

JORDAN of Idaho, McGEE, METCALF, MOSS, STEVENS, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate from the close of business today until noon, Thursday next, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives and that they may be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that during the same period all committees be authorized to file reports, including all minority, individual, and supplemental views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate took an adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, Thursday, June 5, 1969.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 29, 1969, under authority of the order of the Senate of May 29, 1969:

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

William Henry Harrison, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, vice Jack Beaty, resigned.

William Scholl Whitehead, of Virginia, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, vice Herschel C. Lovelass, resigned.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Stephen Horn, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice John A. Hannah, resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEY

John P. Milanowski, of Michigan to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Michigan for the term of 4 years, vice Harold D. Beaton, resigning.

James M. Sullivan, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Justin J. Mahoney, resigning.

U.S. MARSHAL

Frank M. Dulan, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice James E. Byrne, Jr., resigned.

James W. Norton, Jr., of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years, vice Hugh Salter.

Walter J. Link, of North Dakota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of North Dakota for the term of 4 years, vice Anson J. Anderson.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2, 1969:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

John Conrad Clark, of North Carolina, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Murray L. Weidenbaum, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Hamer H. Budge, of Idaho, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1974, reappointment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW EEOC CHAIRMAN SUPPORTS INCREASED POWERS TO ENFORCE CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, equal opportunity for all Americans is a goal with which I am greatly concerned. During this and the preceding Congress I have introduced legislation to remedy a salient weakness in Federal civil rights law—the inability of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to enforce its decisions.

There is a pressing need for this legislation. Millions of our citizens still suffer under discriminatory employment practices that while prohibited, manage to survive because the relevant law has no teeth. As a result, these people see the Federal commitment to equal opportunity as empty, surely not a healthy situation in a democratic society.

Hopefully, a meaningful law will be passed. In the meantime, we have been assured that the limited powers presently available to EEOC will be vigorously implemented. William H. Brown III, the new EEOC Chairman, has forcefully indicated that despite recent political rumblings by some Members of Congress, he does not intend to soft-pedal the Commission's efforts. This is as it should be.

Mr. Brown's personal style combines the diplomatic and legal arts that are suitable to his position, and not inci-

dentally, will be absolutely necessary when the Commission gets "cease and desist" powers. His views were the subject of a very informative article in the Christian Science Monitor of May 21, which I include in the RECORD so that it will be available to all concerned. The article follows:

JOB BIAS CHIEF SETS RIGID GUIDES

(By Lya Shepard)

WASHINGTON.—If the public can expect anything from William Hill Brown III, the slender, soft-spoken Philadelphia lawyer insists, it is that "the law is going to be enforced—vigorously and fairly."

That sort of assurance hardly makes news when uttered by most federal agency heads. But the case of Mr. Brown is special.

The onetime postman and taxicab driver has just replaced tough-talking Clifford L. Alexander Jr. as chairman of the embattled Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. Alexander, target of Senate conservatives over alleged "harassment" of businessmen, never minced words in attacking job bias to which minority workers were subjected.

By contrast, the man tapped by President Nixon to head the five-member EEOC lacks the outgoing Democrat's fiery style, but not his fervor for civil-rights causes.

During an interview in his 12th-floor office near the White House, Mr. Brown indicated that his sense of EEOC priorities is very much in line with that of Commissioner Alexander.

"Too many times people in business have tended to equate the idea of hiring hardcore [unemployed] workers with 'equal employment,'" he said, gazing through a window at the Potomac and the faraway hills of Virginia.

"They've forgotten about the many, many thousands—if not the millions—who have been employed steadily at jobs without hope

of being upgraded. This is an area of prime concern to me."

Mr. Brown, now the holder of a \$38,000-a-year post, may have been recalling his own father who has worked as an elevator operator and starter in a Philadelphia department store for most of the past 40 years.

"So many times," he observed, "the businesses are willing to employ people at entry-level positions. But as you move up the ladder to skilled and white-collar positions, the percentage of minority workers drops off dramatically."

In its controversial Los Angeles hearings this March, the EEOC found what Mr. Brown terms "horrendous examples" of such black ceilings in the aerospace and filmmaking industries.

BARRIERS DEPLOYED

During these hearings even the mild-mannered Mr. Brown joined Mr. Alexander and Commissioner Vicente T. Ximenes in deploring the barriers facing blacks and Mexican-Americans.

"If you think you've done a good job," he scolded one television network spokesman, "then not only ABC but the country is in bad shape."

Last week in a Denver speech before electrical-power executives, the new EEOC chairman charged that the industry was "the worst employer of minorities of any industry grouping."

The same accusation was leveled a year ago. Since then, Mr. Brown said, "we have seen more motion than action by most of you, and I am not disposed to see another such year go by."

Though Mr. Brown is a Republican (appointed to the EEOC by President Johnson), Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen (R) of Illinois sought at first to block his confirmation. A meeting between the two men arranged by Sen. Hugh Scott (R) of Pennsylvania managed to persuade the GOP floor leader to relent.

Today Mr. Brown would like to strengthen the EEOC's structure in several ways. He says he has solid White House backing. "Just prior to the time I was sworn in," the new chairman recalled, "the President told me the commission would have the 100-percent support of his administration to do the job we were charged with doing."

Mr. Brown maintains that "the key thing" is the EEOC quest for "cease and desist" powers to back up its fact-finding efforts. The commission now must rely on the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division and the Labor Department's Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) to enforce the law.

"It's absolutely imperative that we have this power," the chairman says. He also hopes to coax Congress to grant a larger budget and staff for EEOC investigations.

At present, it takes the commission's field staff from 18 to 20 months to process a complaint—"much too long" in Mr. Brown's opinion.

A Brookings Institute report recently suggested that the Labor Department's OFCC should be transferred to the EEOC to end duplication and overlap. Mr. Brown said he would favor that step only if given the added personnel to perform the larger job.

CONSOLIDATION SUPPORTED

"We're already running shorthanded both in terms of money and people," he explained. "If we were to get any added obligations, we would need a substantial increase in budget and staff."

Yet the EEOC chairman admits that such a consolidation would muffle many of the red-tape complaints often voiced by businessmen.

Before Commissioner Alexander stepped down as chairman, he fired a broadside at the Justice Department for its slow start in filing "pattern or practice of resistance" suits. The criticism prompted Assistant Attorney General Jerris Leonard to suggest that it would be "morally wise and sound" for the Democrat to resign from the commission.

Mr. Brown was asked to comment on Mr. Leonard's remark. He responded by upholding "the inherent right of every public servant to be critical." But he gently reproved Mr. Alexander in the same breath.

"I think both Commissioner Alexander and Mr. Leonard have a right to be critical of each other, if they wish," he said, noting at the same time that his colleague's jab at the first three months of GOP civil-rights enforcement might have been thrown too soon.

"The more equitable thing to do," Mr. Brown contended, "would be to look at this administration a year from now to find out what it has done."

PETITIONS CONCERNING POLITICAL REPRESSION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have received several petitions signed by a number of teachers and students at the University of California concerning political repression in South Vietnam. I understand that the petitions originated with Dr. David Marr, a lecturer in Southeast Asian history at the university who served as an intelligence officer with the U.S. Marines in South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the petitions and the names of the signers be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REPRESSION IN SAIGON AND THE FATE OF PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

We, the undersigned University of California teachers and students call your attention to a number of acts of political repression engineered in the past three months by our "duly elected allies," the regime of Nguyen Van Thieu in Saigon. Some highlights include: smashing by police of a non-violent Christmas eve, 1968 Catholic peace procession; continuous harassment of Saigon University Student Union functions and long-term jailing of student leaders who favor an immediate cease-fire; recent sentencing of Thich Thien Minh, a popular Buddhist monk, and a number of young followers to terms from three to twenty years hard labor.

In addition to the undoubted (and hardly new) perversions of justice and humanity involved here, we consider such Saigon government actions to constitute a serious obstruction to negotiated peace in Paris. President Thieu *knows* how many Vietnamese want an immediate settlement, *knows* how small the chances are of his surviving politically the massive readjustments implicit in such a settlement, and is determined to prevent at all costs the re-emergence to his left of a significant urban coalition that can negotiate meaningfully with the NLF.

By condoning Thieu's actions, the United States is helping to condemn thousands more Americans and Vietnamese to bloody graves. We therefore call on President Nixon at minimum to send an official letter of diplomatic protest to President Thieu regarding the ongoing political repression. If this has no effect, we ask the U.S. Government to consider a temporary withholding of selected aid allocations to Saigon—until President Thieu perceives just how serious is the desire of the American people for Peace.

Martin Z. Rivlin, Jonathan Unger, Jonathan S. Grant, Martha M. Kendall, Orville Schell, David G. Marr, John M. Nicholl, Felicia Oldfather, Jeffrey G. Barlow, William S. Asper, Rochelle Weintraub.

Philip Daro, Dawn Urbans, Peter Parrish, Lance Arnes, Marvin C. Borden, Paul J. Grabawley, Dennis Fitzgerald, Ruben O. Collett, Spence Fried, Steven Miller, John Thomas Quinn.

Chris Jenkins, Joseph Fischer, Daniel S. Lev, Franz Schusmann, Carol Brosgart, David J. Baker, Margaret L. Lyon, Karin Lind Taylor, Fred L. Goss, Neely Karl Slinhard, Lawrence Christian.

Lucy Wren Turner, Robert ———, Brian Rennex, ———, Hati Cheirjocethere, Steven Goldfield, Leland Lena, Barbara E. Lena, Lee S. Bach, Roger W. Agay.

Phyllis O'Donnell, Norma Jacobs, Kathleen Gillerd, Murine Turret, Gene Goldenfeld, David Hern, Jane Sprague, Michael Duggan, Kendall Green, Pat Wolf, Rick Feinberg, Jonathan S. Grant, Rhonda Berry, Emily Bach.

KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Capt. John L. Nalls, and Pfc. Stephen M. Thompson, 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 articles in the RECORD:

CHEVY CHASE MARINE DIES—CAPT. JOHN L. NALLS IS KILLED IN VIET AIR COLLISION

WASHINGTON, May 20.—Capt. John L. Nalls, a Marine pilot from Chevy Chase, Md., was killed in a midair collision Sunday over the South China Sea the Department of Defense announced today.

Captain Nalls, who was 26, was killed when, as his fighter was being refueled by an air tanker, a helicopter crashed into the tanker. Seven other persons were killed.

He was the husband of the former Corrie van Hemert, a secretary in the office of Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (R. Md.). The couple lived at 4711 Cumberland avenue.

A native of Washington, Captain Nalls graduated from Woodrow Wilson High School there in 1960 and George Washington University in 1965. He played baseball in both high school and college.

He joined the Marine Corps in March, 1966, and went to Officers Candidate School in Quantico, Va., and then received flight training at Pensacola, Fla.

In addition to his wife, he is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James W. Nalls, of Washington; three sisters, Mrs. Patricia Dixon, of Rockville, Mrs. Janet E. Nazarian, of Glen Falls, N.Y., and Mrs. Mary Lou Baden, of Edgewater, Md., and two brothers, James W. Nalls, Jr., of Silver Spring, and Charles H. Nalls, of Washington.

A memorial service will be held at 3 P.M. Saturday at the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church.

VIET BLAST KILLS S. M. THOMPSON—MARINE PRIVATE DIES AFTER BLAZE SETS OFF SHELLS

Marine Pfc. Stephen M. Thompson, son of Mrs. Regina Traguocio, of 4028 Southclare road, was killed by an accidental explosion in Vietnam May 13, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

Private Thompson was trying to put out a trash fire when the blaze detonated some artillery shells. He suffered fragment wounds and third degree burns of the entire body.

The incident occurred at a fire support base about 25 miles south of Quang Tri where Private Thompson was stationed with the field artillery of the 3d Marine Division.

NATIVE OF BALTIMORE

A native of Baltimore, Private Thompson graduated from Herring Run Junior High School.

He worked in the records department of the Johns Hopkins Hospital before enlisting in the Marine Corps in September, 1967. He had been in Vietnam since September, 1968.

In addition to his mother, his survivors include five sisters, Mrs. Sheila Milligan, of Baltimore; Miss Mary Thompson, Miss Agnes Traguocio, Miss Phyllis Traguocio and Miss Toni Traguocio, all at home; a brother, Robert Thompson, of Baltimore, and his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Cacano, of Baltimore.

MADISON AVENUE READIES ATTACK ON INFLATION

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I recently read an article in the Los Angeles Times about the Advertising Council's plans for an intensive, nationwide advertising campaign against inflation. I looked with great care at the dateline on the newspaper, and it said May 19, 1969. I still think I may have been reading from a newspaper to be printed in 1984.

"The campaign," the story said, "will not tell consumers to slow down their spending, give advice to businessmen, campaign for renewal of the income surtax, tell workers to moderate wage demands, or blame the Vietnam war for inflation." No, Mr. Speaker, it will do none of these things. Instead, quoting Archie K. Davis, chairman of the Wachovia Bank & Trust Co. of Winston-Salem, N.C., the campaign "will condition the collective mind so that when something is done, they will know it will be to their best interests."

That is about the most frightening sentence I have read this year.

The Advertising Council, a "nonprofit" offshoot of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, is going to "condition the collective mind" so that when something—anything, I guess—is done about inflation, the "conditioned collective mind"—that means you and me and our constituents, Mr. Speaker—will simply warm up with delight, like one of Dr. Pavlov's conditioned dogs, drooling at the sound of a dinner bell, whether there is any food there or not.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholly with the Advertising Council that inflation is a bad thing. But I think it is very frightening when tax-exempt funds are to be used to "condition" the American people to accepting whatever they are told will fight inflation.

The newspaper story continues:

Coincidentally, this mind conditioning effort is getting underway at a time when the Nixon administration is opening its campaign to win congressional approval for renewing the surtax passed last year as an anti-inflationary weapon.

The newspaper reporter's use of the word "coincidentally" suggests he may not have had the experience some of us have had with the splendid understanding and rapport that exists between the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Advertising Council's parent organization and the present administration.

I do not care how anyone feels about the surtax—whether one agrees with candidate Nixon that it ought to be repealed, or with President Nixon that it ought to be made permanent. That is a matter of judgment, on which honest men will differ. But I feel very deeply that the American people and their Congress should be left free to make up their own minds about what they want to do about inflation, whether they want to continue the surtax, or perhaps cut back on the high interest rates that have themselves become a major cause of current increases in the high cost of living, or whatever. I certainly think we should be wary of attempts to "condition" the public mind so that any measure that is described as "anti-inflation" will get some kind of automatic knee-jerk reaction of approval.

One of the most dangerous trends in the politics of this Nation has been the tendency—and it has been equally visible on the right and on the left—for a few people to decide for themselves what specific measures are needed to serve a broadly approved goal, and then to proceed to denounce anyone who does not accept those tactics as being against the goal. The extremist right-wing says it

is "for patriotism" as all of us, indeed, are, and then denounces anyone who does not share the ultra-right wing's specific views on what is patriotic as being "against patriotism." The New Left decides that almost anything that can be done to end racism is "inadequate," and so it proceeds to denounce anyone who advocates any such steps as "racist." Now along comes the Advertising Council seeking to implant in everyone's mind a laudable dislike for "inflation," and "coincidentally" along comes the Nixon administration with a tax measure it supports as "anti-inflationary." I will not delve into the intentions of the Advertising Council, Mr. Speaker; I will ask only if the effect of the Advertising Council's "conditioning" program would not be to make impossible opposition to any proposal adequately ballyhooed as "anti-inflationary."

There is a splendid story told about Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln once asked a friend, "If we agree that 'dog' means 'horse,' can we say that you rode to town today on a dog?"

When his friend answered that, under those conditions, he could indeed agree that he had ridden to town on a dog. Lincoln pointed out, "I don't think so you and I can't change a horse into a dog just by saying so."

In an age of highly sophisticated advertising techniques, it becomes dangerously possible to change a horse into a dog by just saying so. In such an age, proposals like that of the Advertising Council are deeply disturbing indeed.

I include the article entitled "Madison Avenue Readies Attack on Inflation" at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 19, 1969]
PRIVATE, FEDERAL DRIVES DOVETAIL: MADISON AVENUE READIES ATTACK ON INFLATION

(By Murray Seeger)

WASHINGTON.—Like litter in the streets, forest fires and automobile accidents, inflation is to be a target of a million dollar advertising campaign.

"We have done Savings Bonds, Zip Code and Smokey the Bear," Robert P. Keim, president of the non-profit Advertising Council, reminded reporters at the White House.

Now, with a budget of \$8 to \$10 million in donated air time and print space, the Advertising Council will take on "inflation, the current form of economic instability."

"This will be a good tough one for us," Keim said.

The council is a 26-year-old industry-supported organization that conducts public service advertising campaigns.

