union.

Apparently very little thought has been given to the fact that Russia, in a few years, will be able to place 50 missile attack submarines off our Atlantic coast, another 50 within the Gulf of Mexico, another 50 in range of our Pacific coast and all could be commanded to discharge their missiles at the same second of time, aimed at every military airport, every naval base and installation and at every electric power station of size in the country.

Russian missiles could strike every one of our metropolitan cities and create a nationwide panic. We would have no means of defense, other than our submarines, if located near Russia.

The defense of the United States could be paralyzed within 15 minutes and the United States could become a Russian satellite.

No other country in the world could oppose the might of Russia and Russian commissars could take over the governments of any or every nation. China would be the only likely nation to offer resistance and that would be futile, for Russian hydrogen bombs would destroy China's nuclear bases and could destroy any Chinese city.

It is likely that in addition to the submarine armada, Russia would place in orbit a half dozen space ships loaded with hydrogen bombs of which one could be orbiting over the United States every 15 minutes and their bombs could be dropped on any desired target at Russia's pleasure.

President Nixon might be the last elected president of this country.

For the last eight years, our defense department has concentrated its attention and spent its money upon Vietnam. It soon may have to give additional attention to North Korea. Both North Korea and North Vietnam are supplied by Russia with abundant weapons and ammunition and tactical experts to supervise their warfare.

It is to Russia's advantage to keep the war going in Vietnam and start another in Korea. It probably will not permit North Vietnam to accept a peace settlement.

Only one thing will deter Russia from taking over the United States through submarine warfare, and that one thing would be such a powerful navy and submarine force of the United States that it could do damage to Russia equal to the destruction it caused in the United States.

A number of our military leaders recognize the doom that awaits us but for fear of alarming the public have spoken only in guarded terms.

The ABM safeguard system might be able to shoot down 80 percent of intercontinental missiles from Russia, but the other 20 percent could destroy us. It would afford no protection against submarine missiles. It is so much simpler for Russia to attack us by submarine that the use of intercontinental missiles would be only supplementary.

If the United States had as many as 75 nuclear powered submarines equipped with Poseidon missiles and maintained most of them within target range of Russia's vital cities and military installations, Russia would be unlikely to attack our country.

A crash program to enormously increase our naval strength and merchant marine, regardless of cost, appears to be the only deterrent to a capture of this country by Russia.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 19, 1969]

#### CHINA POLICY STATEMENT KEEPS UP FIRE AT U.S.

TOKYO.—Communist China virtually told the United States today the price of improved relations between the two countries is American abandonment of Formosa and of the American policy of containment.

The Chinese policy statement in the Peking People's Daily, the organ of the Chinese Communist party, made clear that there has been no softening in Peking's attitude toward the United States by the leaders chosen by the ninth party congress last month.

The statement made no mention of a resumption of the Warsaw talks between the ambassadors of the two nations.

It denounced President Nixon as a "hypocritical priest" and "gangster" wielding "a blood-dripping butcher's knife."

#### SEES DOUBLE TACTICS

"Nixon resorts to crafty counter-revolutionary, double-faced tactics toward socialist China," it said. "On the one hand, he talks loudly about so-called 'peaceful co-existence' and plays the trick of sham relaxation; on the other hand, he persists in continuing to occupy China's territory of Taiwan (Formosa), carrying out repeated military provocations against our country, and further stepping up the rigging-up of military encirclement of China."

It charged that Nixon is plotting a new military alliance with Japan as its backbone to replace the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

While quoting Communist Chairman Mao Tse-tung that China will not attack unless it is attacked, the paper said the Chinese people "are determined to liberate their sacred territory of Taiwan."

## PODGORNY CRITICAL

The United States also came under attack from Soviet President Nikolai Podgorny, who said the Americans have concentrated troops near the Soviet and North Korean borders and are today "the source of tension" in the world.

Winding up a visit to North Korea, Podgorny assured Premier Kim Il-sung the Soviet Union is the "reliable ally and friend" and would stand with North Korea "at the post of defending the common gains of socialism."

## CLEVELAND ORCHESTRA MUST BE SAVED

## HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial yesterday, the Cleveland Plain Dealer described the severe financial plight of the Cleveland Orchestra. It is most saddening to realize that a truly great orchestra, which provides untold enjoyment to every segment of society, because it is unable to meet its annual operating expenses, faces possible demise.

Our Government has only recently begun to acknowledge the importance of the arts in society. Last year \$5.9 million was channeled into theaters, ballet companies, and orchestras by the Federal Government. This year the Appropriations Committee has before it an administration request for \$16,744,000 for the arts and humanities, of which \$7.5 million would be allotted to the National Council on the Arts for assistance to needy sources, such as the Cleveland Orchestra. This is a mere pittance to support a nationwide program of the arts. More is needed—much more—to do justice to the several worthy programs that face possible extinction due to excess fiscal strain.

I will do my utmost to bring about congressional approval of sufficient funds for the arts and for the Cleveland Orchestra. All who have taken pleasure in hearing a concert or opera; all who have viewed a ballet or dramatic production should pay careful heed to the calls of their local cultural centers when their aid is sought in meeting these financial responsibilities.

For the interest of my colleagues, I have appended the editorial from the May 19, 1969, issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

## ORCHESTRA MUST BE SAVED

The Cleveland Orchestra is in grave financial trouble. It plays to packed houses but still must dip into endowment funds to meet expenses. Another year of operating losses could see its demise.

This cannot be permitted to happen. The Cleveland Orchestra is one of the world's great orchestras. Its loss would be a blow to the musical arts and would severely damage the prestige of the city.

The orchestra must be saved, by greater support from foundations and private and industrial givers, by support from governments.

The Cleveland Orchestra has joined other financially troubled orchestras in New York,

Boston, Philadelphia and Chicago to seek new sources of financial aid.

This is a good start. Working together, the orchestras will be better able to impress on the sources of wealth the economic crisis faced by the performing arts in America.

It is ironical that at a time when interest and participation in cultural activities are growing, the arts are in financial trouble. It is ironical but it is a fact that American creative and performing artists are acknowledged as the finest in the world and yet, while living in the world's most affluent society, many of them have to subsidize their own creative work with outside jobs.

The arts play a vital role in establishing and shaping the values of society. They must be kept viable.

The orchestra should point out to industry that cultural and economic development go hand in hand.

They should appeal to Congress for greater financial assistance. Government support of orchestras, ballet companies and theaters is well established in many nations. It has barely started in the United States.

They should approach state and local governments for aid. Some cities already contribute significantly to the maintenance of their cultural institutions. Cleveland does not.

They should continue trying to win new public support with summer concerts, as the Cleveland Orchestra is doing at the Blossom Music Center. The orchestra is counting heavily on Blossom income to help offset operating losses, but this will not be enough. Outside help will be imperative.

## OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION IN LAKE ERIE

## HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people in my area of western New York State are rightfully concerned about the pending proposals for leasing underwater lands in Lake Erie for the purpose of drilling for natural gas.

Everyone already is fully aware of the acute pollution problem in Lake Erie and of the extensive measures which are being taken to halt the deterioration of this great body of water.

Now come these plans for oil and gas exploration along the lake bottom.

The matter of our natural resources is one of concern to all of us and their exploitation must be carefully supervised.

In the case of my home area, including the city of Buffalo, N.Y., and its adjacent communities, we are rightfully concerned about any action that might further affect Lake Erie, which is our chief source of domestic water supply.

At its meeting in Buffalo on May 6, the legislature of Erie County, N.Y., adopted the following resolution:

## A RESOLUTION BY LEGISLATURE OF ERIE COUNTY, N.Y.

Whereas, there are presently proposals for leasing under-water lands in Lake Erie for the purpose of drilling for natural gas, and

Whereas, Lake Erie is the source of domestic water supply for millions of people, and

Whereas, the present pollution of Lake Erie serves as a threat to its continued use as a source of domestic water supply, and

Whereas, it has been demonstrated in other

parts of the country that the drilling for gas and oil in under-water lands has frequently led to the pollution of bodies of water, and

Whereas, it has been demonstrated that all known safeguards cannot prevent equipment failure or human error in drilling operations, and

Whereas, the pollution of Lake Erie is a major concern of the citizens of Erie County as well as the citizens of the State of New York.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Erie County Legislature does hereby express its vehement opposition to the leasing of under-water lands in Lake Erie for either natural gas or oil exploration, and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the leaders of both houses of Congress, the Governor of the State of New York, the leaders of both houses of the New York State Legislature, the New York State Conservation Department, the State Health Department, and all members of the New York State Legislature who represent the County of Erie.

ALBERT N. ARGOTT,  
NORMAN J. WOLF,  
LESTER S. MILLER,  
JOSEPH A. TAURIELLO.

Attest:

BENJAMIN DE YOUNG, JR.,  
Clerk of the Legislature of Erie County.

## THE IACP'S 76TH ANNIVERSARY

## HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The IACP, as it is known in the trade, is a professional, nonprofit organization based here in Washington. Its membership is made up of more than 7,000 executives in the law enforcement profession, representing approximately 60 countries including the United States and Canada. The current president is Chief Thomas Cahill of San Francisco, and the longtime executive director is Mr. Quinn Tamm, one of the most esteemed men in the field.

The IACP is dedicated to improving the profession, both for the men who work in it and, most importantly, for the citizens of this Nation whom it serves. The organization is, and I quote from one of their recent publications, "dedicated to continuous study and research in improved methods for the protection of life, liberty and property through the lawful exercise of police power."

Organized back in 1893, the International Association of Chiefs of Police has seen our society change and, with it, the role of the policeman. We have always had crime, but we have not always had the complex technology and unsettled social conditions which characterize modern life. In recent years particularly, police work, like the society it serves, has been in a state of flux.

IACP efforts are concentrated in four major areas of law enforcement, two of which—training and education, and research and development—are directly aimed at keeping the law enforcement

profession abreast of the times. In the area of education and training, the organization has been active in developing and promoting the widespread adoption of higher standards both for the education required of recruits, and for pre-service training. The IACP has campaigned diligently and effectively against the all-too-common situation of the rookie cop's being handed a badge, a gun, and a billy-club and told to go out and enforce the law. The other two areas of special interest are managerial consultation and highway safety. Technical guidance is provided in these areas on an individual basis, when requested, and in the forms of surveys and studies conducted and disseminated by the organization.

The importance of the International Association of Chiefs of Police as both the voice of the Nation's police and as a source of expertise on the national crime situation received official recognition last year when it was asked to provide a spokesman to testify before both the Democratic and Republican platform committees. The IACP recommended endorsement of two basic law enforcement principles: First, the primacy of local law enforcement; and second, the necessity for swift, sure justice to wrongdoers. It urged enactment of legislation which would include severe penalties for assaulting police officers, inciting riots, participating in organized crime activities, trafficking in LSD, and violating traffic laws. In an editorial in the IACP's monthly publication, the Police Chief, the executive director, Mr. Quinn Tamm wrote:

In summary, the committees were informed, no one is more anxious than the police to return our communities to havens of law and order where every citizen is afforded the protection that is his due regardless of his race, color, social or economic status. They were advised that those in the police service feel that definite advancement has been made toward this goal, but that final attainment is not possible until every citizen and his elected representatives fulfill their responsibilities to respect the law and support law enforcement.

It is an honor for me, both as a former member of the New York City Police Department and as a Congressman, to salute the International Association of Chiefs of Police on their 76th anniversary, and to commend them for their leadership in the law enforcement field.

#### J. CLARK SAMUEL HONORED AT TESTIMONIAL

#### HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for 21 years, the Foxboro, Mass., Reporter has enjoyed the leadership and prospered from the wisdom of J. Clark Samuel, who retires as editor this month. The wide respect and admiration of the com-

munity is demonstrated through designation of Mr. Samuel as "Editor Emeritus." I share the sadness of citizens of the Foxboro area in the loss of this outstanding community leader. Mr. Samuel will always be remembered in the community to which he so unselfishly has devoted himself throughout his newspaper career. Although we shall certainly miss him in Foxboro, I join the many well-wishers who hope that Mr. Samuel's retirement will be most enjoyable and gratifying.

Under unanimous consent I submit an article from the Foxboro Reporter entitled "J. Clark Samuel Honored at Stirring Testimonial" for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Foxboro (Mass.) Reporter,  
May 14, 1969]

"COUNTRY EDITOR" J. CLARK SAMUEL HONORED AT STIRRING TESTIMONIAL

(By Art Brennan)

"You will never see another Selectmen's meeting like this one" Selectman Edward Fox warned, and he had never seen one like it before either, as a startled "Reporter" editor, J. Clark Samuel, was tendered a testimonial at the Town Hall attended by representatives from many clubs and town departments.