Although Keim and a committee supporting the new project were introduced by Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy after meeting with President Nixon, the council stressed that this is not a federal program. The President issued a statement in conjunction with the council's announcement reiterating his position that "we can cool inflation only if we deal with fundamentals."

In addition, Mr. Nixon said, "We must curb 'inflation psychology.' When people understand what is behind the sharply rising cost of living, they see that tax measures essential for a strong budget are better than the cruel tax of inflation." He said he did "indeed welcome" the advertising campaign.

CONDITIONING PROCESS

The campaign will not tell consumers to slow down their spending, give advice to businessmen, campaign for renewal of the

income surtax, tell workers to moderate wage demands, or blame the Vietnam war for inflation.

Instead, it "will condition the collective mind so that when something is done, they will know it will be to their best interests," said Archie K. Davis, chairman of the Wachovia Bank and Trust Co., Winston-Salem, N.C., and also chairman of the National Chamber Foundation.

An offshoot of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the foundation is paying for a five-year economic education program prepared by the Joint Council on Economic Education. The Advertising Council will carry the message of that program to the public.

Coincidentally, this mind conditioning effort is getting under way at a time when the Nixon Administration is opening its campaign to win congressional approval for renewing the surtax passed last year as an anti-inflationary weapon.

The Administration's economic "troika," Secretary Kennedy, Budget Director Robert P. Mayo and chief presidential economic adviser Paul W. McCracken, have been invited to appear before the House Ways and Means Committee Tuesday for the first time since they took office.

At that time, they will plead for the Administration's plan to continue the full 10% surtax beyond its June 30 expiration date until Dec. 30. It would then fall to 5% for the next six months.

Still, according to congressional sources, the Administration will have a tough fight on its hands to win renewal of the surtax.

Some liberal members of Congress are insisting on action to reform the tax laws before the surcharge is moved. But the official view is that the attitude is a blind.

To counter this attitude, the Administration is beginning to step up its anti-inflation public relations campaign. Herbert Stein, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, made a new speech on the subject Thursday. Three Cabinet members, Kennedy, Labor Secretary George P. Shultz and Commerce Secretary Maurice H. Stans, made similar pleas during the last week.

Previously, the Administration had concentrated on setting what it considered the proper policy lines for slowing down economic activity and removing inflationary pressures. It avoided the type of public exhortations common to the Johnson Administration.

SERVICE TO THE BLIND

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Hammond, Ind., Times recently carried an article telling of the unusual service to the blind which my constituents, Dr. and Mrs. Ray Sanders, of Lansing, Ill., have developed.

At a time when international and national news media continually focus on the radical and ruthless elements of society, it is refreshing to read about a humanitarian project of this type.

The article follows:

GIFT TO SPOUSE CREATES "TAPESPENDENTS"

(By Edith Ladick)

Little did Mrs. Raymond Sanders realize four years ago when she gave her husband a tape recorder that the gift would completely monopolize her free time and give a new dimension to her life.

Mrs. Sanders was recently appointed assistant director of the newly formed Blind

and Handicapped Division of Anselm World Tape Forum. Its aim is to develop friendships all over the world.

It is part of Anselm Forum, Inc., formed 37 years ago to further human relations and is directed by Reuben Olson of Gary, Indiana.

Mrs. Sanders is presently taping with 30 blind and handicapped "tapespondents."

In 1966 Dr. and Mrs. Sanders visited the Middle East and developed a professional colored slide show in three 40-minute sections, complete with appropriate background music and commentary. Tape and slide shows were also developed from their 1967 trip to Spain, Portugal, and Morocco and 1968 trip to Great Britain. The shows are sent all over the country and shown throughout the Calumet area to clubs, churches, and schools as well as in their home at 3328 S. Manor Drive.

Dr. Sanders, who is an osteopathic physician in Schererville, designed a projection room in the basement of their home where as many as 27 have been seated comfortably. The projection screen is hung permanently in front of the room.

Dr. Sanders has also built a control panel at the side of the projection room to operate the lighting, slide projector, and tape recorder simultaneously. He has remodeled another room in the basement into a tape recording studio, complete with tape library. The library contains tapes which are not erased. Of particular interest to the blind are the tapes of Harold Ewins of Capetown, South Africa. They have sounds of jungle animals, capture of an elephant, and sea gulls fluttering above the water. Another are the tapes of Nellie Sweeney, New South Wales, Australia, blind singer, organist, and composer. She plans to publish her own hymn book.

The Sanders have made many other friends through taping. After viewing a tape slide show of Weymouth, England, they decided to include the area in their tour last summer. A tape was sent to Eric Stillwell, overseas representative of the Indiana Recording Club. He opened his home to them and was their guide on Labor Day weekend. Mrs. Sanders contributes taped material for his monthly taped magazine to the blind.

Palm Banks, blind tape enthusiast in Decatur, Georgia, played Santa Claus at Christmas for Mrs. Sanders' mother, Mrs. Olga Carlson. She took the many knitted socks made by Mrs. Carlson to the Home for Handicapped Children in Decatur.

Mrs. Sanders received a letter this week from Frank Senn, Jr., blind organist at the Holiday Inn of Buffalo, New York. After hearing her sing on tape, Senn wants to play the organ on tape, send it to Mrs. Sanders, and have her add the singing.

Mrs. Sanders has sung with the Merchandise Mart Chorus, Trinity Evangelical Covenant Church Choir, and the Aristocrats of Song. She is an international judge and member of Sweet Adelines, Inc., women's barber-shop harmony group.

In addition, Mrs. Sanders is quite creative and has numerous handcraft projects, but her first love is serving the blind and the handicapped.

RETIREMENT OF CHARLES L. VICKERS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, Mr. Charles L. Vickers will retire as general manager of the Port of Long Beach, a post he has held for the past 11 years. During the time he has been in his present position, the port has experi-

enced the greatest growth in its 58-year history in both physical development and cargo movements, going from 7 million tons 11 years ago to nearly 20 million tons in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Charlie Vickers for 45 years to dedicated service and leadership in building the Port of Long Beach into the world's most modern port.

Charlie was born in Ethan, S. Dak. He came to Long Beach when he was of high school age, attending Poly High School.

When he first came to work in the harbor, silt was still being dredged out of the entrance channel from the devastating 1913, 1914, and 1916 floods in the Los Angeles River. Back then, the port only had one wooden pier with two berths on it. Now it has 60 deepwater berths.

During his early years in the port, Charlie was employed by the city and the Army Engineers, working on beach erosion problems, dredging, breakwater construction, shoreline contours, and surveying.

From 1937 on he rose successfully from surveyor, assistant harbor engineer, assistant general manager, and to general manager in 1958.

Perhaps, the most dramatic way to describe how the port has developed over the years he has served is to say that in the early days it was hard put to handle an 11,000-ton oil tanker drawing 25 feet of water. Today it can handle supertankers weighing over 100,000 tons and drawing 50 feet of water.

The Port of Long Beach's top executive has a broad engineering background and his thinking is international in scope.

By increasing the size of the port and by providing the most modern facilities obtainable, it attracts more shipping. This increases imports and exports, which in turn raise the annual income of everyone directly and indirectly involved in world trade.

This is especially true in the Pacific Basin area where the majority of our foreign trade is generated. So in developing the port, it has helped hundreds of millions of people to raise their standards of living.

Vickers has served as a director of the Long Beach Community Hospital, International Association of Ports and Harbors, Community Chest, and has been president of the Los Angeles-Long Beach Propeller Club, World Trade Week, and first vice president of the California Association of Port Authorities.

He was made a knight in the Order of Leopold II by the Belgium Government, a member of the National Defense Executive Reserve, Local 13 of the ILWU honored him as the City of Hope Man of the Year.

His successor will be the port's assistant general manager, Thomas J. Thorley. We wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my personal congratulations to Charlie Vickers for all he has done for the port, the city of Long Beach, the State of California, and the Nation. I wish him a pleasant retirement.

DRISKILL ERA ENDING

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Capitol Historical Society, I have more than a passing interest in preserving the history and traditions of the Nation's Capital.

This interest has quite naturally spilled over into a separate, but related, field. There is in Austin, Tex., a building that has been a part of the history of my district since 1886—I refer to the fabulous and old Driskill Hotel. This magnificent old building, fittingly marked with a plaque and medallion designating it a historic Texas landmark, this fine reminder of our past may be torn down. It may even be leveled and a gleaming, antiseptic parking garage erected in the spot where history once dwelled.

The Driskill closed today. No more rooms are to be rented. The hotel was to be closed earlier, but was kept open in deference to the Texas legislators and lobbyists who have resided there during the current legislative session. But the Texas Legislature said they would adjourn sine die today—and so did the Driskill.

It is a pity. This grand old lady has been hostess to a President, scores of Governors, even more legislators, hordes of reporters, lobbyists, and socialites of eight decades.

Part of the first floor will remain open for an indefinite period—just the essentials: The barbershop, two private clubs, and a few offices. But the elegant charm of a bygone era may be lost forever.

On a typical day, the Governor of Texas can be found breakfasting in the elegant dining room. A score of the wiser reporters are nearby waiting for some big news of the day.

In the past, inaugural balls have been staged here for Gov. Preston Smith, Gov. William P. Hobby, Gov. Miriam Ferguson, and Gov. Dan Moody.

Many a political caucus has been held here and much of the legislative history of Texas written within its walls.

An early historian wrote:

Governors have walked through its lobby arm in arm with legislators and confidential advisors on their way to conferences at which grave problems of state were resolved or more seriously complicated.

Among the historic decor of the old hotel are the eight mirrors which Emperor Maximilian ordered as a gift for his wife, Carlotta. The gold leaf framed mirrors were to hang on the walls of Chapultepec Castle in Mexico. Maximilian was executed and Carlotta died in Europe. The mirrors now hang in the Maximilian room, which was specially designed for them.

An Austin historian, Mary Starr Barkley, once said:

Probably no place in the Austin area is more heaped with history than the Driskill Hotel.

Financial troubles, which have plagued the hotel since its opening, have become too burdensome. The managers of the hotel would keep it open if they could, but the daily operations have become daily losses. They have treated their help right, however, in closing the hotel. Over \$200,000 was spent in severance pay—but that is little consolation for people who have invested their lives in that romanque structure.

For example, we might lose one of Austin's finest gentlemen—Theodore Youngblood. About 46 years ago, Youngblood became a busboy at the Driskill while he tried to support two boys, a wife, and attend college in the same breath. Youngblood made it fine—his boys have both graduated, his wife is still by his side, and he is now the supervisor of the hotel's party and banquet service.

He may also be out of a job now.

This is a nostalgic pill for a man who was once the only man the Secret Service would let enter the President's quarters.

There is a faint breath of optimism in the wind. A save-the-Driskill group has been organized and an Austin architect, Max Brooks, is doing his best to save the hotel from the bulldozer and the sledge hammer.

He only needs two things: Public support and money. Public support can be mustered because the hotel is loved by nearly all Austin natives and visitors. The money may be another story altogether.

If the Driskill goes, I want it to be remembered. Once it was called the finest hotel south and west of St. Louis. It could be again.

I hope so. The hotel was closed once before. During those troubled times, one faithful employee kept a key to the front door. I wish I knew where that man could be found today.

RESOLUTION AGAINST THE ABM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the New York City Council recently received a resolution, with broad sponsorship, against the construction of the ABM. The sponsors of this resolution represent many communities and neighborhoods within New York City. They respond, I believe, to the growing determination of the citizens of New York, and other cities, that popular expression of views on national policy must be organized and effectively directed to elected public officials.

I welcome this initiative by New York City and its representatives. I hope the Congress will respond by a decisive rejection of the ABM.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 1959

Resolution by the City Council of The City of New York Calling Upon the Congress of the United States to Refrain from Appropriating the Funds Necessary for the Deployment of the Safeguard Missile Sys-

tem and urging that the monies saved by Such Action be Spent Towards the Promotion of Equal Opportunity and Social Harmony within Our Nation's Cities

(By Messrs. Manes, Bernstein, Weiss, Merola, Mrs. Greitzer, Friedland, Low, Katzman, Lazar, Moskowitz, Scholnick, Knigin, Lebron, Sadowsky, Cohen, Rios, Sharison, Thompson, Maze.)

Whereas, The cost of the recent presidential decision to deploy the Sentinel Anti-Missile system is conservatively estimated at \$6,000,000,000 to \$7,000,000,000 and

Whereas, The system has provoked considerable disagreement as to both its technical feasibility and political desirability and

Whereas, The Defense Department has exhibited a history of spending billions of dollars on weapon systems that become obsolete before they are completed and

Whereas, It is universally accepted that millions of Americans are daily faced with a multitude of problems that severely limit their present and future well being and

Whereas, An enlightened government has the responsibility to endeavor to provide equal opportunity for all of its citizens and

Whereas, The greatest danger facing the United States is the slow disintegration and polarization of our Nation's social framework, and

Whereas, Needed economic and social programs within our Cities are not properly funded or are non-existent and

Whereas, This intended deployment will only further siphon off funds badly needed for our Cities and

Whereas, It will be more practical as well as morally correct for our national government to make the commitment needed to eliminate social imperfections before our nation's flaws become its permanent failures and

Whereas, The deployment of these systems may abrogate a portion of the newly ratified treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the City Council of The City of New York does respectfully call upon the Congress of the United States to refrain from appropriating the funds necessary for the deployment of the Sentinel Missile System and be it further

Resolved, That the City Council urges that money saved on this action be spent towards the promotion of equal opportunity, social harmony and badly needed capital projects within the Cities of our nation.

Referred to the Committee on General Welfare.

MEAT CUTTERS' UNION SEEKS TAX REFORM

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Executive Board of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, has issued a strong policy statement on tax reform legislation. This 500,000-member food industry labor union emphasizes the inequities in the present tax system and points out that "it asks sacrifice of those Americans least able to provide it."

I want to congratulate the executive board of this important union for its stand and action. I know from my past work with the Amalgamated—especially in the battle against the Mexican farm

labor importation program—that it is a determined group which will fight against great odds until it wins.

Mr. Speaker, I include the policy statement on tax reform of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, in the RECORD:

POLICY STATEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN (AFL-CIO) CONCERNING TAX REFORM, APRIL 29, 1969

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO) has long called for actions to correct the inequities and injustices of the existing federal, state and local tax systems. We have long urged (1) the closing of loopholes, which allow the rich to escape their fair share of payments, and (2) the reduction of low and middle income rates, which impose special hardships on wage earners.

At long last, the nation is aroused about tax inequities. A "taxpayer's revolt" is in progress. Increasingly, a large number of Americans are seeking tax reform.

We are delighted with these developments. We fully support the hard-hitting letter which our Union's Executive Officers, President Thomas J. Lloyd and Secretary-Treasurer Patrick E. Gorman, sent to Chairman Wilbur D. Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee. It is an important and forthright statement of the views of our Union. We urge the Committee to heed the proposals of the letter.

The present tax system represents nothing short of robbery of wage and salary earners. It asks sacrifice of those Americans least able to provide it. It bestows tax benefits and credits upon those Americans who have the greatest means to meet their tax responsibilities.

It literally undermines other national policies established by the President and Congress concerning the economy, agriculture, poverty and urban reconstruction. It undermines the citizen's belief in justice and his adherence to law and order.

The time for change is now.

We urge Congress to overhaul completely the tax system by eliminating every single loophole which distorts the tax structure in favor of corporations and the upper income brackets. This includes the investment credit, oil and resource depletion, hobby farms, capital gains, real estate, and other gimmicks.

We urge Congress to reduce the tax burden shouldered by lower and middle income families.

We urge Congress not to renew the surtax unless tax reform legislation is previously enacted.

We urge state and local governments to reconsider their tax laws and to make them just and equitable. (In many cases, these tax structures are even worse than the federal one. Some states and communities, in fact, depend largely on the tremendously retrogressive sales tax.)

The Amalgamated recognizes that wishing changes will not make them come about. Action is necessary. Our Union has worked and will continue to work to make tax reform a reality.

We therefore instruct our Washington Office to continue the campaign for tax reform in collaboration with the AFL-CIO and other Unions and allied Organizations. To support the efforts of the International Union, we strongly urge our Local Unions:

1. To conduct meetings and forums among their members and other interested citizens on the injustices of the present tax system and the need for tax reform, and

2. To accelerate sharply the letter writing campaigns now underway to Congressmen and Senators urging the speedy enactment of thorough-going and meaningful tax reform.

ON CITIZENSHIP, PATRIOTISM

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that violent actions and so-called nonnegotiable vocal demands of some of our young people receive widespread publicity, while all too often discerning and perceptive dissertations by other young people get comparatively little notice.

A few days ago a senior from James Blair High School in Williamsburg, Va., Mills A. Bradshaw, Jr., presented a penetrating analysis of the general unrest being evidenced by members of the younger generation. The occasion for his remarks was an assembly program at Oak Hill Academy, a small Baptist-operated secondary school in Grayson County, Va.

Young Bradshaw's remarks were considered of such import the editor of the local newspaper, the Galax Gazette, reprinted the speech in full. I concur in the editor's thinking and feel this young high school senior's remarks are deserving of even wider distribution and include them in the RECORD:

ON CITIZENSHIP, PATRIOTISM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Last Friday at Oak Hill Academy, Mills A. Bradshaw, Jr., a senior at Williamsburg's James Blair High School, spoke at the Oak Hill Academy assembly on "Citizenship and Patriotism." He was introduced by Richard C. Gwathmey, of Brington, Va., Commissioner of Revenue of King and Queen County and whose daughter, Emmi, attends Oak Hill. Because of the pertinence of the talk, The Gazette reprints it in full.)

(By Mills A. Bradshaw)

Not too many months ago we read in the newspaper about a group of individuals who became dissatisfied with the conditions under which they were living. It was a group of Negroes in Watts. They were living in poverty and they blamed their condition on society as a whole. They demanded a change and when it didn't come they used violence. They rioted and burned and looted and killed. When I read about it I condemned them.

Another time it was a group in Detroit. When I read about their rioting I condemned them. Another time it was a group of students in Berkeley, California. They were dissatisfied with the role of the students. They wanted a greater role in governing the campus. They protested, they demonstrated, and they seized control of the administration building. When I read about them I condemned their actions.

It happened again at Columbia University, Duke and Cornell and many more colleges across the nation. When I read of these, I was angered at their demonstrations. Another time it happened at Concord in New England. These protesters were dissatisfied with their government and in the end tried to overthrow it. They protested and even used gunfire to win their cause. The administration they were overthrowing was King George of England and the year was 1776. When I read about them I couldn't condemn these dissenters; they founded our mighty nation.

It was a confrontation similar to this that I came against when I met at Williamsburg with the Student Burgesses. The theme for the conference was Patriot and Protester—Can we be Both? Here I was, condemning the dissenters of today and yet my country was founded by dissenters in an age of protest.

I was sure that I was in favor of the protest and even violence our forefathers resorted to, and I was just as certain that I was against the rioters and protesters of today. But the circumstances seemed similar so I had to decide what justified protesting and what were the limits to protest techniques.

After considerable thought I came across three basic differences between the American Revolution protest and many of those we see today. The first is the cause being fought for. In the Revolutionary War the cause was one of basic political freedom. The colonists had been taxed without having a voice in the government. They had been forced to feed and house soldiers placed in the colonies against the desires of the colonists. Their commerce was restricted by taxes and finally by the closing by the king of one of their harbors. They were restricted from voicing their opinions about their government. Basic freedoms that I wouldn't hesitate to protest for.

Each of these is a political freedom necessary for the very existence of democratic principles and they aren't petty violations of total freedom. Our society wouldn't survive if we weren't able to vote at least indirectly on our taxes, if we were forced against our will to provide food and shelter for troops in our homeland that we didn't request, if we were not able to trade with other nations because of unbearable taxation, or if we were unable to vocally express our thoughts on our government.

Looking at the racial disturbances we see slightly different causes. The National Advisory commission on Civil Disorders blames most of them on "frustrations of powerlessness". In other words, many of the rioters felt that they couldn't change their present status. They felt unable to get out of poverty, unable to gain the respect of the nation, unable to get a decent job. They felt unable to get a proper education. From their frustrations they turned to violence. But freedom from frustration is not a basic political freedom. Our constitution doesn't provide for a guaranteed good job, it doesn't guarantee freedom from poverty, it doesn't guarantee a good education. Our society provides the opportunity for all of these but they aren't basic political rights.

Looking now at student revolts we get even further from basic freedoms. Most of the student protests in high schools center around dress codes. Students complain because the administration won't allow long hair or short skirts. They complain that their right to freedom of expression is being violated. Perhaps by not too great a stretch of the imagination we can agree that total freedom of expression is not being allowed. This is where we have to consider what freedoms and expressions of freedom are worth fighting for.

Some individuals argue that we should proscribe the exercise of First Amendment rights and not merely tolerate it. In other words we should encourage people to do whatever can be justified as exercising the rights of free speech, free press, freedom of religion and so on, and not just put up with people who do this. It seems to me that this is an attitude of: do everything you can get away with. Just try to imagine what would happen if everyone tried to practice whatever he could justify as freedom of expression. Our soldiers in Vietnam would be unable to fight because the long hair would be in their eyes, we wouldn't have many students in school because they would all be off expressing themselves at the beach, and our parents could be expressing themselves by boozing it up in the middle of mainstreet every night.

We certainly don't want to see how far we can stretch our rights, we just want to protect our basic rights. If the only complaint students have is the dress restrictions they should be thankful.

More recently on the college level the complaints have centered around the fact that students don't have a major voice in school

administration. They complain because they can't set up the school curriculum and they can't help hire and fire teachers. But what basic freedom is being violated here? I don't remember anywhere in the Constitution where I was given the right to choose what teachers I wanted to teach me and what I wanted to hear them talk about. Each student has the choice of what college he wants to attend. If he doesn't like the instructors or the influence of the students at any institution he doesn't have to go there. He should consider himself fortunate to have been accepted at the college of his choice and he should abide by the rules that he asked to live under as a student at that institution.

The student revolts aren't in defense of any basic political freedom.

The second difference is the methods used before violence was resorted to. Before the American revolution our colonial fathers sent emissaries to the king asking him to give them the rights of all Englishmen. They sent letters requesting the same. All these were ignored. They sent stronger notes and finally boycotted English goods. They formed Committees of Correspondence to explain to people their complaints and reasons for their protest. Finally when the king sent troops against them they used force in return.

Generally speaking, we didn't see a similar restraint before the racial disturbances. Many of them began without the general public even knowing that a problem existed. To my knowledge, peaceful means were often neglected and demands and violence were the starting point.

Student revolts are often similar. They begin by demanding specific changes and if they don't come immediately violence does.

I have to speak in generalities here because some of the student protests have come only after exhausting any other means of action. The same is true in many of the racial disturbances and if we look closely even our colonial forefathers used unnecessary violence. There was no compelling reason for them to have the Boston Tea Party. They could have peacefully just refused to purchase the tea rather than destroy it.

What I'm suggesting is "Don't fight the administration; use it." If you can accomplish your objective by legal, peaceful means don't resort to violence. The success of your mission will often depend on it. Use tactics that won't alienate the crowd if possible. Supposing I had a date this weekend and since I live in Norge, which is ten miles from anything, I would need the car. Would I go up to my Dad and say, "Dad, give me the car or I'll put sand in your gastank." You can bet your life I wouldn't. Even if I had needed the car to go get him a birthday gift, if I go about it that way I'll never get the car. Instead of that I'd use the line of least resistance. "Dad, you remember Karen, the girl who thinks your mustache look's so neat? How about loaning me the car, so I can take her out this weekend? And if you want me to clean up the yard for you I'll be free all Saturday morning."

It's just common sense to use a bit of diplomacy along the line of least resistance.

The third difference is the respect each group gave to the rights of others. In the American Revolution only rarely did the colonists infringe upon the rights of others. With the Boston Tea Party they destroyed the property of some merchants whom they didn't agree with. But for the main part they only protected their own rights. They defended their homes, and only destroyed in self-defense when attacked. They remained within their own lands, they didn't disrupt other lands.

Our racial disturbances certainly didn't follow this standard. The looting and burning that took place wasn't in protection of anyone's rights. It was a grave infringement upon the rights of others. And the students aren't following the rules, either. They occupy buildings, they destroy records, they block

traffic, they deface public property. What rights are they defending? None at all. In fact they go so far as to deny others the right to protest. Just last month we read about some students from the University of Virginia who were demonstrating on the lawn of the Capitol in Richmond. In and of itself this was not illegal although it didn't gain much support for giving 18-year-olds the right to vote. The problem was that when some pages came out to demonstrate in favor of the current administration, they wouldn't allow it. The student demonstrators attempted to tear down the banners of the pages. They not only wanted to exercise their rights to the fullest extent but they wanted to deprive all others of this same right.

There's the old adage: "A friend is a friend to the end of my nose." But as soon as he steps on my rights he has lost my support. If more dissenters would remember this they would be a lot more successful and a lot more popular.

And a lot of the things people are demonstrating for would not violate the rights of others.

Protest is justified for protection of our basic rights if we can't achieve our objective peaceably and so long as we don't violate the rights of others. The only problem is, how do we know which rights are basic? What we can do without violence? and what the rights of others are? Perhaps the protesting students think that the right to decide what they want to wear and hear in class is a basic right; maybe the poor think it's a government responsibility to provide food, clothing and shelter for them, maybe students don't realize they can have an administration voice legally by evaluating the teachers responsibly and informing the administration, maybe they don't know what restrictions there are at college and that they can choose what college they want to attend. Maybe the poor don't know that they can elect candidates to office, receive job training, help themselves under the present system. Maybe students don't know they are violating another's rights when they destroy records, occupy buildings, and block traffic; maybe rioters don't know they are violating another's rights when they loot and burn.

This is where we find a job to do. If people don't know what their basic rights are, if they don't know how to effect a change peaceably and legally and if they don't know the rights of others we can't expect them to act responsibly.

"Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern but impossible to enslave." This is why we must educate ourselves and help to educate others. We need this education not just in how our government works but in all skills. Anyone who does receive a good education will understand his role in society, he will have the knowledge and skill necessary to obtain a good job and keep out of poverty. He won't have reason to riot and loot and burn. If he has a good education he will know how to correct evils in our society without using violence.

"Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern but impossible to enslave."

THE POSTAL CORPORATION

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was most interesting to read in the June 4, 1969, issue of the Federal Times an editorial entitled "The Postal Corporation." I am

CXV—915—Part 11

confident it will be of interest to my colleagues since it points out some of the pitfalls embodied in the administration bill we received last week regarding the conversion of the Post Office to the postal service.

I sincerely hope my colleagues, especially those who may have been misled by some of the administration propaganda, will take time to study this editorial carefully.

THE POSTAL CORPORATION

The plan to turn the post office into a corporation again is in the limelight. It is there because it is politically expedient for this course of action at this time.

The needs and the problems of the post office are growing. The public is demanding more and better service. The postal employees are tired of poor working conditions and substandard salary levels.

The Congress is in a quandary. Legislators know they will face the wrath of the voters if they try to put through additional postage rate increases at this time.

The easiest way for them to get rid of the problem is to pass it on to someone else. Thus, the postal corporation looms as a possible answer.

The corporation could raise postal rates and trim service. The public could complain, but the complaints would have far less effect than they now have when directed at the congressmen.

Just how effective would a corporation be in actually solving the problems and improving the service? We doubt it could contribute much.

The basic need of the postal service is money—scads and scads of money. A switch to a corporate structure is not going to reduce this need. On the contrary, it could increase it substantially.

It has been the refusal of Congress to provide the funds in the past which has created many of the problems the department faces today.

Advocates of the corporation plan talk of the need for modernization and automation. This is not a new concept. We had experimental post offices and "test periods" on new equipment decades ago. Some of the "test equipment" still is in the test stage because the money was not available to put it into widespread use.

If the corporation is unable to get the money from the congress, it will have to turn to the only other source—the mail user. The effort to turn mail delivery from a service to the public into a service which can at least break even financially is bound to bring major rate hikes.

Recent testimony before a congressional committee put the amount needed for modernization at five billion dollars.

Former deputy postmaster general Fred Belen summed up the problem beautifully in his appearance before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

He said: "Change of name or skeletal form will not result in the change or disappearance of the problems which result primarily from growth rates. The postal system will take its problems with it regardless of where it goes, what it is called, or who heads it."

There is no magic in a corporation plan which will answer this. If more money and better management is the need, why not provide it within the framework of the present structure, or at least in a modification of the present system?

Congress ought to ignore the political pressures and face up to its responsibility to provide the nation with an adequate postal service. Instead, it seems to be leaning toward finding a convenient dumping ground to bury the problem.

The answer is not simple. The cost of the Vietnam War is staggering. The demand for

domestic anti-poverty programs is compelling—and will have to be met. The congress will have to decide the priority it wants to put on postal service. And, the growing mail load makes it urgent that the decision be made now.

Further complicating the proposed transfer is the matter of the post office share of the retirement fund deficit. Who will pick up the tab for it?

Construction costs are immense. Even if the new corporation inherits all of the existing real estate, it still will be faced with a huge building program to eliminate the deplorable old buildings and accommodate the burgeoning mail volume.

In the light of all these problems, we do not feel that the change to a postal corporation would be the best course of action—at least, not for the present.

OMNES ESTES SIGNIFICANTES— DEAN CARLSON MAKES EVERY- ONE FEEL IMPORTANT

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for more than a quarter of a century, Dean Wallin J. Carlson, better known to generations of students as "Dean C," has served as registrar for Chico State College. In this impersonal era of statistics, computers, and numbers, Dean Carlson had the warm personal ability to treat people as individuals, as important individuals.

Dean Carlson is retiring and I want to join his many friends in paying respect for the wonderful job he has done over the years and to wish him well for the future.

No better tribute to this outstanding man can be made than that which was made by the Chico Enterprise-Record. So that this may be shared with my colleagues, I include the Enterprise-Record editorial, entitled "Omnes Estes Significantes," in the RECORD at this point:

OMNES ESTES SIGNIFICANTES

Down through the years, one of the hardest things about going to college always has been "getting in." For millions of young people throughout the nation, the period between high school graduation and actually sitting down in a classroom as a bona fide college student has been one of great nervous strain.

The tension and worry always has been enhanced, of course, by what youngsters describe as "the cold, impersonal, mathematics-like nature of the process of application, acceptance and registration."

We've had youngsters who were going away to college tell us: "Gee Whiz, it makes a fellow feel like some kind of a little number in a gigantic lottery. It's as if you were trying to communicate through a deep fog with some sort of a machine that is regarding you with a chilly eye. Oftentimes, this initial feeling stays with a guy for months and months. Some kids never are able to lose the feeling that they are considered by the institution as a factor rather than a person."

Needless to say, the process can be even more nerve-wracking for exceptional cases, such as transfer students (with another institution inserted between the high school and the college) and foreign students (whose prep work or other secondary records may even stem from a different nation).

Surely the difficulties of this initial period have contributed greatly to the general unrest which now is sweeping many institutions of higher learning throughout the land. The feeling of being a "little number in a big lottery" and the general lack of recognition as a "person" has left thousands of students less than comfortable in their campus surroundings.

Happily, however, all the foregoing would have to be relegated to the rank of the "exception rather than the rule" insofar as our own Chico State College was concerned during the period in which colleges and universities boomed after World War II.

And the credit for making Chico State a place where "getting in" did not amount to a traumatic and depersonalizing experience must go to an unusual educator named Wallin J. Carlson, better known to generations of students and alumni as "Dean Carlson" or simply "Dean C."

Dean Carlson originally came to Chico State as an instructor in business in 1938, making him one of the two or three "true pioneers" insofar as current oldtimers on the faculty are concerned. Within a few years after his arrival, however, Dean Carlson was named Registrar—and it was in that post, for the better part of a quarter of a century, that he built the record under which thousands of students over the years were enabled to regard Chico State as a "college" rather than as an institution. First impressions are of deep importance, of course, and Dean Carlson and his staff made such a deep and warm impression of multitudes of incoming students that they came to regard him as "Mr. Chico State," and continued to do so through their time on the campus and into their post-college adulthood.

To the fresh-cheeked high school graduate from either a Shasta County whistle-stop or the sophisticated neighborhood of a metropolitan area, Dean Carlson was the one who made the transition from prep school to college a procedure in which the youngster felt that he (or she) was being regarded as a person and that his case was being considered across the desk or through the mails by another person, a person who truly was interested in him.

To the veteran who was returning to studies after time out for service in World War II or Korea, Dean Carlson was the one who helped shake the dust from his educational records of the past and helped him undergo the intricacies of the GI Bill—and, in a sense, helped him feel more comfortable returning to the classroom "as a guy older by several years" than his classmates.

To the foreign exchange student (in this realm, Dean Carlson was an innovative pioneer), the Registrar was an understanding and helpful link between a far distant land and the green lawns and ivy-grown buildings of Chico State. Language barriers notwithstanding, Dean Carlson somehow managed to enable this young person to get off to a good start in adapting to the strange culture of his new campus "home away from home."

Even when enrollments began to feel the brunt of the post-war "baby boom" and necessitate the introduction of mechanization in the registration process, Dean Carlson and his staff managed to maintain the personalized attitudes so many other colleges and universities had long ago lost. This aspect of Dean Carlson's tenure was, of course, perhaps the chief hallmark of his ability to imbue his entire staff with interest and zeal to match his own.

Up until a year or so ago—whether he went by the title of Registrar or Associate Dean of Students in Charge of Admissions and Records—Dean Carlson played a major role in shaping Chico State College and, more importantly, in making the procedures of "getting in" an easier and happier one for the young people.