As Clark expressed it, after a stream of speakers and letters had commended his twenty-one years of journalistic service to the town of Foxboro, "I am totally overwhelmed." Visibly struck by the surprise affair, Clark said that he and his wife Jeanne would be leaving Foxboro in a physical sense only.

Mr. Samuel retires at the end of the month and the well known and well liked couple will then pack up and head South to Red Point Beach, North East, Maryland, where they have a home on a picturesque knoll overlooking Chesapeake Bay.

In honor of his upcoming retirement, representatives of the many clubs and town agencies whose activities he has reported over the years turned out last night for the testimonial, many giving scrolls and gifts as tokens of their appreciation.

EDITOR EMERITUS

Rep. Robert Aronson (R) Foxboro-Sharon spoke in behalf of Governor Francis Sargent, whom he described as a man who gave out citations only when he thoroughly knew the kind of individual it was for and the purpose of it. Rep. Aronson said that after hearing his description of Clark, the Governor said "If a man like that is going to retire, we can't have that; we'll make him 'Editor Emeritus.'" and so the citation was composed.

Rep. Aronson also presented a citation of his own which was read by Selectman Fox, in which he said, "If ever a man personified the combination of integrity and humor, of wisdom and tact, of involvement and determination, it is you." In his remarks in behalf of the Governor he said he hadn't had the chance to become a truly close friend of Clark's but in talking with him, reading his articles, etc., he became a friend of Clark's in attitude, coming to know and respect how Clark thinks and writes.

CONGRESSWOMAN HECKLER

Congresswoman Margaret Heckler also sent a citation noting the retirement and stated, "For twenty one years you have given selflessly of your time and energy in the interest of community service."

Senator John M. Quinlan, unable to attend, sent a congratulatory letter expressing his warmest wishes noting, "We have all

benefited from your being editor of "The Foxboro Reporter", which he described as one of the best newspapers in the state.

Also unable to attend, but forwarding a warm message, was local School Superintendent William A. Glynn, who said he would miss Clark in both a personal and a professional way, as a friend over the recent years and as a "good friend to education in Foxboro". He noted that when Clark had criticized the schools in any way it had always been constructive criticism.

During his 21 years in Foxboro, Mr. Samuel has been a member of the Foxboro Lions Club and a past president. He did not hold nor did he seek public office since he felt that it would create a conflict of interest in his work as editor of The Reporter.

He has been active in professional organizations, and is a member of the New England Professional Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, the national journalistic society, president four terms of the Massachusetts Press Association, and member and director of the New England Press Association, and member of the National Newspaper Association.

PRESENTATIONS

Others making presentations in behalf of local organizations included Mrs. Helen Fuller for the Boyden Library Trustees who gave to Clark a foot-tall replica of the Civil War Soldier which stands atop Memorial Hall as a memento of the town.

Also: Commanders Thomas McGowan of the Lawrence W. Foster Post, American Legion and Gordon Winget of the Foxboro VFW Post, 2626, who gave citations thanking Clark for his assistance and publicity coverage throughout the years enabling the local veterans organizations to carry out their community projects.

The Board of Selectmen read a formal proclamation in behalf of the town recognizing Clark's service to the community and wishing him good fortune in continued successes during his retirement in Maryland.

Norman Lawton, 4-H representative, expressed the thanks of the 4-H organization for Clark's help in nurturing their activities throughout the years and said that if the Samuels would be able to attend, he planned to present them with a special gift at a 4-H event coming up on May 23rd.

St. Alban's Lodge, AF & AM, represented by John Fuller, also presented a message from the Masonic Lodge commending Clark's achievements for the community over the twenty-one year span. Mr. Fuller, noting the 150th anniversary of the Lodge, also gave Clark a supply of the commemorative "wooden nickels," noting that their value was strictly as a memento of the town.

Robert Conkey delivered a message of congratulations of the College of William and Mary president, Dr. Davis Paschal, with whom he had talked earlier in the day. President Paschal congratulated Clark and reminded him it had been William and Mary "where he polished his English".

COMRADE IN ARMS

Long time colleague on the paper, Vin Igo, finished off the program giving some examples of his and Clark's experiences over the years and said that Clark always wished to be thought of as the typical country editor, even as the town grew. "When the day comes when people and their roles are rated," he said, "that of the country editor will rank high on the list."

Citing his warm personal friendship with Clark, Mr. Igo presented a sum of money and a portable electric typewriter in behalf of many friends in the town.

GUESTS

Representatives present included the School Committee, Housing Authority, Town Clerk, Town Collector, Planning Board, Po-

lice and Fire Departments, Highway Department, school staff, Advisory Board, Foxboro Federal Bank, Rodman Ford Sales, Republican and Democratic Town Committees, Foxboro Knights of Columbus, the Association of University Women, League of Women Voters, Jaycees and Jaycee Wives, Little League, Lions Club, Assessors, Quaker Hill Restaurant, Town Hall employes, local neighborhood, Plymouth Bay Council of Girl Scouts, St. Mary's Council, several of the local clergymen, Foxboro Grange, as well as many other friends.

A collation was served following the testimonial.

Clark first came to Foxboro from New York City where he was engaged in public relations work. Prior to that he had worked as a reporter and rewrite man on these newspapers: The Waterbury (Conn.) Republican; The Albany (N.Y.) Times Union, and Knickerbocker Press, also Albany; The Philadelphia (Pa.) Public Ledger, Atlantic City, N.J., bureau.

He began his newspaper career at the age of 18 as a club reporter on his hometown paper, The Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, and was also a reporter on the old Wilmington Evening, and the present Wilmington Evening Journal.

He attended Friends School, public schools and Tower Hill School in Wilmington. He also attended The College of William & Mary in Virginia at Williamsburg.

#### KOREA AND VIETNAM: THE PRICE IN BLOOD OF BANKRUPT POLICY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the United States is now engaged in one of its longest and bloodiest wars since the formation of the Union. It is an undeclared war against an unidentified enemy. In its course the leaders of our Government have consistently prevented the professional officers of our Armed Forces from ending the conflict in the only way that war can be successfully terminated—a decisive victory.

In an address to the House of May 14, 1969, on "Korea and Vietnam: The Penalty of Perfidy," I discussed at some length the background of our Korean-Vietnam involvement and quoted two significant published statements: one by Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp, former Commander in Chief, Pacific, on "We Could Have Won in Vietnam Long Ago" in the May 1969 issue of the Reader's Digest; and a second by Dan Smoot on "More Pueblos" in the April 28 issue of the Dan Smoot Report. In addition, I invited attention to my remarks to the House of Representatives in the RECORD of June 14, 1967, on "Crisis in World Strategy: What Would MacArthur Do?"

Because of the little known facts presented in my May 14 address and the documents cited therein, I would again urge all concerned with the formulation of our Vietnam policy to study it, especially the quoted parts, and not to depend upon editorials in the Washington Post.

In looking up the history of the Washington Post, which is, unfortunately, the only major morning newspaper in the

Capital City of our Nation, I find some very interesting facts. It was acquired by its present ownership at the depth of the great depression at auction for only a fraction of the value of this important property. It thereupon became strongly pro-Soviet even to the extent of forcing the resignation of its able editor-in-chief, Ira E. Bennett, after he refused to write editorials urging U.S. diplomatic recognition of Soviet Russia. It has also had an internationalist editorial policy favoring escalation followed by U.S. intervention in European wars with results against the best interests of Western civilization. It has advocated the surrender by the United States of its treaty based sovereign control over the Canal Zone at a time when such action plainly implies the surrender of the Panama Canal to Red power. It supports the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from the Vietnam war and advocates a hostile policy against friendly Southern African countries, especially the strategic Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia.

Mr. Speaker, is it the policy of certain elements in our Government for the United States to withdraw from a conflict that Communist power does not wish us to win in Southeast Asia in order to embark upon a vastly more sanguinary one in southern Africa that these same internal forces manifestly wish the United States to undertake against the highly civilized non-Communist Republic of South Africa and non-Communist Rhodesia? As I stated on May 14, the once great organization, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has published a general staff type of war plan for war against South Africa.

With such controlling editorial policies as I have noted above, the castigation of Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp by an unsigned May Day editorial in the May 1, 1969, issue of the Washington Post for his forthright signed article on the conduct of the Vietnam war conforms to the well-established pattern of this paper's performance over many years. In this connection, let it not be forgotten that the Washington Post appeared to trawl the New York Times in support of Castro's takeover of Cuba.

It was, therefore, with much interest that I read in the May 13, issue of the Washington Post a number of ably written letters to the editor commenting on the indicated editorial, two of them by professional officers of our Armed Forces with a background of vast experience as regards the current war: Gen. Wallace M. Greene, U.S.M.C., retired, former Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army, retired, formerly on the staff of General MacArthur in the Pacific.

Because of the relevance of the indicated letters to current problems in Southeast Asia facing our Government, I include with my remarks four of the letters and invite special attention to those by Generals Greene and Lane:

[From the Washington Post, May 13, 1969]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—CONCERNING  
"ADMIRAL SHARP'S KNIFE"

Having read your lead editorial of May 1 ("Admiral Sharp's Knife") which appears to

have been written by some intemperate, uninformed and emotional person, I would like to take a stand by the side of Admiral Sharp and attest to the factual accuracy and reasonable conclusions of his article in the May issue of the Reader's Digest ("We Could Have Won the War in Vietnam Long Ago").

As with the questions of the F-111, the C5-A and the electronic barrier at the DMZ, the American people deserve to be told the facts regarding the management of the military campaign in Vietnam. In that respect Admiral Sharp's "knife" has served a useful purpose.

On the other hand, your article, in my opinion, certainly was not of much help in presenting the truth of the situation to your readers. With the sources of information open to a great newspaper like the *The Washington Post* and with the former Secretary of the Navy now the president of your paper and certainly available to you for consultation, it seems to me that you might have done better.

Gen. WALLACE M. GREENE,  
U.S. Marine Corps (Ret.).

Admiral Sharp is right in asserting that the United States should have won the Vietnam war long ago. Instead, gradualism has given us another Korea; only this time it might drag on another ten years. War is a risky business: people get killed, nations are destroyed, so when the United States enters a war it should pull no punches. Worrying about the Russians or Chinese is immaterial in Vietnam because they are not supplying troops, only equipment. If they choose to become involved that is one of the risks, and the Russians and Chinese know the possible consequences of such an action. In short, the United States should put up or pull out.

J. S. TAYLOR,

Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

I reply to your May Day editorial concerning the recent comments of Admiral U.S. Grant Sharp.

More than anything else that editorial showed that Admiral Sharp's knife hurts where it cuts.

In the period 1966-68 the Admiral no doubt expressed his views. Even though they were not those of the decision makers, he, like any high member of our armed forces, did not engage in public disagreement with his civilian superiors. If in this time period he had said what he thought, as you suggested, *The Washington Post* would have been among the first to demand his removal. Admiral Sharp has timed his public comments as he should, after retirement.

I wonder who "Virtually every . . . authority" includes. The Admiral's thesis is a professional military judgment based on complete data. Because of his widely respected military ability and experience and his practically unlimited access to relevant intelligence, I accept his judgment relative to a military question rather than that of *The Post* or some relatively low level officials whose knowledge of North Vietnam is limited to what they saw in South Vietnam.

What he says, that we got where we are because of ineffective use of military power as ordered by civilian authorities, is a valid point of view held by many responsible people. It is fitting and proper that this view be expressed in print and that the military leadership be allowed to defend itself against charges that it is responsible for what has happened in Southeast Asia.

Essentially, *The Post* is saying that Admiral Sharp is wrong because you say he is wrong. I suppose you would have your readers believe that *The Post* staff, sitting in Washington reading press dispatches, knows more of what happened in Vietnam than does the commander of the headquarters

through which most all intelligence, orders, analyses etc., were handled.

BOB CLARK, JR.,  
University of Virginia.

Your editorial of May 1, 1969 attacking Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp for his article in May Reader's Digest, "We Could Have Won The War In Vietnam Long Ago", is a mean and unprincipled assault on a distinguished public servant. Its distortion of the Admiral's essay seems designed to smother by smear constructive discussion of what you call "a war which has obviously gone wrong".

It is your editorial writer and not Admiral Sharp who suggests that "civilian policy-makers in Washington were stupid, cowardly or naive—or all three". Admiral Sharp's restrained narrative implied only that their judgments were wrong.