It is not surprising, then, that word of Dean Carlson's impending retirement this year has spread among alumni throughout the nation, even throughout the world, and that nostalgic and laudatory comment has begun coming in.

It is appropriate that Dean Carlson's faculty colleagues and former students already are planning several functions to officially record the mark he has left on Chico State College in particular and on education in general. One such session was scheduled today by the Student International Club and the MacArthur Scholarship Committee.

Even without such formal manifestations, however, the place of Wallin J. Carlson in educational history is secure. To faculty colleagues, students, alumni, and even to admiring townspeople, he always will be "Dean Carlson" and regarded as one of their happiest links with Chico State College. It seems reasonable to say that, had there been more like him during the past quarter century, higher education on a national basis might be far less a battleground than it is today.

We don't know if Dean Carlson ever adopted a motto. But it strikes us that an appropriate one might be devised from the philosophy he adhered to and practiced: *Omnes Estes Significantes—Every Person Is Important.*

OEO DIRECTOR RUMSFELD'S STATEMENT ON POVERTY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Donald Rumsfeld, the new Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, testified this morning before the House Committee on Education and Labor.

His statement deserves the attention of the Congress. It is forthright, candid, and perceptive. I was pleased to find the Director call for a 2-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act.

It is my belief that Don Rumsfeld, in his first appearance before the Congress in his new role, has set a sound course for improving OEO and its operation.

His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I am pleased to appear before this distinguished Committee on proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

During my first week as Director, I have been wrestling with the details, problems, and prospects of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I will attempt to be as complete as possible in my responses to your questions. I do not presume to have all the answers, or all the information, but I am determined to pursue the answers we all seek. A comprehensive review of the OEO and its activities is needed, and I intend to complete it as soon as possible.

President Nixon is sending to the Congress a proposed amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to extend the authorization for appropriations from June 30, 1969 to June 30, 1971. This extension, providing for a request for \$2.048 billion for FY 1970, will furnish a sound framework for change in the agency's policies and operations. More comprehensive improvements, he feels, should be made after careful study by the new Director and the staff of the Agency.

A two-year extension, the President believes, will improve the management of this program by allowing longer-range planning and making possible more orderly and efficient allocation of funds. It will lead to better recruiting by guaranteeing to those whose talents are needed that the commitment to deal with these problems exists. It should improve the potential for results by insuring the continuity and flexibility that an innovative agency needs. The extension will give greater assurance to those who initiate experiments that even though a particular program may not prove successful, the lessons learned will be put to use, and the larger effort will continue.

This is not a commitment simply to continue present programs. It is a commitment to find out what works and what does not, to review the performance of these programs, and to utilize new knowledge. Our efforts over the past years have not been as successful as we might have hoped. We must develop more systematic approaches to identifying the needs of the poverty population and to devising effective solutions to those needs.

The people served by OEO deserve this. The people of the Nation require it.

I believe that the Office of Economic Opportunity should assume the role outlined in the President's February 19 Message—to be the innovating agency, an incubator for new programs, devising and developing new approaches to the problem of poverty. The changes being made—the delegation of Head Start and the Job Corps—should enable the Office of Economic Opportunity to fulfill this role more effectively. Organizing and managing innovation in the social field is no easy task. In developing new programs, as well as evaluating on-going ones, we must apply tough standards of measurement. We must set our goals high—but we must also set them precisely and clearly enough so that we will know whether or not they have been achieved.

Innovation will be meaningless unless it is coupled with penetrating evaluation. We must define objectives in both qualitative and quantitative terms. We must test alternatives, and we must be equipped to measure progress or failure against defined goals. We must not be afraid to admit failure, for we may learn as much from programs which appear to fail as from those which succeed.

In the same sense we must admit how little we know about the problems of the poor. The admission of a lack of knowledge may be the first step toward knowledge—and toward solving these problems.

I am now searching for new talent, men and women with the energy, dedication and intelligence needed to carry out the tasks ahead—the research, planning and evaluation necessary for improvement in these programs. I am seeking people with the competence to institute higher standards of operation. At the present time, some 20 of the top 59 positions in the Office of Economic Opportunity are vacant.

I am establishing a number of study teams to examine some of the more critical issues. I don't anticipate that these teams will produce fully satisfactory answers to our questions, but they will be at least help to outline some of the ways to get answers—some of the information we must have to reach decisions.

One issue which we must study is the relationship between the Community Action Agencies funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Community Demonstration Agencies funded through the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Over 30% of CAA funds are spent in the present 150 Model Cities. The need for close coordination and cooperation between these two programs is of a high priority to the Administration.

Another critical issue concerns the role of the states in OEO programs—How do we bring states into a more meaningful and

active role in programs funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity. OEO provided some \$6.5 million to fund State Economic Opportunity Offices in 1969, for technical and planning assistance to the Governors and local agencies. The Administration is now engaged in an intensive review of the role of States in many federal activities. I believe that we can find new and better ways to involve the States in dealing with the problems of poverty.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has been devoting roughly 28% of its resources to rural poverty, but there is still a lack of sufficient information in this area, due in part to insufficient research and experimentation. OEO, working with the States, should be able to help to develop mechanisms for dealing with elements of rural poverty, such as scattered pockets of the poor over large areas. I know that members of this Committee have expressed concern about this problem and, with your support and advice, I would hope to devote greater attention to it.

The evaluation of programs must be one of the most important activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity. It appears to be one of the most neglected. OEO has only recently completed the first evaluation of the national impact of one of its major programs. Until last year, this Agency had no systematic process for initiating and conducting evaluation. The state-of-the-art of evaluating social programs is still primitive. I intend to devote more of OEO's resources to evaluation and to work with other federal agencies in developing a more effective evaluation capability. I believe that the Congress should be made aware of the results of such evaluations so that the Legislative and Executive Branches are dealing with the same set of facts.

Also important is the question of delegation—how best to insure that a program's focus is preserved once direct operating responsibility is passed to a department. The recent debate on the delegation of Job Corps and Head Start raised such questions as: How should a delegated program be monitored and evaluated so that it continues to accomplish its original goals? What, ideally, should be the stages of delegation or transfer? Should the experimental activities of the program be left to OEO? How should delegation relate to transfer?

It was the original intention of those who developed the anti-poverty program that this process of delegation would be a means of disseminating and strengthening the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity. There has been a negative attitude toward delegation—a tendency to avoid it—because a program ready for delegation usually has a degree of acceptance and a constituency, and there has been a concern that delegation might weaken support for the OEO. The process of delegation can be developed as a positive process. To be able to make sound decisions and defend them intelligently—decisions that really help the poor—we must develop a policy for relating delegation to the goals and operations of our programs. This is particularly significant in that roughly two-thirds of OEO funds will not be under the direct control of OEO.

We must find a means of fulfilling more effectively the goals of community action. The questions being raised concern means of achieving greater responsiveness, of strengthening and improving performance. Much of our domestic controversy focuses on the issue of whether a particular institution—a government agency, a legislature, a university—is sufficiently responsive to the needs of the time and to those it serves. The basic strength of our system—and its capacity to deal with poverty—springs from the fact that the institutions of our society do change and can respond. Progress here lies not only in encouraging institutions to be more responsive, but in convincing non-

participants that they can participate in and benefit by the change.

To conclude, I must confess my concern at how little hard analysis of these questions there has been. None could have expected the problem of poverty to be totally eradicated in four years. But I believe that by this time we could have hoped to accumulate a useful body of knowledge about the problem and about the impact of programs now underway, and the success or failure of our efforts. I believe that the people of the Nation have a right to ask why so little is known about the effects of these programs.

I assure this Committee that I will work with you to devote the agency's resources and energy to producing answers, and to attempt to use this knowledge. The President has indicated the spirit in which we must proceed: "The men and women who will be valued most in this Administration," he said in his Message to Congress of February 19, "will be those who understand that not every experiment succeeds, who do not cover up failures but rather lay open problems, frankly and constructively, so that next time we will know how to do better."

The founders of this program, some of whom are on this Committee, clearly recognized the need for flexibility: "As conditions change," President Johnson stated in his Message to Congress in 1964, "and as experience illuminates our difficulties, we will be prepared to modify our strategy."

Many of our conventional attitudes about problems of poverty and the Office of Economic Opportunity ought to be re-examined. The men and women to be served by this program will not be content with words and gestures. Posturing cannot replace accomplishment.

We must heed the hardship and despair of the poor, the deep hurt of poverty and its impact on individual human beings. We must build the knowledge and stamina to provide for real gains in opportunity and human dignity. The President has made this commitment. I join him in it. I look forward to working with this Committee on these and other questions now facing the Agency.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

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

MAY 29, 1969.

The Editor,
The Washington Daily News,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a former newspaper editor myself, I can well appreciate the wide latitude of reportorial expression and judgement that determines both the news content of a story as well as its placement in the newspaper.

Whether a sensational crime story is placed on Page 1, Page 3 or Page 35 would depend on the editorial propensities of three different editorial points of views such as the *New York Daily News*, *The Chicago Today* and the *New York Times*.

But one practice which has diminished significantly in American reporting is the labelling of people involved in crimes or court cases. Years ago, most white newspapers labelled people by race—today, very few do. *The Washington Daily News* is a rare exception.

In a city which is now 74% Black, the relevance of race is even more archaic in reporting the apprehension or conviction or trial of a suspect. What does it prove?

Yes, when a serious crime is committed and a suspect is at large, his race is indeed quite relevant. But, how does the factor of his race become significant after his apprehension or his court trial?

Why not label people by religion as well—John Doe, Catholic; Ellen Doe, Jewish; Joseph Jones, Protestant? Or, if the *Daily News* is going to be consistent, why not label all races: thus, John Doe, Chinese; Mary Doe, Spanish; Albert Jones, Philippino.

Perhaps the *Washington Daily News* believes that the identification of criminal suspects and others contributes to a healthier racial climate and to a better understanding between the black and white races. If the editors so believe, of course, then one cannot quarrel with their decision as editors.

But from the heavy volume of mail which I have continued to receive protesting the *Daily News'* practice, I am convinced that the vast majority of the District's Black citizens are deeply offended by this editorial practice. And since black people comprise the majority of the nation's Capital, the *Daily News* has placed itself in the curious position of publishing a newspaper which ignores the expectations and personal feelings of that majority.

With every good wish.

Very truly yours,

ADAM C. POWELL.

SOVIET MARITIME STRATEGY

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University has just completed an incisive study of Soviet seapower. The 14-member panel of American and European experts, cochaired by Hanson Baldwin and Lawrence W. Martin, concluded that the Soviet Union has developed a plan of strategic priorities and a highly coordinated maritime program which challenge the basic interests of the world's major non-Communist seapowers.

Because of the timely importance of this topic, I have asked that the panel's findings as reported in the *New York Times*, May 30, 1969, be set forth below: SOVIET IS FOUND BY STUDY GROUP TO SEEK CONTROL OF WORLD'S SEAS

BRUSSELS, May 28.—A panel of American and European analysts has concluded that the Soviet Union has embarked on a maritime strategy of challenging the United States and other non-Communist sea powers for control of key areas around the Eurasian land mass.

This Soviet policy is based on the continuing expansion of the navy and merchant marine, the panel noted in an analysis issued today. The study was made by 14 analysts assembled by the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University in Washington.

The policy means that the Soviet Union will "attempt to control the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and ultimately the Mediterranean," the panel said.

"The policy also envisions," it continued, "Soviet predominance in the Sea of Japan to the east, the Greenland-Iceland-Faeroe Islands gap to the west, and the Indian Ocean to the south."

STRAITS MAY BE GOAL

Control of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, through which its fleets pass to the Mediterranean, is a probable objective of the Soviet Union.

"Beyond these goals," the panel reported, "the Soviets want to gain dominant influence at several major junctions of the world's seaways." The group identified these as the Suez Canal, the Bab el Mandeb, leading from the Red Sea to the Gulf of Aden, the Strait of Malacca, between Malaya and Sumatra, and the Strait of Gibraltar.

The panel predicts that in pursuit of these ends the Soviet Union will "most likely" try to limit and eventually stop non-Communist naval operations in areas they consider strategically important to their plans.

Hanson W. Baldwin, one of the panelists and former military editor of The New York Times, called "the substitution of blue water horizon for the landlocked concepts of the Soviet past" one of "the epochal events of the 20th century" that probably insures the extension of the frictions of the first half of the century to "distant seas and many continents."

The panel's report has been welcomed by diplomatic and political leaders of the North Atlantic alliance. Long concerned by the growth of Soviet sea power and the apparent complacency and indifference with which the process has been viewed, they hope the analysis will promote efforts to meet it.

This means, in the first instance, the United States for the report makes clear that the Soviet challenge is directed first of all at the United States Navy, the world's largest and most powerful.

In important categories of sea power, the panel found, the Soviet Union already surpasses the United States and is gaining in others. The Russians may have many more conventionally powered submarines, "unparalleled" long-range surface-to-surface cruise-missile systems on surface ships and submarines and a sizable missile-equipped fleet of patrol boats, the report said.

The Soviet Union is said to be "catching up" in Polaris-type ballistic missile submarines and helicopter carriers. Its modern fleet and land-based air power in the Mediterranean is said to pose a "major political threat" to the United States Sixth Fleet.

The North Atlantic Alliance acted today to meet this threat when the Defense Planning Committee agreed to organize an emergency naval force in the Mediterranean. But the ultimate force envisaged, six destroyers, is far weaker than the Soviet squadron.

THERE OUGHT TO BE A LAW

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, "There Ought to Be a Law" was the title for a very thoughtful editorial by WBZ Radio-Television in Boston earlier this month. Contrary to the idea conveyed by the title initially, the editors maintain that Government's responsibility in dealing with campus disorders is not through Federal intervention on the university campus, but through the implementation of action-oriented programs to conquer the pervasive ills of our society which kindle social anger and disturbance. I offer the full text of the editorial for consideration

of all my colleagues, who share my concern over the crisis on our campuses:

THERE OUGHT TO BE A LAW

(Delivered by James R. Lightfoot, general manager, WBZ Radio, and Winthrop P. Baker, general manager, WBZ-TV)

Campus rebellions continue to dominate the news across the country. And as usual, in times of such unrest, many people are inclined to mouth that old phrase—"There ought to be a law against that sort of thing." So it's no surprise that there are a host of proposals for government intervention into campus affairs, a real crackdown on students.

We don't profess to know just how this campus mess will be straightened out. But we're convinced of one thing. Congressional or legislative intervention of this sort would be a disaster. There are ample legal means of dealing with campus disorders right now. Police action has already been taken to clear buildings and restore order at Harvard, Dartmouth and a number of other campuses. We support this type of move as an unpleasant necessity.

One of the men who had to make that type of decision was Harvard's Nathan Pusey. Significantly he told a "Meet the Press" audience on WBZ-TV that the answers to the crisis must come from within the university itself—primarily from the faculty and students.

This doesn't mean that there's nothing for government to do, that there shouldn't be a law. But what's needed is local, state and federal action to deal with the rot in our society—poverty, prejudice, slums and materialism. These are conditions that have angered many responsible students. They have been trying to give American society a message it ought to listen to. Unfortunately much of it has been garbled by the actions of a maniac minority. The university and if necessary the police can deal with the troublemakers. The challenge for government is to defuse the anger of the responsible majority—not with negative acts of repression but a positive attack on society's many ills.

VIOLENCE AND UNREST ON THE CAMPUS

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently, I testified before the House Special Committee on Education which is investigating campus violence and unrest.

With the thought that my remarks might be of interest to some of my colleagues, I include them in the RECORD. This problem is the greatest domestic problem we have today. It must be brought under control immediately. My remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN BEFORE THE SPECIAL HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REGARDING CAMPUS VIOLENCE, MAY 15, 1969

Mr. Chairman, members of the House Special Subcommittee on Education, I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to briefly outline my views and those of the majority of my constituents from the 1st District of California who, in ever increasing numbers, are expressing their impatience and their growing concern over the problem of campus disruptions and violence.

Twice in my lifetime, I've heard talk and

seen evidence of anarchy or revolution in America. The first time was in the late 20's and early 30's when, as a young boy, I heard people talk about changing a system of government that permitted people to go hungry in a land where food was plentiful, but money was short.

Today, such talk is being heard again. Not from people who are hungry or without jobs, but, surprisingly enough, from people of affluence who are personally convinced and advocate that the only way to bring about "meaningful change" in America is through the destruction of our educational, governmental and social institutions. Regrettably, many young people, today, are not sure, or so they say, that they want to belong to this society.

At the outset, then, I want to comment on the timely, articulate, and profound statement made to this special subcommittee by Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, President of Harvard University on May 8. I applaud Dr. Pusey's statement that "very serious injury is being done to the academic enterprise" and I commend his conviction that it is the responsibility of the academic community to resolve the conflict now raging on our campuses.