Admiral Sharp's statement that "Secretary McNamara arbitrarily and consistently disregarded the advice of his military advisers" is a statement of fact and not of opinion. It is attested by Defense civilians engaged in the process. The observation of your editorial writer that the responsibility for decision rested with President Johnson seems calculated to obscure the fact that the President acted upon the recommendation of Secretary McNamara.

Just what competence does your editorial writer have to challenge the "competence and intelligence" of Admiral Sharp? This personal attack betrays an incapacity to respond cogently to the Admiral's thesis. It is not Admiral Sharp who suggests that the war goes badly "because someone was stupid or cowardly or false"; these are Washington Post words. Admiral Sharp kept the discussion on the level of good or bad judgment, where it should be. Your editorial introduces emotional irrelevancy to the debate.

When Admiral Sharp reported that the closing of Haiphong Harbor was vetoed because "closing Haiphong would not affect the enemy's capability of waging war in South Vietnam", he gave the more credible excuse for the veto. Your suggestion that closing the port would have brought Chinese and/or Soviet counter attacks is the counsel of irrational fear. That is what some people said to President Kennedy when he imposed a quarantine on Cuba.

I disagree with Admiral Sharp's judgment that effective conventional bombing and blockade would have ended the war, though I believe both measures should have been taken. But I think the challenge to Admiral Sharp should be made in constructive analysis for the benefit of our citizens and not in the vituperation to which the Post editorial has resorted.

I hope we may hereafter see in the Post a more mature and dispassionate consideration of important public issues.

Maj. Gen. THOMAS A. LANE,  
U.S. Army, Retired.

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1969]

#### ADMIRAL SHARP'S KNIFE

The Vietnam war is not over, or ended, but the re-writing of history has begun. The latest chapter is from Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp, the former commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific, who has written an article in the *Reader's Digest* entitled "We Could Have Won The War in Vietnam Long Ago." The Admiral's thesis is that airpower could have won it by destroying the North Vietnamese economy; the principal villain is former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. "We could have won the war long ago—perhaps by the end of 1967," Sharp writes. "We could have achieved victory with relative ease, and without using nuclear weapons or invading North Vietnam." The Admiral explains that now that he is retired, "I feel obliged to speak out, to warn the American people against the folly of conducting a major war on a piecemeal basis."

Thanks, Admiral. It is nice to know that

now, in 1969. It is information which might have been somewhat more valuable in 1968 or 1967 or 1966 or earlier, but at that time Sharp was formulating and partly responsible for the policy he now turns his back on. As far back as 1965, he predicted that the tide was turning, that the allies were "no longer losing the war." Now he breaks silence in the *Reader's Digest*, in a piece filled with cheap shots like this one: "In his handling of the war . . . Secretary McNamara arbitrarily and consistently disregarded the advice of his military advisers. His insistence that we pursue the campaign on a gradualistic basis gave the enemy plenty of time . . ." As Sharp knows better than any of us, it is the President who made the decisions on the air war in North Vietnam. But a former President, even an unpopular one, is a bit tougher target than an unpopular Secretary of Defense.

The Admiral's basic argument, which would be disputed by virtually every civilian and military authority with actual experience inside South Vietnam (experience which Sharp, headquartered in Honolulu, did not have), centers around the efficacy of airpower to destroy North Vietnam and thereby win the war. He states that in 1965 "we could have quickly broken North Vietnam's resistance." He would have bombed railroad yards and power stations in Hanoi, and the docks in Haiphong. In a 2000-word article, there is scant mention of the risks of Chinese or Russian intervention in the event of unrestrained attack on the North. It is possible (though not plausible or realistic) to make a case that there would have been no intervention; but Sharp does not discuss that question, except to say, from his Hawaiian vantage point that the risk was "minimal," and his implication is that civilian policy-makers in Washington were stupid, cowardly, or naive—or all three. All along, he writes, "our military leaders" recommended that Haiphong harbor be closed. The recommendation was vetoed because "it was claimed that closing Haiphong would not affect the enemy's capability of waging war in South Vietnam . . ." Wrong, Admiral. It was vetoed because of the fear of a wider war, a war possibly involving Chinese troops in the South or Russian troops elsewhere (Berlin, for example).

The re-writings will come in abundance now, and not all of them will be from military men. The knives are out—military vs. civilian, officialdom vs. the press, younger officer vs. older, and so on and on. These are efforts to assess responsibility for a war which has obviously gone wrong. Admiral Sharp's contribution represents the worst kind of apologetics, a misconception and distortion of events so serious as to call into question both his competence and his intelligence. This is an article which does damage not so much because it is wrong (which it is), but because of what it says to the men who have fought and died in South Vietnam. It says to them, and to the rest of us: Look, none of that need have happened. A few more bombs on a power plant in Hanoi or a dock in Haiphong, heavy bombing from the beginning in the North, and the back of the insurgency would have broken. 34,000 Americans need not have died in South Vietnam. *We could have won the war in the South by bombing the North, if they had let us.* It panders to an ancient American belief, that things go badly not because they are inherently difficult (or intractable) but because someone was stupid, or cowardly or false. It refuses to accept the reality that events are sometimes outside the control of the United States, even the armed forces of the United States.

But Sharp's is an article which will receive notice, get play in the newspapers, cause comment. "We could have won in Vietnam long ago." It has a fine, resonant sound; and is as empty and hollow as a Chinese gong.

## ROYBAL PROPOSES NATIONAL WELFARE STANDARDS, WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO PAY 90 PERCENT OF COST

### HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 11044, to relieve State and local taxpayers of the major financial burden of supporting the country's fast-growing public assistance programs, while establishing uniform national standards for minimum welfare benefits to apply across the board in all 50 States.

Public assistance is a national problem, with constantly rising costs now exceeding the funding capability of many of our local jurisdictions to handle by any further increases in sales, income, or property taxes.

They have about reached their limit, and the Federal Government is long overdue in assuming its responsibilities in this area.

The recent U.S. Supreme Court decision, eliminating residency requirements for welfare recipients, adds urgency to the need for quick action to help solve the acute fiscal crisis facing already overburdened State and county governments in trying to meet the mounting cost of caring for those eligible for the Nation's public assistance programs.

In addition to setting up uniform minimum benefits and eligibility standards, and authorizing 90 percent Federal cost-reimbursement—covering programs for aid to the aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children, Medicaid; as well as emergency assistance and local administrative expenses—with higher maximum welfare payment ceilings, H.R. 11044 would also repeal the controversial child-welfare "freeze" provisions of the program for aid to families with dependent children—AFDC.

Regarding the AFDC "freeze," now scheduled to go into effect this summer, I believe such a regressive Federal aid cutback would simply attempt to shift the financial burden to local taxpayers, and would result in imposing even greater hardships on America's dependent children—who are neither responsible for their situation, nor able to help themselves in any way.

#### SUMMARY OF H.R. 11044

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide a somewhat more specific and detailed explanation of my bill, H.R. 11044, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following narrative summary of the bill's major provisions:

#### SUMMARY

H.R. 11044 would amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act by (1) increasing the Federal matching contribution for payment to public assistance recipients to 90 percent, (2) establishing nationally uniform minimum standards for assistance, and (3) repealing the child-aid freeze in the AFDC program.

#### TITLE I—INCREASE IN FEDERAL MATCHING

Section 101 of Title I provides for an increase to 90 percent in the Federal matching

contribution to the States for Old-Age Assistance. The maximum payment which would be matched is \$125 a month. In addition to 90 percent matching for cash payments, the bill provides for 90 percent Federal matching for allowable premiums under part B of title XVIII (Medicare) and for other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care, and for expenditures under the program of medical assistance for the aged. The Federal Government would also pay 90 percent of the costs of administering the program.

The program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children would be amended under section 102 to provide for 90 percent Federal matching for payments to AFDC recipients up to a maximum payment level of \$70 a month (\$100 for foster care). A Federal share of 90 percent would also be provided for premiums under part B of title XVIII (Medicare), for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care, and for emergency assistance to needy families with children. The Federal Government would also assume 90 percent of the cost of administering the AFDC program.

Section 103 would amend the provisions relating to the program of Aid to the Blind in the same manner as it amends the program of Old-Age Assistance. The amendment provides for 90 percent Federal matching up to a maximum payment level of \$125 a month, the same amount allowable under OAA.

Under present law each State receives Federal reimbursement for public assistance payments under a complicated formula which involves a "Federal percentage" based on the State's per capita income. Section 104 of the bill would eliminate this provision to conform with the new provision for 90 percent Federal matching for all States.

Section 104 would also eliminate the present Federal payment limitations for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, providing instead that they would receive the same matching as the States. The dollar limitations would be retained for Guam.

Under section 105 the program of Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled would be amended in the same way as the other adult categories of Old-Age Assistance and Aid to the Blind. Ninety percent Federal matching would be provided, with a maximum payment level for matching purposes of \$125 a month.

Present law provides that States may combine the administration of the three adult categories. Section 106, recognizing the need for administrative simplicity, would allow the States to continue this method of administration and would provide 90 percent Federal matching up to a maximum payment level of \$125 a month, as is provided for the separate programs.

Section 107 would increase the Federal contribution to the States for programs under Title XIX (Medicaid). Under the bill the States would receive 90 percent Federal matching for the cost of payments made under Medicaid, including the cost of administering the program.

The effective date of all of the changes made under Title I would be December 31, 1969, as provided in Section 108.

#### TITLE II—UNIFORM MINIMUM STANDARDS AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Title II of H.R. 11044 amends the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act to require that the States provide in their State plans for minimum standards and acceptance requirements for all applicants of public assistance. Section 201, which includes this requirement, would affect all of the public assistance categories, including Old-Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled, and Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

Section 202 requires the Secretary of

Health, Education and Welfare to establish the minimum amount of assistance which would have to be paid to recipients under the various public assistance categories. The Secretary would also determine eligibility requirements, such as the amounts of other income and resources which must be taken into account in determining the need for assistance.

The minimum standards of payment and the acceptance requirements are to apply uniformly throughout the United States, and are to take into account the full need of all recipients. However, variations may be allowed between the various programs and also to take into account variations in cost of living in different geographic areas.

The minimum standards and acceptance requirements are to be up-dated annually.

Under section 203 the Secretary of HEW would be required to determine the expenditures made by the States in order to comply with the new requirements in Title II, and to reimburse them for these amounts.

#### TITLE III—REPEAL OF AFDC FREEZE

Section 301 would repeal the section of present law which would limit Federal matching to the proportion of all children under age 18 who were receiving AFDC payments on the basis of a parent's absence from the home in each State as of January 1, 1968. The "freeze" is now due to go into effect on July 1, 1969.

#### TEXT OF H.R. 11044

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the verbatim text of H.R. 11044:

#### H.R. 11044

A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal share of a State's expenditures under the public assistance programs (including administrative expenses) to 90 percent, to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform minimum standards for aid or assistance thereunder, and to repeal the freeze on the number of children with respect to whom Federal payments may be made under the aid to families with dependent children program

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### TITLE I—INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE EXPENDITURES

Sec. 101. (a) Section 3(a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this title, for each quarter, an amount equal to 90 percent of—

"(1) the total amount expended during each month of such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to such month as exceeds the product of \$125 multiplied by the total number of recipients of old-age assistance for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (A) the number of individuals who received old-age assistance in the form of money payments for such month, plus (B) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as old-age assistance in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care);

"(2) the total amount expended during such quarter as medical assistance for the aged under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for med-

ical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof); and

"(3) the total amount expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan."

(b) (1) Section 2(a) (12) (C) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 3(a) (4) (A) (1) and (ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3(a) (3)".

(2) Section 3(c) of such Act is repealed.

(3) Section 6(c) of such Act is repealed.

(4) Section 1902(a) (20) (C) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 3(a) (4) (A) (1) and (ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3(a) (3)".

Sec. 102. (a) Section 403(a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid and services to needy families with children, for each quarter, an amount equal to 90 percent of—

"(1) the total amount expended during such quarter as aid to families with dependent children under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or other type of remedial care or the cost thereof, and including emergency assistance to needy families with children), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds (A) the product of \$40 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to families with dependent children for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (i) the number of individuals with respect to whom such aid in the form of money payments is paid for such month, (ii) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to families with dependent children in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care, and (iii) the number of individuals, not counted under clause (i) or (ii), with respect to whom payments described in section 406(b) (2) are made in such month and included as expenditures for purposes of this paragraph), plus (B) the product of \$30 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to families with dependent children (other than such aid in the form of foster care) for such month, plus (C) the product of \$100 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to families with dependent children in the form of foster care for such month; and

(2) the total amount expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan."

(b) (1) Section 408(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "clause (A) of".