I feel compelled to say, however, that, in my judgment, there is far more at stake than just the "academic enterprise" and I question whether or not the academic community is prepared to deal with open anarchy or revolutionary style guerrilla warfare at our educational institutions, should it come to that.

I also question if the academic community is prepared to cope with the reaction that is now beginning to set in as a result of the disruptions and violence that have occurred at our colleges and universities. Throughout the Nation, we are witnessing what appears to be a growing "citizens reaction" to this turmoil. I refer, specifically, to the ever-increasing school bond and school tax elections going down to defeat, which is but one manifestation of what is becoming known as the "taxpayers revolt."

We are also witnessing, I believe, the beginning of a reaction by those students who, until now, have been standing on the "sidelines" and watching quietly or completely ignoring the destruction of their schools and the disruption of their educations. Many of these students, and I don't think the militants should take them for granted much longer, are now saying: "We are the losers—the militants don't care about an education!" The overwhelming majority of our students are dedicated and responsible citizens with a genuine desire to acquire the best our educational institutions can offer. These students see how their future and their educational opportunities are jeopardized by these "rule or ruin radical revolutionaries."

Although the circumstances are much different, we have seen what happened in Communist China when even government-sanctioned violence got out of hand, as was the case in this instance. As a result of the thorough job the Red Guards did there, many of mainland China's universities are still closed today. The ultimate confrontation that erupted between students who wanted an education and the rampaging Red Guards resulted in an unprecedented blood-letting.

At present, there is a minority (although their numbers grow daily) that has achieved a significant measure of success in turning responsible dissent into militant anarchy. Dr. Pusey calls them "active revolutionaries" and, in my judgment, I believe we should accept his term because it has, indeed, become a "revolution in the making."

Within the past sixty days, guns have been used by students and police against each other on the campus. Just this week I read a story appearing in the San Francisco Examiner titled "Get Guns, Reds Tell Berkeley Militants". It describes an organization known as the Bay Area Revolutionary Union as "Communist-inspired" and reports it has

circulated leaflets urging Berkeley militants to "arm themselves with guns against the police". Reportedly, the leaflet tells readers to "reach informed groups to discuss and apply the thoughts of Mao Tse-tung!"

While I agree that our educational administrators have the fundamental responsibility for maintaining order within their areas of jurisdiction, to date, there has been too little evidence that, as a group, they are willing to exercise that basic responsibility or have demonstrated any real willingness to stand up to the confrontation that threatens to destroy their institutions. And, it may be later than we think.

With few exceptions, student demands have been met with an attitude of "let's not rock the boat". Many unreasonable and unwarranted and even non-negotiable demands have been meekly accepted and agreed to. Too often, student violence and specific violations of law have resulted in amnesty or a mere "wrist-slapping".

It is fitting, I believe, that Bayard Rustin, one of the most active and ardent Negro civil rights leaders, should remind us that: "There is a great irony in the demands now being made by black college students for separate black studies departments, for in essence those students are seeking to impose upon themselves the very conditions of separatism and inequality against which black Americans have struggled since the era of Reconstruction..."

And I share Mr. Rustin's view that: "I reserve my most severe criticism for those white students and faculty members who are aiding and abetting the separatist's demands and for those frightened administrators who do not have the courage to reject their demands."

This is not the summer of 1968 and it is not just academic freedom that is at stake now! We are rapidly approaching the summer of 1969 and neither campus violence nor student revolution can any longer be condoned in the name of "academic freedom" or (in the current cliché) in the name of "meaningful change".

With more and more schools closing daily, and with more and more teachers and faculty members quitting their jobs in disgust or fear, I believe we in the Congress have a responsibility to the people in this country to be aware of and, if necessary, to respond to the serious crisis that now exists on many of our campuses today.

Many students today are raising political, not academic, questions—yet we in the "political arena" have, in effect, been told to stay out of the campus turmoil. The most militant students allege that we, in government, are not addressing ourselves to the compelling questions of our time—yet they resort to public confrontations rather than communication or dialogue in an attempt to seek solutions.

Recently, Attorney General John Mitchell said: "I recognize that the students of today are an 'involved generation' who wish to tell us—as strongly as possible—that they are dissatisfied with many aspects of American life... but I must draw the line at those actions which seriously disrupt a university and which involve a substantial denial of rights for those students who wish to pursue scholarship and civility."

While I grant and feel strongly that our colleges and universities remain autonomous in academic affairs, I too must draw the line when violence and criminal conduct or the denial of basic constitutional rights are being practiced and tend to disrupt or deny the dedicated and responsible students and faculty members the basic right of acquiring and/or dispensing the best education our institutions can provide.

In that regard, I believe violence in a school is not unlike violence in any other institution; whether it be a factory, a labor union hall, a sport arena, a church, or a

public facility or building. If it is beyond the capability of local officials to control, then it is clearly in the best interest of public safety, good order, and domestic tranquility to call in those security forces necessary to maintain and restore order.

The fact that present disorders are a nation-wide problem, that they involve taxpayer supported schools and often disrupt Federally-financed programs, and that Federal criminal statutes are being violated, gives the Federal government not only a substantial interest in the problem, but an inherent responsibility to those who are "footing the bill."

All of us in representative government are anxious to see the leadership of the academic community resolve campus problems. But, unless they do, there is going to be a mighty outcry from the people in this country who are getting fed up with disorders and disruptions on the campus.

Unless the administrators of our educational institutions can and do restore order and some semblance of discipline, then I predict that one of two things will happen. Either an increasing number of responsible and concerned citizens will demand that their elected representatives intervene and insist that educational appropriations be curtailed, or they will intensify their efforts to defeat every school bond and school tax election presented to them.

In addition, those volunteer contributors to higher education endowments and scholarship funds will be withholding their donations.

And this, in the final analysis, could achieve what these revolutionary anarchists are trying to accomplish—the total destruction of our educational system in this country!

So, in my judgment, it has become abundantly clear that we, as a Nation, have no choice but to demand from the academic community a much firmer policy of control over their institutions and a closer and more coordinated line of communication with local, State, and Federal security organizations in order to rid ourselves of these "campus destroyers" once and for all.

The future of America and her educational institutions is at stake—this emergency must be resolved quickly before it is too late!

D-DAY REVISITED—BLATANT DISRESPECT TO THE GALLANT MEN WHO FOUGHT AND DIED AT NORMANDY BEACH

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the bloodiest battles in the history of this Nation was fought June 6, 1944—just 25 years ago—on the beaches of Normandy in France. This was D-Day, marking the beginning of the final drive to end the decade of tyrannical rule by Adolf Hitler.

The men who died on those now famous beaches—Omaha, Utah, Red, Juno, and others—gave up their lives in hopes of creating a better world. It was a good and solemn thing in which they participated.

It is regrettable that on this anniversary, 25 years later, some find it necessary to capitalize on what these brave soldiers, sailors, and airmen took part in. The television program—"D-Day Revisited,"—which was viewed last night could have been a fitting and informative

tribute to the men who took part in the Normandy invasion. But instead it was a transparent attempt to capitalize on their efforts to promote the rerunning of Darryl F. Zanuck's "The Longest Day," a motion picture produced a few years back and now ready for re-release.

There may be some historical justification for such motion pictures. But it seems to be in bad taste to tie the marketing of such entertainment to the gallant efforts of the men who died on those beaches a quarter century ago.

The facade fell away quickly as soon as the first promotion spot came on the television screen, advertising the fact that the motion picture "would soon be seen at your neighborhood theater."

It is Mr. Zanuck's business when and how he merchandises his products. However, a 60-minute commercial in prime viewing time on television stretches the credibility that he produced this show for any reason other than making money.

The poor taste of this television program is only compounded by the fact it was broadcast just 2 days after Memorial Day and less than a week before the solemn 25th anniversary of this momentous invasion.

Such a transparent commercial effort can only discredit the valiant deeds of those who shed their blood on the beaches of Normandy. The lives and memories of these men are far too valuable to be used for such crass commercialism.

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR AT THE 75th ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. ROCHUS LODGE, CROATIAN FRATERNAL UNION, JOHNSTOWN, PA., MAY 18, 1969

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I come from a district in western Pennsylvania where there are many Americans of Croatian extraction. It is a pleasure therefore, for me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fine tribute to the members of the St. Rochus Lodge, Croatian Fraternal Union, Johnstown, Pa., by my colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, on the occasion of their 75th anniversary. His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR AT THE 75th ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. ROCHUS LODGE, CROATIAN FRATERNAL UNION, JOHNSTOWN, PA., MAY 18, 1969

Of all American freedoms, the two most basic, certainly, are freedom of political expression and freedom of religion. And to Croatian people throughout the world these particular freedoms have a special historical significance.

Following the experience of centuries of toil and drudgery without political power of any kind, the people of the Balkans began to organize, politically, toward the close of the Sixteenth Century. Feudal masters were taxing their hard-earned wealth to the point of rendering every man a pauper and regulating all they did in the most oppressive

manner. The people protested, quietly at first, then angrily. In 1573 a spontaneous peasant uprising rocked all of Croatia and in that moment the Croatian political conscience was born. Repressive governmental measures stamped out the peasant uprising, but could not stifle the burning desire for political reform.

The struggle for religious freedom was no less drastic and no less painful and disturbing. When the Reformation movement attracted the attention of the Croatian people, in the 1590's, it was savagely suppressed by edict of the Archduke Ferdinand, and many Croats fled the country in fear of their lives, a large number settling in Prussia. As time passed however, the Prussian government began to utilize oppressive measures to prevent the free expression of the people, and many of the Croatian group decided once again to move on, in search of liberty and religious independence. Their goal became the far-off American hinterlands, where it was said that freedom really existed.

One group of Croats accompanied an expedition to the Colony of Georgia, settling on the Ebenezer River, there to introduce to the New World the silkworm industry. They found that here indeed was true freedom of religion and, comparatively speaking, freedom of political expression. They wrote home of this phenomenon and in short time other Croats were on the way.

A port-of-call for most Croats sailing to the New World was New Orleans. Until the middle of the Nineteenth Century this was the chief Croatian settlement in the Country. There they engaged in the oyster industry, controlling it for many decades. Not all of them were fishermen, however. With the discovery of large iron and coal deposits, to the Northeast, shortly preceding the American Revolution, many Croats traveled up to Pennsylvania and Ohio and other places where the mining industry was starting up. As time passed, more came, and, as the industry grew, so grew the Croatian communities in the mining areas. Centuries of hard physical labor had fitted the Croatian people to the task, and many hundreds of them took advantage of the fact. Out of this migration, Johnstown came into being.

Development of the locomotive and the establishment of the Baldwin Locomotive Works in 1831 gave steel a tremendous new outlet in eastern Pennsylvania, and in short time western Pennsylvania was equally active. Johnstown became a major coal and steel center, and from the start the Croatian people had much to do with its productive capacity.

Croats also were subject to the call of adventure, and when gold was discovered in California, many of them joined in the Gold Rush. These advised their friends and relatives in the old country of the fortunes to be made in mining the wonderful "shiny metal" on the Pacific Coast, and soon a host of ships were sailing from their native shores carrying scores and scores of Croatian prospectors to the Golden State of California. There, they found, of course, that there were far more prospectors than there was gold enough to go around, and many of them responded by returning to the ways of their fathers, taking up again the tools of agriculture.

Croatian immigrants are generally recognized today as the pioneers of the apple, grape, and fishing industries of California and along the whole Pacific Coast. It is recorded that a Croatian apple dealer was the first man engaged in the apple business in Watsonville, in the Pajaro Valley, in the 1870's. This date marks the beginning of this universally-known industry. The author Jack London described in his novel *The Valley of the Moon* the magnificent creation of the apple industry in the Pajaro Valley—an industry which, in London's words, transformed 12,000 acres of veritable jungle into an "Apple paradise." As London observed, the

work of the Croats in the Pajaro Valley was "one of the most wonderful demonstrations of the United States," and a true credit to its creators.

In the matter of a century's time, following the arrival of the first Croats at the Ebenezer River, in Georgia, there were some 50 Croatian colonies throughout the land. Ties of race or kinship, language and culture, and the need for social exchange inevitably drew the Croats together, to a remarkable extent. Adjustment to the New World was rendered easier where the immigrants from the same village or district could settle together and speak their own language, sing their own songs, eat their native food, and follow their old customs.

As noted in the matter of a century's time, following the first arrival of Croatian immigrants in North America, there were some 50 Croatian settlements in existence. By the close of the Revolutionary War there were more than 200. By the close of the Civil War the number was up to 600. At recent count, the number exceeded 1,000.

From an early date the Croatian people in America banded together, for many worthwhile purposes. Predominantly wage earners, they understood the value of cooperation in time of need, when jobs were scarce, when sickness plagued the land, when debts piled up, and when other emergencies prevailed. In addition to all this was the common background of everyone involved. No wonder, then, that fraternal organizations came to be a feature of the Croatian American way of life.

Soon upon arriving here, the Croatian immigrant came to realize that when he got sick there was no household group to take care of him as there had been in Europe. In America, he was dependent on the sympathy of his companions, who were not as close to him as his family had been. Accordingly, mutual benefit societies were established to provide for him in case of sickness or other difficulties.

At the beginning, the societies remained merely small local organizations, but eventually a trend developed toward federation along national lines. Your organization, the Croatian Fraternal Union, is a case in point. Chartered in 1894, it has attracted a following throughout the Country and stands today a leader in every Croatian American community from Maine to California.

The great strides, natural and spiritual, made by the Croatian Fraternal Union during this Century must be attributed, at least in part, to your remarkable leadership, which has invariably kept in mind the interests of the Croatian community, in general, and the organizations membership, in particular. The courage, initiative, industry, perseverance, and foresight of their policies has helped to build a better Croatian American community in every respect. Without such leadership, the tremendous gains of the last generation would have been impossible.

It is a great pleasure to have been with you on this occasion, and I wish you well in the knowledge that you will ever persevere in the manner that has rendered the Croatian people among the outstanding members of American society.

SCHOOL CRISIS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of San Diego's most distinguished publishers, Mr. Joe Holmes of the San Diego Dispatch, recently published a gutsy edi-

torial essay on the current crisis in the schools. I include as a portion of my remarks the following editorial from the San Diego Dispatch of May 23, 1969:

BABY, YOU ARE NOT GOING TO RUN THE SCHOOLS

(By Joe Holmes)

To the militant, rebellious students of this country, I have a message.

You will not be given administrative control of the schools you are now attending.

You will not be allowed to violate the law in pursuit of either a worthwhile or meaningless case.

You will not be allowed to publish school publications which are permeated by filth.

You will not be allowed to disrupt the educational pursuits of the majority of fine young people attending school.

You will not be allowed to berate, maim or malign those public and school officials who have the courage to disagree with your mass protests.

You will not be permitted to seize and wreck school buildings as you attempt to intimidate school administrators.

You will not be permitted to march in force as a guerilla tactic under the guise of orderly dissent.

Who am I to bark these orders at you?

I am a member of the silent majority or as you would call me . . . the establishment . . . the older generation . . . those symbols to you of decadence and decay.

We don't do much marching. We don't do much protesting. In this competitive society we work to survive. We work to keep what we have and fight for a bit more, whether it be a house, car, job, business, bank account or semblance of well-being.

And when any of this seems to be in danger, we react.

We react by a different sort of march of protest than what you have developed. We march to the real espresso house of a democracy, the voting booth.

That's where we tell it like it is. And like it is, is like this.

Your attempts to gain voice in schools is, largely, unacceptable.

Where there are administrators who give in to you, they will be replaced. Where there are schools which are constant caldrons of turmoil, the funds will dry up from the silent majority taxpayers and the silent majority benefactors.

Because of your tactics, what you hope to achieve is going to cost you what you now have.

Baby, you are not going to run anything until you grow up and only then, when you earn it.

BREAKTHROUGH IN THE CONTROL OF INFANT MORTALITY

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Dr. Leon J. Arp, professor of industrial engineering, College of Engineering, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va., has made what experts in the field acknowledge to be a major breakthrough in the control of infant mortality.

In cooperation with authorities at Roanoke Memorial Hospital, Roanoke, Va., Dr. Arp has demonstrated the utility of a new respirator which he designed. When used with special nursery techniques, the respirator has proven to

be remarkably effective in reducing the present high mortality rate for infants who suffer respiratory distress. The impressive empirical data is sketched briefly in a letter dated May 23, 1969, addressed to me by Dr. Arp, and which I quote in its entirety.

The letter follows:

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING,
Blacksburg, Va., May 23, 1969.

HON. RICHARD H. POFF,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POFF: Eight years ago one of my infant twin sons developed some respiratory distress shortly after birth. Although he seems to have survived this difficulty without apparent ill effects, I have remained concerned about the general inability to be able to effectively cope with this problem.

Two years ago (June 1, 1967) a study was started at the Roanoke Memorial Hospitals in Roanoke, Virginia to determine if a new respirator, which I designed specifically to meet the special and critical requirements of the newborn with R.D.S., would be effective when used with special nursery techniques in reducing the present high mortality rate for these distressed infants. The answer to that question has been an unqualified "yes."

I am enclosing a copy of Table 4 from our paper which will appear in the (July-August) issue of *Anesthesia and Analgesia*. This paper presents the clinical applications of the new infant respirator. A paper which analyzes the special requirements of the newborn and the new respirator appears in the (May-June) issue of the same Journal. I will forward reprints of all of our publications to you just as soon as I receive them.

I would like to make a few comments in regard to the data which is presented in Table 4. As you know, one can never be certain with the larger infants whether they would have survived without intervention or not. Therefore, I believe it unwise to try to show statistically that infants have been

saved in the weight groups above 1,500 grams. I, of course, believe we have saved many in this group, but proof would be difficult to obtain. How does one really prove how sick a baby is without delaying treatment so long that only God could save him?

The situation is entirely different, however, for the low birth weight infants. No one denies that only about 29.3% of the infants weighing no more than 1,500 grams survive. Likewise, the reported survival rate for those weighing no more than 1,000 grams has been a dismal 10 to 15%. These figures include those infants who had no respiratory distress and survived.

Since the beginning of our work at Roanoke Memorial Hospitals we have been able to obtain the first massive reduction in mortality from newborn respiratory distress in more than 20 years. The survival rate for infants weighing no more than 1,500 grams, all with respiratory distress, is now 46.3%. The survival rate for those weighing no more than 1,000 grams is now 31.6%. These figures show a tremendous improvement over any figures reported in the past. It should be noted, in order to stay on the conservative side, that I have not included those who survived with no respiratory distress. If I had included those infants, as was the case in the reported figures of 29.3% and 10 to 15%, our figures would be almost unbelievable.

One final comparison should be made. From June 1, 1965 to the beginning of our study, June 1, 1967, the survival rate for infants, all with R.D.S., and weighing 1,500 grams and less at Roanoke Memorial Hospitals was 14.4%. During this same two year interval prior to this study the survival rate for those with R.D.S., and weighing no more than 1,000 grams was 5.9%.

There can be no doubt or argument about what has been done for the low birth weight infants. It is also very unlikely that what has been done for the small infants would not also apply to those weighing more than 1,500 grams. However, with all of the variables involved with the larger infants, it would be nearly impossible to prove this beyond any doubt for everyone, even with a controlled study. Common sense, however,

will tell everyone that what has obviously worked for the smaller infants must also work for the larger ones.

To this date, I have been reasonably successful in persuading the lay press not to publish what they had been able to learn about this work until after we were well published in the official medical press. I have been forced, because of this, to make a decision on whether to work with them to try to insure the technical accuracy of what they will print or to let them do the best they can on their own. Past experiences with the lay press have been so bad in the field of medicine that I believe it would be far better to try to control the technical accuracy of what is printed by having a news conference with prepared releases rather than take a chance on their usual inaccuracies and exaggerations. In an attempt to try to obtain a reasonable sense of proportions and accuracy we are going to hold a news conference at Roanoke, Wednesday, May 28, 1969 in the auditorium of the Roanoke Memorial Hospital at 10:00 A.M. to publicly announce this breakthrough and the availability to physicians of the Flying Intensive Care Nursery service. A second conference, like the first, will be held at the Plaza Hotel in New York City at 10:00 A.M., May 29, 1969.

All of the information to be presented at the news conferences has been published by Medical Journals. The Journal publications are: *Anesthesia and Analgesia* (May-June) 1969, and (July-Aug.) 1969, *Virginia Medical Monthly* (May) 1969, *Pennsylvania Medicine* (May) 1969, *Medical Annals of the District of Columbia* (May) 1969, *Michigan Medicine* (June) 1969, *Journal of the Indiana State Medical Association* (June) 1969, and the *Ohio State Medical Journal* (July) 1969.

It is my sincere hope that this rather long letter has been worth the effort and time which was required to read it. If I can answer any questions which you may have in regard to our work, I can be reached at 552-6574.

Sincerely yours,

LEON J. ARP, Ph. D.,

Professor of Industrial Engineering.

TABLE 4.—SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM THE CLINICAL APPLICATIONS OF THE ARP INFANT RESPIRATOR

	All weight groups combined		0 to 1,000 grams		0 to 1,500 grams		1,001 to 1,500 grams		1,501 to 2,000 grams		2,001 to 2,500 grams		over 2,500 grams	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total number of live births.....	4,156	100.0												
Number with respiratory distress.....	200	4.8	19	9.5	41	20.5	22	11.0	38	19.0	45	22.5	76	38.0
Number with mild respiratory distress and not treated with the respirator (all infants in this group survived).....	99	49.5	1	5.3	5	12.2	4	18.2	15	39.5	25	55.6	54	71.1
Number with more severe respiratory distress and treated with the respirator.....	101	50.5	18	94.7	36	87.8	18	81.8	23	60.5	20	44.4	22	28.9
Number treated with the respirator to survive.....	73	72.3	5	27.8	14	38.9	9	50.0	21	91.3	19	95.0	19	86.4
Total number with respiratory distress to survive.....	172	86.0	31.6	17	46.3	13	59.1	36	36	94.7	44	97.8	73	96.1

¹ The average survival rate for all infants, including those not in respiratory distress, weighing no more than 1,000 grams, given by Yerushalmi, is about 15 percent (26).

² The average survival rate for all infants, including those not in respiratory distress, weighing no more than 1,500 grams, given by Yerushalmi, is about 29.3 percent (26).

Note: This table includes only infants with respiratory distress syndrome.

THE SISTER IN TODAY'S COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL CENTER

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Sister Mary Immaculata entitled "The Sister in Today's Comprehensive Medical Center," which appeared recently in the magazine, *Hospital Progress*. Sister Mary Im-

maculata has received a master of science in nursing degree from the Catholic University of America and is assistant administrator of St. John Hospital, Steubenville, Ohio.

The article follows:

THE SISTER IN TODAY'S COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL CENTER

(By Sister M. Immaculata, RN, OSF)

Today, the concept of the hospital center is changing from that of an institution which provides general medical-surgical care to one which provides the broadest possible scope of health care and health facilities. Within this changing system, the sister, whether she be an administrator, nurse, medical secretary

or technician, must redefine her role and function if she is to effectively fulfill both her apostolic and professional obligations.

Rapid changes in technology and in the basic philosophy and funding of medical and social care, and an awareness of overwhelming and no-longer-to-be-ignored needs have prompted a major reappraisal of the goals and functions of various health professionals. This reappraisal has led, on the one hand, to experimentation in role expansion and role change and, on the other, to some experience of role confusion, discomfort and concern.

In reappraising her own position, the hospital sister should begin by evaluating her attitude toward changes in the health profession. The modern voluntary health center

presents new challenges to a sister's religious life; the ever-increasing complexities of hospital administration, nursing care, nursing service, and other hospital services place great pressure upon her spiritual and professional life. As a professional she must keep abreast of current developments in her area of work; she must act as a leader and, at the same time, maintain the standards of patient care and service. Urged by the Church to greater apostolic endeavors, the hospital sister, as a religious, must be far more zealous than ever before.

Efforts must be made to eliminate any conflict between the sister's apostolic and professional obligations. Religious communities should aid each sister in this task by providing her with the means, time and education necessary to fulfill these obligations. Continuing education must be provided and encouraged so that the sister will be prepared to participate and contribute in a manner equal to or above that of her average lay counterpart. Religious community leaders are responsible for providing such educational opportunities in the form of workshops, institutes, conferences, seminars, up-to-date tests, reference books and other resource materials.

In addition, each sister must be willing to recognize her own assets and liabilities. Likewise, the religious community must take a personal interest in each sister and attempt to discover how she best fits into the medical center's work. A sister should be evaluated according to her intellectual ability, her competence and her interests. Efforts should be made to assign a sister to work in an area for which she has both preparation and preference. There seems to be no obvious gain in assigning a sister to a position which makes her dissatisfied and unhappy and in which she can function only as an obedient religious. On the contrary, those sisters who are properly prepared and placed in their desired areas of work contribute greatly to the successful operation of the health center. This contribution need not be made on a key or administrative level. Numerous positions are filled effectively by the sister who performs to the best of her ability with true zeal and personal satisfaction.

It cannot be denied that religious and laymen are equally responsible for ensuring the most effective, comprehensive, comfortable and safe care to all people at a price they can afford. Beyond this, it is expected that the hospital sister's performance will be an inspiration to patients, co-workers and other personnel. It will be, only if it is governed by the rules, regulations and procedures which affect lay personnel. The sister should not operate as if her religious status exempts her from adhering to the policies and regulations which govern all other employees.

Effective planning demands consistent regulations. Personnel policies governing sick leave, vacations, holidays and leaves of absence and fringe benefits should be the same for the sister and the layman. By such consistent professional relations with their co-workers, hospital sisters show their respect for and approval of policies that are concerned with equitable treatment of employees and effective patient care and service.

The principle of "convincement by involvement" is applicable to the sister in the medical center. Sir Leslie Stephens has said, "The only way in which one human being can properly attempt to influence another is by encouraging him to think for himself instead of endeavoring to instill ready-made opinions into his head." A program is acceptable only if all the persons involved are given a chance to participate in the planning and operation of the respective program.¹

Here again the religious community must allow the sisters to be creatively active in the medical center's programs and activities. On this point, a statement issued by The

Catholic Hospital Association in February, 1968, under the heading "Staff Nurse Experience for Young Religious Who Are Nurses," is worth noting. The CHA Committee on Nursing Service recommends to major superiors, administrators and directors of nursing service the following consideration:

"All religious graduating from preservice nursing programs—associate degrees, diploma, and baccalaureate—should be assigned as staff nurses in their first positions in nursing. Promotional opportunities should be considered the same as for their lay counterparts—either vertically in administrative positions in nursing or horizontally in clinical specialist positions."

The above recommendation was approved by the CHA Council on Professional Practice and Patient Care in March, 1968, and by the CHA Board of Trustees in April, 1968.

EVALUATE LIMITED ASSIGNMENTS

The time has come when religious communities engaged in care of the sick must re-evaluate the traditional policy of reassigning a sister every six to eight years. If a sister is doing a good job, is happy in doing it and is considered an asset to the center, she should be permitted to remain in her position. Often we fail to realize the amount of regression that takes place when lines of continuity and long-range as well as intermediate planning are interrupted by replacing an individual who is considered merely "instrumental." It is very doubtful that such actions are beneficial to the medical center since additional time and money are required to develop job competence in an "understudy." Too often such changes prove expensive, and the public whom we are serving becomes the victim of higher medical expenses. Sisters have a maximum responsibility to seek ways to minimize such drawbacks.

The recommendation made above does not preclude the fact that the hospital sister should be subject to performance evaluations. If she is unhappy in her position or is performing unsatisfactorily, she should be transferred to another position in which she can more readily meet expected requirements and achieve personal satisfaction. Religious community leaders have a grave responsibility to help the sister overcome the obstacles she may encounter within the framework of her assignment.

Because the hospital is gradually becoming a community health center, an institution able to assume the responsibility of providing comprehensive health services, the hospital sister must recognize the need for change. She must recognize, as well, that some Catholic hospitals have long been noted for their resistance to change. Yet change is an inevitable element in the world and the essence of progress.

Why must present patterns of patient-care services change? What factors indicate the need for a new approach to patient care? The reasons are many. The demands of hospital care are far greater today than they were a decade ago. Doctors are demanding closer and steadier care for their patients; administrators are having difficulty getting enough nurses to staff even the critical areas, and the cost of nursing care is rising to such an extent that hospitals are finding it hard to budget and balance their books. Nor is the patient more content. Recent figures show he receives professional nursing care only eight minutes of every eight hours. The nurse is probably unhappiest of all. She would like to spend more time with her patients, but her many other responsibilities do not permit it. One solution to such current problems is the concept of progressive patient care.

PROGRESSIVE PATIENT CARE

Progressive patient care may be defined as the organization of facilities, services and staff around the medical and nursing needs of the patient. A hospital that has imple-

mented progressive patient care is comprised of five units: an *intensive care unit*, for patients who are critically ill; an *intermediate care unit*, for patients requiring a moderate amount of nursing care; a *self-care unit*, for patients who are either physically self-sufficient but still require a great deal of restorative care, or who were admitted to the hospital for diagnostic studies; *long-term care unit*, for patients needing prolonged or rehabilitative assistance, requiring the services of the hospital; and an organized *home care program* that is hospital-based.²

Progressive patient care regards the individual patient's medical and nursing needs as the pivot of hospital services. Hence this concept of patient care is especially suited to the establishment of comprehensive medical service centers in which a wide spectrum of services and facilities for both inpatients and outpatients are available.

The concept of the clinical nurse specialist is another suggested approach to a more effective system of patient care. The image of the professional nurse has changed from one who administers direct nursing care to one who guides and administers the nursing care of patients. The clinical nurse specialist is to nursing what the physician specialist is to medicine. Her primary responsibility is quality nursing care. She diagnoses the nursing needs of the patient and formulates a nursing care plan for other members of the nursing team. In this role, there are many possibilities for the sister who is a clinical nurse specialist, as Sr. Leon Douville, DC and Sr. Marilyn Emminger, DC, point out in their study of *The Sister as a Clinical Specialist*.³ Such possibilities cannot be overlooked by religious communities, who have been searching for ways in which to use their sisters to the greatest advantage both for the Church, the community and the sisters' own spiritual and professional development.

PENETRATING QUESTION

Any long-range plan which proposes change should be based on the answer to this question: "Is our primary objective to exercise control or influence?" Today's hospital sister must answer this question in terms of her philosophy, her Christian commitment to people requiring health care and her concern for the best interests of the community.

Modern organization of health services radically departs from some traditional patterns. It demands that the sister become directly involved in today's community health center on a level equal to or above that of the secular professional and along lines suggested by David B. Wilson, MD, director of University Hospital, Jackson, Miss., and past president of the American Hospital Association. Dr. Wilson identifies four issues as being particularly pertinent to hospitals today: *manpower, reimbursement, planning and effectiveness*. The federal government is very active in all of these areas. Hospitals are living in a fishbowl and must be prepared to reveal to the public the complete details of their operations.⁴ If those details are not in order, hospitals may be forced to face some very embarrassing revelations. Sisters, too, must recognize the part they play in the *manpower, reimbursement, planning and effectiveness* issues of today's medical health center.

The personal needs of the hospital sister can be met through her role in health service only if she is prepared to respond totally and effectively to the challenge presented by the health needs of society. In addition to the challenges described above, she, as a religious, must commit herself to Christ's work of healing. The sponsors of a Catholic-affiliated health facility must commit its unified strength and continuity to health care. Moreover, as a civic as well as Catholic health facility, the medical center must strive to identify unmet needs and help meet them through community effort.

¹Footnotes at end of article.

APOSTOLIC AND PROFESSIONAL LIVES

Today's hospital sisters undertake many functions that are recognized by their communities as integral to the sisters' apostolic and professional lives. Within the comprehensive medical centers, effective interaction between the sisters and the employes of the various departments permits the philosophy of the institution to permeate the different areas and levels of the medical center. At the same time, this interaction does not prevent the sister from being with the community at the times prescribed or from participating in the "family life" of the sisters. What is required of her are individual planning and the willingness to function as a dedicated and competent member of her religious community and of the health team in today's comprehensive medical center.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Lewis E. Weeks and John R. Griffith, ed. "Progressive Patient Care," An Anthology, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1964, p. 21.

² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

³ Sister Leon Douville, DC and Sister Marilyn Emminger, DC, *The Sister as a Clinical Specialist*, St. Louis, Conference of Catholic Schools of Nursing, 1966.

⁴ David B. Wilson, MD, "Voluntary Hospitals Face Critical Years," *Hospital Topics*, March 1968, p. 27.

THE JOURNEY AHEAD

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, to commence is to begin. Commencement ceremonies mark the conferring of diplomas, the closing of a period of education and the beginning of a new chapter in the lives of the recipients of the diplomas.

Commencement addresses sometimes emphasize the closing aspect, sometimes the beginning. Ideally, they tie the two together with a thought that enhances the value of what has gone before by relating the past to the journey ahead.

The commencement address delivered by our colleague, JOHN N. ERLBORN of Illinois, at St. Procopius College in his district, clearly falls in this category. What he had to say, however, has meaning, I believe, not only to the students who were that day graduating from college but to us in Congress, as we contemplate solutions to the many problems this Nation faces.

The address follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT ST. PROCOPIUS COLLEGE BY JOHN N. ERLBORN, MAY 25, 1969

I am going to refer to two texts today in developing a theme about Freedom and Slavery; and in doing so I am going to borrow, first, from the Bible, and, second, from English literature.