(2) Section 408(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 403(a) (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 403(a) (2)".

(3) Section 409(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 403(a) (3) and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 403(a) (2)".

Sec. 103. (a) Section 1003(a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind, for each quarter, an amount equal to 90 percent of—

"(1) the total amount expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect

to any month as exceeds the product of \$125 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to the blind for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (A) the number of individuals who received aid to the blind in the form of money payments for such month, plus (B) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to the blind in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); and

"(2) the total amount expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the plan."

(b) Section 1003(c) of such Act is repealed.

SEC. 104. (a) Section 1101(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out paragraph (8).

(b) Section 1108 of such Act is amended by striking out everything down through "(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 502(a) and 512(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"LIMITATION ON CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO GUAM  
"SEC. 1108. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 502(a) and 512(a)."

(c) Section 1118 of such Act is repealed.

(d) Section 1121(c) of such Act is amended by striking out ", except that" and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 105. (a) Section 1403(a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, for each quarter, an amount equal to 90 percent of—

"(1) the total amount expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of \$125 multiplied by the total number of recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (A) the number of individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled in the form of money payments for such month, plus (B) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to the permanently and totally disabled in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care); and

"(2) the total amount expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the plan."

(b) Section 1403(c) of such Act is repealed.

SEC. 106. (a) Section 1603(a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this title, for each quarter, an amount equal to 90 percent of—

"(1) The total amount expended during each month of such quarter as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to such month as exceeds the product of \$125 multiplied by the total number of recipients of such aid for

such month (which total number, for purposes of this subsection, means (A) the number of individuals who received such aid in the form of money payments for such month, plus (B) the number of other individuals with respect to whom expenditures were made in such month as aid to the aged, blind, or disabled in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care);

"(2) the total amount expended during such quarter as medical assistance for the aged under the State plan (including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof); and

"(3) the total amount expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.

(b) (1) Section 1602(a)(16)(C) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 1603 (a) (4) (A) (1) and (11)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1603(a)(3)".

(2) Section 1603(c) of such Act is repealed.

(3) Section 1902(a)(20)(C) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 1603 (a) (4) (A) (1) and (11)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1603(a)(3)".

SEC. 107. (a) Section 1903(a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary (except as otherwise provided in this section) shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this title, for each quarter, an amount equal to 90 percent of—

"(1) the total amount expended during such quarter as medical assistance under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI, or part A of title IV, and, except in the case of individuals 65 years of age or older who are not enrolled under part B of title XVIII, other insurance premiums for medical or any other type of remedial care or the cost thereof); plus

"(2) the total amount expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan."

(b) (1) Section 1903(c)(1) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "that the Federal medical assistance percentage for such State applicable to" and inserting in lieu thereof "that 90 percent of the total amount expended as medical assistance under the State plan, with respect to"; and

(B) by striking out "shall be the Federal medical assistance percentage (instead of the percentage determined under section 1905 (b) for such State" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall be substituted for 90 percent of the total amount expended as medical assistance under the State plan in applying subsection (a)(1) with respect to such State".

(2) Section 1905(b) of such Act is repealed.

SEC. 108. The amendments made by this title shall be effective with respect to expenditures made during calendar quarters beginning after December 31, 1969.

#### TITLE II—UNIFORM MINIMUM STANDARDS AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. (a) Section 2(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (12),

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (13) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (13) the following new paragraph:

"(14) provide, with respect to all individuals seeking or receiving assistance under the plan at any given time, for the application of the minimum standards and accept-

ance requirements promulgated and in effect at such time under section 1122."

(b) Section 402(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (22), and

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (23) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and (24) provide, with respect to all individuals seeking or receiving aid under the plan at any given time, for the application of the minimum standards and acceptance requirements promulgated and in effect at such time under section 1122."

(c) Section 1002(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (12), and

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (13) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and (14) provide, with respect to all individuals seeking or receiving aid under the plan at any given time, for the application of the minimum standards and acceptance requirements promulgated and in effect at such time under section 1122."

(d) Section 1402(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (11), and

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (12) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and (13) provide, with respect to all individuals seeking or receiving aid under the plan at a given time, for the application of a minimum standards and acceptance requirements promulgated and in effect at such time under section 1122."

(e) Section 1602(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (16),

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (17) the following new paragraph:

"(18) provide, with respect to all individuals seeking or receiving aid under the plan at any given time, for the application of the minimum standards and acceptance requirements promulgated and in effect at such time under section 1122."

(f) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to calendar quarters beginning after December 31, 1969.

SEC. 202. Title XI of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

#### "NATIONAL MINIMUM STANDARDS AND UNIFORM ACCEPTANCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 1122. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time (as provided in subsection (c)) determine and promulgate—

"(1) the minimum amount of aid or assistance which (with appropriate adjustments based on other income and resources as required by the relevant provisions of this Act) would have to be paid to eligible recipients under titles I, X, XIV, and XVI, and part A of title IV, and

"(2) the manner in which other income and resources shall be taken into account in determining need for aid or assistance under such titles and the other conditions which it might be appropriate to impose in determining eligibility for such aid or assistance,

in order to assure that the purposes of such titles are being carried out effectively and without discrimination between applicants and recipients in different States. The minimum standards determined and promulgated under paragraph (1), and the acceptance requirements determined and promulgated under paragraph (2), shall (subject to subsection (b)) apply uniformly and equally throughout the United States with respect to aid and assistance provided under State plans approved under such titles.

"(b) The minimum standards and acceptance requirements determined and promul-

gated under subsection (a), which shall take into account the full need of all recipients, may vary as between the several programs of aid or assistance involved to the extent necessary to take into account the different requirements of the classes of individuals to whom such programs respectively apply, and may vary as between individuals in different geographic areas to the extent necessary to take into account any differences between cost levels in such areas; but any such variations shall be designed only to prevent aid or assistance under the programs involved from being of greater net benefit to one individual or class of individuals than to another.

"(c) The minimum standards and acceptance requirements described in subsection (a) shall be promulgated by the Secretary between January 1 and March 31 of each year, beginning with the year 1970, and such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the four calendar quarters in the period beginning with the July 1 next succeeding such promulgation; except that the Secretary shall initially promulgate such standards and requirements as soon as possible after the enactment of this section and such initial promulgation shall be conclusive for the two calendar quarters in the period beginning January 1, 1970, and ending June 30, 1970."