The first is one of the most famous lines from the Bible—so famous, indeed, that many are surprised to learn that it is in the Gospel according to St. John. In speaking to some of the Jewish elders, Jesus said, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free."

All of us want to be free, and perhaps the most stirring line of our National Anthem tells the world that we are the land of the free and the home of the brave. There is a

certain poetic license in this, for not very many of us are truly free; and there are even some of us who aren't very brave.

The second element of my text comes, as I say, from English literature—from the poem *Herakles* by Robert Browning. "A man in armour," wrote Browning, "is his Armour's slave."

He does not intend it that way. He intends that his armor shall protect him from harm—that it shall free him from the slings and darts of his enemies while he goes about smiting his opposition hip and thigh.

So much for my two texts on freedom and slavery.

In this country, men for the first time were privileged to establish a government based upon the consent of the governed; and to seek—in the words of the Constitution—"to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity . . ."

That was quite an undertaking, and of course we haven't fully lived up to it yet. But we're working on it.

Man hasn't lived up to the Ten Commandments, either; but we keep trying.

We believe that men are most likely to solve their problems if they are free to discuss them, to find probable solutions, to test those solutions, and then to learn to apply what is good in them while discarding what is bad.

Sometimes, I hasten to add, it is difficult to know what is good and what is bad, what is true and what is false. There was a time, I suppose, when it was safe to judge by the appearances—but today, the woman who looks like a dumb blonde may be, in reality, a smart brunette.

All too often, men have rallied to labels, have wrapped themselves in the appearance of virtue rather than in virtue itself. They have been more interested in strengthening their point of view, or—if you will—in strengthening their prejudices, than in finding what is best for our country or how they can best serve their fellow men.

Over the years, for example, some have prided themselves on their liberalism; and these people have sneered at conservatives. At the same time, others have declared themselves to be conservatives. To them, "conservative" is a title of honor and it is shameful—well, almost shameful—to be a liberal.

Both of these kinds of men have wrapped themselves in the armor of a label; and they are, as Browning wrote almost a century ago, enslaved by their own armor.

It is my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives. In that place there are drawn together 435 men and women from every part of the country. Some are from wealthy constituencies and some from poor; some are from literate constituencies and some from illiterate; some are from farms and some from cities; some are good men and some are bad; and I cannot close this list without mentioning that some are conservative and some are liberals.

Some wear these labels only for convenience and make up their minds on a basis of good sense; but others wear the labels as armor—and they are enslaved.

On any controversial question—the anti-ballistic missile, or the boycott of grapes, or Federal aid to education—the armored liberal first inquires—not, "What are the facts?"—he first inquires "What is the liberal position?" "What side are my liberal friends on?"

At the same time, the enslaved conservative moves instinctively to the opposite pole—to where his fellow conservatives are.

To these people, the only thing worse than being on the wrong side of the argument is being in the middle.

Now let me sketch for you a most interesting journey—or, rather, pair of journeys—of recent years, journeys in which the liberals have moved from left to right, and the conservatives from right to left.

By definition, a liberal is said to be interested primarily in individual freedom and, by common consent, a conservative is more likely to emphasize law and order—compliance with the mores and the laws of the community.

In the furtherance of the individual freedom in this century, the liberal has fitted the individual workman into unions and has fostered the growth of big government; while the conservative has sought to avoid a vast accumulation of power in Washington and has spoken favorably of individual liberties.

A generation ago, in the quest for peace, the liberal espoused internationalism. The cause of peace would be served, he said, if we in the United States were more concerned about our brothers across the sea. We are all citizens of the world, he told us; and some conservatives used the epithet, "One World-er," as one of scorn.

This conservative tended to be a nationalist, and even isolationist. We were secure, he said, behind our moats, the Atlantic on one side and the Pacific on the other. He heeded to the letter Washington's farewell admonition about staying out of foreign alliances. The conservative dominated our foreign policy in the 1920's and 1930's.

The liberal stood for more trade and tariffs for revenue only; the conservative was prone to blame our entry into World War I on the liberals, and he kept us out of the League of Nations.

Twelve million of the sons of this liberal and this conservative went off to fight in World War II; and they went to places their fathers had never heard of—Guadalcanal, the Murmansk Run, and Remagen Bridge.

These young men came back. They had that world-wide vision that the liberals had been talking about; and the United States helped organize the United Nations. We led in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The liberals purged and the conservatives fulminated against the Marshall Plan and, a little later, foreign aid.

All these things were done in the interests of collective security, and that was the key to peace. While the liberals went merrily on their way, conservatives had to content themselves with deploring Communist infiltration into almost every department of government.

The liberal, priding himself upon his tolerance of change, was often scornful of this preoccupation of the conservative. For his part, the conservative often became so suspicious of Communism that he opposed all change.

Each drew his label about him like armor, and each became a slave to that armor.

In the middle fifties, we sent a few hundred men to help some little country in Asia, but it was no war. Our men were advisers. Nobody was much concerned when President Kennedy increased the number of advisors from 750 to 15,000 in 1961 and 1962, nor even in 1964 when we raised the number of advisers to 23,000 and Congress approved the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

During the years 1966 and 1967 it began to dawn on the liberals that collective security agreements and treaties might not of themselves guarantee peace, and could lead to our armed intervention in other parts of the world. And about the same time conservatives were embracing the concept that Communist Aggression and expansion could be thwarted only by credible mutual security agreements.

Parallel evolution had taken us to the point where the conservatives had become internationalists and the liberals changed to neo-isolationists.

Now, we began to hear eminent liberals reasoning that we were in a war because, in the first instance, we had given aid to a little country called South Vietnam; and may-

be we wouldn't be involved in that far-away place if we had kept our aid to ourselves.

Suddenly, it was the liberal who told us that we cannot police the whole world. Suddenly, the liberals were urging us toward a new isolationism.

The conservative shouted, "Win or get out!" But he didn't really mean that we should get out. He meant we should win. The liberal shouted, "Hell, no! We won't go!" And strangely enough both of these people want peace. Each believes he is pointing us toward a path of peace.

I may be guilty of foolhardiness when I suggest that we might—and let me underline the tentative character of my verb—we might have avoided this war in Vietnam if our liberals had spent a little more time listening to our conservatives; and our conservatives had given some more consideration to the liberal point of view.

President Nixon touched upon this point in his Inaugural Address. He said, in part:

"We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another, until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices."

I say, be careful about shouting at your fellow man. Inflammatory words don't often sound the same to the listener as they do to the speaker. A label which may serve as armor against having to think things through may also serve as a prison which prevents a man from hearing both sides or from thinking about what's right and what's wrong.

We must shed this type of armour and practice a bit of tolerance of the views of others. You know what tolerance is. It's that uneasy feeling that comes over you when you begin to realize the other fellow may be right after all.

In our busy and complex world, it is both easy and convenient to substitute names for thinking. It is easy to brush off a discomfiting statement with a curt dismissal: "Look who's talking—just a young punk with long hair who needs a bath. He's a hippy."

And it's convenient for a college student to reject the advice of his elders: "Just a bunch of old fogies. They haven't had a new thought since the gay 90's."

In this kind of world, police quickly become fascist pigs, student activists become revolutionaries, and college presidents become agents of the military-industrial complex.

It doesn't matter what these people say, for obviously nobody needs to listen to a pig, or a revolutionary, or an agent of the military-industrial complex. And as I mentioned a few minutes ago, no liberal needed to listen to a reactionary isolationist; and no conservative ought to consider what a muddle-headed liberal might be saying.

How willingly we wrap ourselves in the armor of labels and become its slave!

Perhaps it would be well for the youngsters to listen for a while to the older people; and to consider that their parents' generation has contributed much to the betterment of the world. The material improvement is most often mentioned, because it is visible and measurable. I submit, however, that the generation which was born between—let us say—1905 and 1935 and which now ranges in age from the mid-thirties to the mid-sixties—these are the people who make up what is known as the Establishment, and they have contributed greatly to the betterment of their fellow men.

These contributions have been intellectual, scientific, cultural, physical and even spiritual.

They have a right to be heard. Their words need to be considered.

By the same token, it may be well for the oldsters to examine some of the articles of faith which our young people are trying to

proclaim. To be sure, the youngsters have not been particularly adept at getting their message across. They might do better, now that they have gotten our attention, if they would pay more heed to good grooming, to well-combed hair, and to a schedule of regular baths.

What I want to say is:

Let's not be overly concerned about labels. Is he a liberal? Let's not place as great importance on that as on what he has to say.

Is she an old fuss-budget? Let's forget her age for a time and give her an opportunity to express her point of view.

Is he a hippy? But perhaps if we listen we can find something with which we can agree—perhaps we can find some common ground on which we can meet. And perhaps we can expand that common ground.

Let us go to the root of the questions before us, concerning ourselves less with labels than with the good that can be done.

Let us remember that labels change—and times change—and people change.

You know, throughout most of my life—until just the past few years—the flapper has been regarded as the epitome of the new freedom for women. It was the flapper who raised women's skirts so as to show her ankles and even the calves of her legs to her horrified elders.

I was about the age of these seniors—perhaps a little younger—when it came to me one day (and I don't mind saying it was a shocking revelation) that, before I was born, my mother had been a flapper.

I had always regarded her as old fashioned. Nice, of course, but not really with it. And—let's face it—when I was 20, she was old fashioned. She was no longer the carefree young thing who defied the Establishment. Now, whether she liked it or not, she was part and parcel of the Establishment.

I repeat, labels change, and liberals become conservatives. Times change and peace becomes war. People change, and flappers become matrons. Customs change and Catholics may now hear the Mass in English.

My friends, if we spend our time on these external things—if we wrap ourselves in the armor of labels, such as flapper, hippy, or moss-back, or Establishment—then we become the slaves of the wrappings and the labels become our masters.

Abraham Lincoln had this thought when he sent his annual message to Congress in 1862. He wrote:

"If there could ever be a time for mere catch arguments (which is another term for labels) that time surely is not now. In times like the present, men should utter nothing for which they would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity."

I am sure you seniors will know what I mean when I say that the certificate which you are about to receive is only a wrapping; and the degree is a label. Wrap yourself in the armor of that degree, and you will become a slave to it.

On the other hand, if you use your education as a weapon to cut your way through the catch arguments to discover truth, then you will be free—and your 16 years of schooling will have achieved its purpose.

I suppose I could have said all that I have intended to convey today in a very few words—in a few short sentences: The best advice I can give to any young man or young woman upon graduation is this: Keep an open mind, receptive to the wisdom others may possess regardless of the label they wear. And don't allow the label placed upon you to become your prison, for remember in your research for truth, and that is what our lives are all about, "A man in armor is his armor's slave."

With these precepts in mind you may be successful in your search for truth "and the truth shall set you free."

And now I remind you that you have only

11,000 working days at your disposal before you will be ready to retire at age 65.

Young people! Get busy! Make the most of those days!

LAKE OKEECHOBEE, FLA.

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today asking the Secretary of the Army to cancel a proceeding which he personally ordered involving an application to mine minerals from Lake Okeechobee, Fla., and to deny the permit request on the grounds that the company no longer holds title to the minerals.

The Secretary ordered the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the processing of a permit application filed by Coastal Petroleum Co., to remove minerals from the submerged lands under the 700 square mile fresh water lake, in spite of the known opposition of the State government which owns title to the lands in question, and contrary to a published official agreement which existed between the State and the Army districts having jurisdiction in Florida area matters.

The basis of the Coastal permit application was a lease which had been granted by the State over 20 years ago. That lease has now been canceled by official action of the State cabinet.

Coastal Petroleum no longer has a lease on the submerged lands, and therefore cannot mine minerals. The permit request should be denied forthwith, and the public hearing scheduled for June 12 canceled.

The company may wish to contest the lease decision in the courts. But there is no longer any grounds for an Army public hearing on an application which can now be denied on the simple fact that the company does not have title to the minerals it seeks to mine from the lake, until the courts may determine otherwise. If the courts reinstate the lease, the company may reapply and I would hope the Army would deny the application on the basis of the damage mining will cause to fish and wildlife, flood control, and water pollution. But as of today, there is no legal basis for the permit application, and the Secretary should so order by denying the application without hearing.

STEBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA
OBSERVES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this spring, the Steuben Society of America is observing its 50th anniversary. The Steuben Society was founded to further un-

derstanding between Germany and America, and between Americans of German descent and Americans of other origins. More broadly, members of the society have dedicated themselves to pursuit of the ideals of public service and patriotism exemplified in the life of General von Steuben, the German-born military adviser to George Washington who helped train the Continental Army and who subsequently became an American citizen. Over the years, members of the society, in my own State of Wisconsin and across the Nation, have compiled a notable record of civic leadership and service to those in need. The society has never faltered in its adherence to the guiding principles of unity, tolerance, charity, and justice. Today, those principles are as relevant to American life as they were when the society adopted them in 1919. I wish to salute the Steuben Society and its members for their many accomplishments over the past 50 years, for their continuing work on behalf of national unity and international understanding, and for their contribution to the vigorous life of communities throughout the Nation.

WHEN IS A DETERRENT A DETERRENT?

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. K. H. Wood of Pittsburgh, has recently written to me expressing his concern about many of the world's problems, particularly the missile system.

He has enclosed an article written by Dorothy Thompson which incorporates some of the views concerning deterrents expressed by the late General Eisenhower and Winston Churchill after World War II.

Though written 14 years ago, the philosophy expressed in the article is timeless, and I include it here in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Post Gazette, Mar. 11, 1955]

IS H-BOMB SUPERIORITY A DETERRENT OF WAR?

(By Dorothy Thompson)

NEW YORK, Mar. 10.—In reading Churchill's sober—and, in passages, sublime—speech to the House of Commons on March 2, I recalled a talk I had with General Eisenhower in Paris on April 1, 1952. President Truman had just declared his intention not to seek the presidency again and it seemed certain that the general would do so, but he had not yet spoken and would not discuss political questions. Instead we talked about his philosophy of life.

I now recall his affirmation that the world had had no ease from tension in which fully to digest the "enormous and tragic" experience of World War II. That, perhaps, is the root of the matter. This generation has endured that experience without innerly evaluating it. One thought during the war that nobody would emerge from it as he had been before; that the experience of slaughtered millions, falling cities, unexampled brutality and unforgettable heroism, would induce a universal conversion, rendering insignificant

the various contending ideologies and ushering in the great revolution for civilization and humanity.

But the soul is not purged by pity and terror except as it spiritually digests the experience of them and sublimates it into new moral values impelling new actions. Only thus does suffering purify.

There was such recognition in Churchill's speech on defense and the hydrogen bomb; of wonderment that the abyss is still there, yawning with infinitely more hideous depths than the one into which he gazed without falling in 1940. He still gazes without falling. Interpidity is the core of his character. But he does not gaze without being profoundly shaken. He spoke far more candidly than any other leader has done of the world in which we find ourselves, the prime fact of which we prefer not to face—treating it as though it were not really a fact, but rather a Jules Verne popular science tale.

The fact, of course, is the H-bomb. And even Churchill, who has foreseen the possibilities in nuclear fission since 1931, does not pretend to know how it can be controlled. He said, "It may well be that by a process of sublime irony, we have reached a stage in history where safety will be the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation."

This is the theory of mutual possession as a deterrent. The Russians, he is convinced, will not start a war as long as the United States has great nuclear superiority, though "in three or four years or even less" the Soviets will probably be capable (as America already is) of inflicting "crippling if not mortal injury" on any country. He thinks that at such a point the risk of war may be less "when each realizes that global war will mean mutual annihilation," and the aggressor can count on instantaneous massive reprisals. At that point, he hopes, genuine and effective disarmament may be achieved.

It boils down to building deterrents and postponing disarmament until each side will be able to annihilate the other. Then, at last, that great act of conversion may occur.

But suppose it does not? We assure Moscow that we will not make a preventive war. But the fact is that preventive war is the only logical form of war in the H-bomb era.

The overwhelming advantage is with the side that delivers the first "crippling, if not mortal injury," above all, at the nuclear plants of the main enemy. With effective nuclear parity the deterrent of "massive reprisals" would not offset that advantage if either or both sides believed war unavoidable.

The "deterrent," therefore, is only in the goodness or badness of the human heart; only in the act of conversion.

Churchill spoke movingly of "watching little children at their merry play and wondering what would lie before them if God wearied of humanity."

But God endowed humanity with the freedom to weary of him. It will not be because of God's weariness if man destroys mankind.

VIRGINIA MILITARY INSTITUTE GRADUATION

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the class of 1969 of Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., was privileged to hear, on Sunday, May 18, 1969, an address by the Honorable Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army.