SEC. 203. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, in the case of each State, from time to time determine the expenditures made during periods after December 31, 1969, under the plans of such State approved under titles I, X, XIV, and XVI, and part A of title IV, of the Social Security Act, which are necessitated by compliance with the new requirements under such titles imposed by the amendments made by this title, and shall pay to such State the amount of the expenditures so determined.

#### TITLE III—REPEAL OF AFDC FREEZE

SEC. 301. Section 403(d) of the Social Security Act is repealed.

### POSTAL RATE INCREASE

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the administration has proposed an increase in postal rates even though the third step of the rate increase approved in December 1967 has not yet gone into effect.

My own conviction, as I have stated before, is that we should not consider further increases in postal rates until we take some effective steps to bring about a reorganization of the postal system.

Our Post Office and Civil Service Committee now is conducting extensive hearings on postal reform and I believe that we will come up with comprehensive recommendations in the next few weeks. Although I do not accept all of the conclusions he has reached, I believe that the recent column by David Lawrence in the Washington, D.C., Star touches on many of the factors involved as we look at the postal rate schedule. Following is Mr. Lawrence's column:

#### POSTAL RATE RISE, MORE INFLATION (By David Lawrence)

The government does more to create inflation than is perhaps realized. Thus, the administration has just proposed to Congress an increase in postal rates. While many letters and other articles put in the mails are exchanged between individuals, a large proportion of the postal revenue is collected

from private businesses. As postal rates go up, the charges to the consumer have to be raised accordingly.

Perhaps the most unfortunate phase of the government's hike in postal rates is related to the discrimination that is practiced. A person may drop a letter in the mail box near his home addressed to a store or friend in the same city, but the postage stamp costs just as much as if the letter were going 3,000 miles away. There was a time when the Post Office Department made a lower charge for letters to addresses within a city, but this practice has been discontinued.

Even higher costs for letters or articles mailed to the Midwest or points across the continent by residents of the east would cause little resentment if prompt delivery were assured. But it takes a long time for some letters to reach destinations, and the increases in postage which have been made in recent years have not helped matters at all.

In fact, private companies now are carrying lots and lots of packages long distances so as to insure prompt delivery. But even when publications, for instance, are sent across the continent by private airplane or trucking service, they must then be delivered to a Post Office and the regular postage rates have to be paid just the same.

Such inequitable factors have been given little consideration by Congress. It costs, for instance, less in postage to send a newspaper or other publication by what is known as second-class mail. But the rates have been steadily moved up, and it now is proposed that they shall be raised another 20 percent in the next year. These increases will undoubtedly be passed on to the consumer, so the general public will have to pay more.

The printed word is, of course, fundamental in the educational process of the nation, and there are still vast numbers of citizens who get their basic information from the print media. But the public pays a relatively small amount, because advertising revenues are expected to meet the expense and provide a profit. This doesn't always happen, and many a publication of large circulation has gone out of business because it could not get enough advertising to sustain itself.

One of the principal reasons why the publications are having difficulties today is that their competitors—television and radio—are absorbing a large part of the advertising revenue in the country. Although radio and television companies collect hundreds of millions of dollars each year from advertising "commercials," they pay to the government only a small license fee for using the airwaves. The charge is \$75 to a radio station for three years and \$150 to a TV station for three years.

Today, too, as a large number of trains have been discontinued, transportation by rail of package mail has been substantially diminished, and anybody who prints a publication that has to be distributed across the land has to add to other cost the heavy expenses of using trucks and commercial airplane service in order to reach all parts of the country promptly. Many publishing companies also have to bear the cost of sorting the mail in advance and putting it in pouches to help get better delivery from the Post Office Department.

A publication pays a relatively uniform rate of postage for news and editorial sections but the postage cost for the advertising pages varies according to the distance from the mailing point. This runs up to four times more for delivery in one area than in another, and constitutes, in effect, a tax on advertising.

Many companies that deliver publications all over the United States would not object to the rates they are being charged if they could be assured of prompt delivery. But they wonder why their competitors in television and radio are immune from any government levies at all on the advertising they

distribute over the air through channels allocated to them by the Federal Communications Commission.

Meanwhile, as postal rates go up, prices of publications go up, and that's the story of inflation in America in many a business and industry.

### ONLY OURSELVES TO BLAME, BUT REASON MUST PREVAIL

#### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 20, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, millions of words have been written by editorial writers looking at the problem of violence on our campuses from every direction. Of all that I have read while studying this problem a recent editorial in the outstanding weekly newspaper, the Westbury Times, struck me as a solid assessment of the situation. The editor of this consistently high quality newspaper, Martin E. Weiss, correctly deplores the sometimes apathetic response to the mayhem on our campuses. At the same time Mr. Weiss makes the equally valid point that change brought about by violence and in disregard of the democratic process is unacceptable.

Because I regard Mr. Weiss' comments as quite probing I commend this editorial to my colleagues' attention and insert it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Westbury Times, May 8, 1969]

#### ONLY OURSELVES TO BLAME, BUT REASON MUST PREVAIL

Perhaps the most amazing thing about the protests, sit ins, lock-outs, strikes, building seizures and riots that have swept college campuses around the nation is the relative calm with which the public has greeted each new outburst.

It may well be that people have become inured to it all, but we suspect that the general attitude is simply one of laissez-faire.

In actuality, it is just such thinking that is the root cause of much of the problem.

Success and well-being have led far too many people to adopt the policy of letting someone else worry about the situation—but legislators, administrators, faculty, and law enforcement officials are no substitute for what is, too often, parental failure.

And, if we remain more interested in new cars, television sets, vacations, and all the other elements of pleasure, than in the message our young people are trying to get across, then we will have only ourselves to blame for that which will almost surely follow.

The other side of the coin is that no one person, nor any group of persons, is above the law. Moreover, college campuses are not sanctuaries meant to be inviolate from the dictates or mores of society.

If there is to be change, it must come through the democratic process—not at the end of a gun; if that which is wrong is to be righted, reason must prevail. Substituting one madness for another is insanity.

The inequities which exist, and our involvement in Vietnam, will not be ended by destroying the foundations of higher education. Rather, young people of serious intent will use their learning experience to provide themselves with the wisdom to make meaningful change.

They must, however, understand that if such change is to be lasting it must be obtained through the democratic process; that which is obtained through anarchy can be taken away in the same manner.