Because I believe Secretary Resor's re-

marks will be of interest to the House, particularly with respect to his assessment of the importance of the ROTC program to the readiness of our defense forces, I include the text of his address at this time, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE STANLEY R. RESOR

General Shell, Members of the Board of Visitors, Members of the Class of 1969 and their Parents and Friends, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am grateful for your invitation to share this important day with you. As General Shell noted, it is a day of mixed emotions—a day that affects each of us here in quite different ways. Some are filled with nostalgia; others are eager with anticipation; a sense of continuity is mixed with a feeling of change. It is a time for looking forward and a time for looking back.

In the words of your most illustrious graduate, General George Catlett Marshall, at a commencement address here in June of 1940, "This is a day of high emotions to you men of the graduating class; it is the culmination of your period of preparation for life. You step off this morning on your own, to make your way in the world. To your parents this is a morning of profound pride and satisfaction, far beyond any such previous reactions. Maybe to some of them it is the moment for a sigh of profound relief. The hazards of youth have not sunk your ship. You are across the bar and safely started on your way." From those words it would appear that a concern for the hazards of youth is not one peculiar to today's parents.

As Cadet Smith has so well noted, we are today in a time of questioning—and the defense establishment is not going unnoticed. The ABM, our involvement in Vietnam, the size of the defense budget, our overseas bases and commitments are all under close public scrutiny. I want to address today that aspect of the debate which concerns the role of ROTC in our educational institutions. This seems a particularly appropriate time and place, for all of you have had ROTC training, and many of you have accepted commissions in the armed forces. I have chosen this subject not only because of its topical interest, but because I believe that resolution of the issues which are involved in ROTC on the campus bears on some of our most vital concerns.

Let me start by emphasizing the importance which ROTC has in our system. The ROTC program is now the primary source of officers for the active Army, and a significant contributor to the officer corps of the other Services. We plan that it will continue to be. But its full importance is not indicated solely by counting the number of lieutenants commissioned. To appreciate its importance fully we must recognize the influential positions to which its graduates have advanced. For example, there are currently 147 general officers on active duty in the Army who were commissioned through the ROTC program. At one point both of our Field Force Headquarters in Vietnam were commanded by lieutenant generals who started their careers as ROTC cadets. At another time five of our divisions in Vietnam were commanded by major generals with ROTC backgrounds. At the present time, the Assistant Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, the principal military advisor to the Paris negotiating team, and newly appointed Deputy Commanding General of our forces in Vietnam, received their commissions out of the ROTC program.

This is by no means a full catalog of the successful ROTC graduates. But it emphasizes the important contribution the ROTC program makes to our military leadership and our national security.

ROTC is more than a means for procuring officers. It serves two larger goals of greater

importance to the nation and to the men who are involved. First, as it appeared to General Marshall when he spoke here in June 1940, so it appears to us today, that for the foreseeable future we must maintain the ability to provide for our national security through an adequate defense establishment. Second, we must all of us be prepared individually to commit time and make sacrifices in public service, both out of obligation to our nation and for reasons of self-fulfillment.

Taking the first point, we have since the end of World War II based our security on collective defense. We have learned that we cannot rely on a "Fortress America." Our lives and our nation's welfare and well being are inextricably tied to other free nations. History has taught us that it is better to help those nations remain free than to have to rush to their defense as we did in World Wars I and II. Further, the existence of an open, outward-looking, humane society in the United States depends upon the vitality of similar societies elsewhere. Nothing has changed to warrant a retreat to isolationism. We still have our commitments to aid free nations of the world in their struggle to preserve independence and live in peace. This does not mean that we have, or must assume, the role of "world policeman." It does mean that it is in our interest to fulfill our commitments, for which we have already paid a heavy price, to those international arrangements which help to preserve world peace. So long as we pursue those commitments, it is necessary to maintain a sizable military establishment and to possess the ability, if the need arises, to expand that establishment. ROTC, as the principal source of officers for our armed forces, is essential to both those goals.

I mentioned that ROTC is important also in that it provides a way for men both to fulfill their obligation of service to their country as well as achieve personal fulfillment. The first point needs no elaboration. In justification of the second I remind you of the ancient Greek conception of happiness, namely, the exercise of vital powers along lines of excellence in a life affording them scope. I believe that in our nation today it is in the arena of public service where happiness, as described by the ancient Greeks, can most likely be found. Nowhere is this more true than in military service. The challenges of military service and a military career require the exercise of all of a man's vital powers, intellectual and physical. The traditions of our military services insist on excellence, and the scope of concerns of the military are as broad as one can possibly envision for any single institution.

There is another, and fundamentally important reason why we should preserve ROTC in our institutions of higher learning. As an authority on the process of revolution has pointed out, "Brave men are not uncommon in any system, but there is a tendency in most systems to make courage and a disciplined openness of mind to the significant facts, mutually exclusive." He saw in this tendency the explanation for the downfall of many nations. We can avoid this tendency, and we can ensure that our officers possess a disciplined openness of mind to the significant facts, only so long as they come to the armed services with the best possible education. The best way to do that is to draw our officers from our college graduates.

It is not only important to the Services that we keep men of breadth of vision in our military establishment, it is important to the nation as well. Our military leadership is called upon to make decisions vital to us all. It is thus not only desirable but necessary that that leadership be as enlightened and as broad of vision as possible. Again it is to our universities where we must turn for such men.

For example, our attention is currently fixed on the war in Vietnam. We recognize that there are several wars in Vietnam: the

tactical war, the political war, the psychological war, the economic war, the war of the military advisor and the war of the negotiator. At all levels of all of these wars, from platoon level to national level, you will find American military officers leading, counseling, or advising. It is thus a matter of prime concern to the people of this country whether these Americans in uniform are equal to the tasks before them and whether they are representative of the nation whose uniform they wear. I can assure you that they are, and I know of no better way to assure an affirmative answer to such questions in the future than through continuation of ROTC.

There is a somewhat more practical reason why we need to draw heavily from our universities in manning the officer corps of our defense system. The tasks that lie ahead in all of our armed forces are of ever-increasing complexity and diversity. They will challenge the best of minds, and a fair share of such minds are needed in the uniformed services to meet this challenge. Some thirty years ago when our present general officers were commissioned, none of us could have anticipated the responsibilities they now fulfill. Similarly, none of us can foresee the world in which you members of today's graduating class will live and work thirty years hence. We do know, however, that to cope with that world our leadership must have the benefit of a broad education, such as you and our ROTC graduates throughout the country receive. It is only with such leadership that we can have confidence for today and hope for tomorrow.

ROTC has proven itself the most successful way to assure a broad representation of backgrounds and philosophies in our officer ranks. It is fortunate that no single institution can meet the Services' requirements for officers. The Army alone commissions over 15,000 new officers through the ROTC program annually. They come from all over the nation. They are educated in some 350 different colleges and universities and in a wide variety of academic disciplines. Thus the ROTC officers entering the Services each year provide the best possible guarantee of a truly representative and diverse officer corps. To be strong and healthy, our Service leadership must be as varied in background as the nation itself. ROTC assures that it will be.

Acceptance of the importance of ROTC to the nation's defense and to the men it serves does not mean that the program cannot be improved. Indeed, its very viability depends on constant improvement to keep it abreast of the changes occurring in the field of education and to meet the changes occurring in the military profession itself.

In recognition of the expanding fields of knowledge, the academic and intellectual content of the ROTC curricula continue to be increased. By capitalizing on improved instructional techniques, the time devoted to the more mechanical phases of training continues to be reduced without loss of effectiveness. We do not resist change but use it for progress and improvement. We are striving to make the ROTC program reflect the fact that there can be a mutually reinforcing relationship between the academic and military disciplines in the education of the whole man. The history of VMI proves that it can be achieved.

The ROTC program is reviewed regularly not only by the Services but also by distinguished civilian educators. It is a large program, hosted by a multitude of autonomous institutions. They embrace a great diversity of educational philosophies, and their academic programs may differ from one college to another and within the same university. For these reasons, the program must allow latitude for harmonizing the Services' requirements with the colleges' requirements. We have recently adopted policies which will go further toward ensuring that such harmony can be achieved.

It is for these reasons that I am deeply

convinced of the importance of ROTC to the nation. It is much more than a means of procuring officers for our armed forces. It provides those who choose, an opportunity to serve their country and exercise their vital powers in the pursuit of excellence. It is a way to ensure that our armed forces are led by men who are not only brave but who have a disciplined openness of mind to significant facts. It is a way to ensure that our armed forces are led by men educated to deal with the complexities of the modern world. And it is a way to ensure that the leaders of our armed forces are representative of all of the people of the United States.

It is in this broad context that I look with such admiration on VMI. The present Corps of Cadets has been drawn from 43 states and 3 foreign nations. The members of this graduating class will join the ranks of the more than 9,000 who have graduated from VMI since it was founded 130 years ago. Those graduates have established an enviable record and have been recognized in many ways, including the Medal of Honor and the Nobel Peace Prize. So too, many in this graduating class will go on to distinguished careers in the military service and in the public and private sectors of civilian life.

Sixteen or more years ago you began your education. Now you have completed four years of arduous college studies. A foundation is laid, built on your innate abilities, your enthusiasm, your ideals. Now the education of adulthood and leadership begins. You go forth to serve your country in positions ever more challenging and responsible. A great opportunity to learn and to grow and to serve lies ahead of you, positions which afford a great opportunity for acceptance of responsibility of which your valedictorian has spoken so eloquently. Here at VMI you have made the beginning which will enable you to seize that opportunity. The future of our nation, and its security, depend on your achievements. I have the utmost confidence in that future.

I know that you can say of your experience at VMI what General Marshall said: "This institution gave me not only a standard for my daily conduct among men, but it endowed me with a military heritage of honor and self-sacrifice."

Good luck and Godspeed.

GEN. OMAR BRADLEY SPEAKS OUT ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, who was known during World War II as the "GI's General," has made some profound remarks in a D-Day tribute to those men who gave their lives on the eventful day. His remarks entitled "That We May Learn To Live as Bravely as They Died," appeared in the Sunday magazine supplement *This Week* for June 1, and I am privileged to insert it in the RECORD:

A D-DAY TRIBUTE BY GENERAL OF THE ARMY OMAR N. BRADLEY: "THAT WE MAY LEARN TO LIVE AS BRAVELY AS THEY DIED"

Twenty-five years ago next Friday the largest amphibious assault in history invaded the continent of Europe, denying the designs of aggressors who would covet and destroy the free world. I was there that day. I can recall that mist-shrouded dawn, the camouflaged LST's, the strong bodies that hurled them-

selves across the sands and into battle on the Normandy beaches.

Many of those earnest young men who left their homes to defend them returned to those homes to live, work and worship in freedom. Too many never returned. They lie buried on the quiet cliffs overlooking Omaha Beach, beneath rain-whipped elms in our national cemeteries in England, or in a hero's grave in their home communities. Our allies, England and France, gave us land on which to bury our dead. They gave us courage and friendship when our need was desperate. And they gave us their sons to fight side by side with our own.

We honor on this anniversary not only those brave soldiers who died on D-Day, but the generation after generation of young sons who have had to die in conflicts visited upon them by issues remote from their everyday lives, in bitter struggles that have scarred the progress of all mankind, wasting the youth and resources of all nations.

We pause today to take comfort and strength from those of our dead who have already given this nation so much. We pause to learn—if we can—how men might live as charitably together in peace as they die for each other in war. We pause to ask why it is that men cannot live as bravely as they die.

Our lost young sons are partly the victims of your folly, and mine. They are the victims of all peace-loving peoples who turn their backs on the ills of the world. And if the United States ever stoops to expedients to avoid the difficult decisions that come with defense, we shall once again run the dangers of all half-way measures and waste our strength and conscience as a force for good.

If we cringe from the necessity of meeting issues boldly—with principle, resolution and strength—then we shall simply hurdle along from crisis to crisis, improvising with expedients, seeking inoffensive solutions, drugging the nation with an illusion of security which does not really exist.

The United States has matured to world leadership; we must steer by the stars, not by the lights of each passing ship. If we are to scamper from crisis to crisis, fixing principles and policies to the whim of each day, we shall place ourselves supinely and helplessly at the mercy of any aggressor who might play on our public opinion and decimate our resolution at will.

In this 25th anniversary week of D-Day, we pay homage to the strong, the weak, the leaders, the led, the brave, the fearful—to all who perished where only God could witness their charity to their fellow men.

Proudly—but reverently, sadly—we honor them. We pray they will ever rest in peace.

MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Hill-Burton hospital construction program has been one of our most outstanding contributions in the field of health care, and I am proud to serve on the committee which has jurisdiction over it.

There have been several unique features of the Hill-Burton Act which, in my view, have proven especially valuable in providing health care.

The matching grant, which has been the mainstay of Hill-Burton for over two decades, has worked to assure that health care is a joint venture between the Federal and State governments. This

approach has increased from 50 percent in 1946 to 90 percent today the supply of hospital beds needed as compared to the available supply. These figures reveal a tremendous success, and I believe it is wise that we continue in this basic method.

Admittedly, there are now certain reasons for departing from the strict requirements of the matching grant, but by and large these reasons do not outweigh the entire program, and the bill reported by the committee recommends new programs to handle needed loan guarantees and interest subsidies.

Another aspect of the traditional Hill-Burton program is that individual projects within each State are subject to clearance by a State Hill-Burton Advisory Committee. This point has been one of the most flexible features of the program, and it is one which has helped to have the question of health priorities within a State solved by those most knowledgeable of the facts. It has been one of the best possible vehicles for assuring that the States use the funds in the way which will give the greatest improvement in the State.

State Hill-Burton Boards now have the authority—and they have had it since 1964—to transfer all or any part of its funds for new hospitals and other facility construction to modernization if the State agency determines that the purposes of the program will be better served by making such transfer. This is another point of great flexibility in the existing program, and I believe it adequately responds to the challenge that the present Hill-Burton program does not place adequate emphasis on modernization as compared to new construction.

It is also significant that the committee has not changed the present formula for determining each State's entitlement under new construction funds or under modernization funds. Under existing law, grants for construction are allotted among the States on a formula based on population and per capita income of a State. Modernization grants are allotted among the States under existing laws on the basis of population, financial need and the need for modernization of the respective States.

The committee examined these formulas very closely. They were the subject of criticism by some, but I feel that the choice of keeping the existing formula is a good one. It has served us well since 1946, and it has given us marked improvement in our hospital capabilities.

Perhaps one of the most important features considered in this new legislation is that of balancing geographically the supply of health facilities. Hill-Burton already has made a significant contribution toward supplying our national hospital needs, and the real problems remaining are not now so much problems of adding new beds, but rather are problems of getting the maximum use of those we do have. The committee has found that there is a greater need to balance the supply of beds between rural and urban areas, and in this connection there is an important question of the proper role of the comprehensive State and area health planners.

In an effort to get the most mileage out of each health dollar, the committee has

recommended that planning agencies be given the opportunity to comment on any specific project, but that they not have authority to veto or override the Hill-Burton advisory agency. The report goes on to specify that the views of the planning agency will be given "considerable weight" by the sponsors of the projects, and I believe it is important that this point be clearly stated.

As medicine becomes more sophisticated, the question of comprehensive health planning becomes a question of getting the most out of every available medical item; it becomes a question of coordination. With medical equipment and facilities becoming more specialized and expensive, it is only logical that a community of interest and cooperation be established among all hospitals in a given area. Before new facilities are constructed or modernized, a hospital should look to its neighbor to see that the course to be followed is in fact the one which will make the greatest overall improvement in the health care available in that area.

This kind of coordination should be done for all types of hospitals—public, private nonprofit, and governmental.

But at the same time, I feel it is important that we keep the proper perspective between the respective importance and size of the comprehensive planning programs and the Hill-Burton program. The latter has been with us for many years; it has demonstrated important improvements in our health care; and it unquestionably is the moving force in all Federal health programs.

For this reason, I strongly support the policy now set by the committee whereby comprehensive planning is achieved, but the traditional Hill-Burton programs are also preserved.

Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 11102, the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1969 comes before the House this week, I am hopeful that it will have the strong and wide support of my colleagues.

OUR NATION'S CRIME PROBLEM

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with many other of my colleagues as a cosponsor of House Resolution 17, a bill to create a select House committee to study and investigate all aspects of crime in the United States.

My past experience, as a practicing attorney and a local judge, coupled with my service on the Judiciary Committee of both the Michigan Constitution Convention and the Michigan Senate before I came to the U.S. House of Representatives, adds to my particular concern about the national crime problem and our response to it.

House Resolution 17 established the purposes of this committee to be the full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of crime in the United States, including:

First. Its elements, causes, and extent;

Second. The preparation, collection, and dissemination of statistics thereon, and the availability of reciprocity of information among law-enforcement agencies, Federal, State, and local, including exchange of information with foreign nations;

Third. The adequacy of law enforcement and the administration of justice, including constitutional issues pertaining thereto;

Fourth. The effect, directly or indirectly, of crime and disturbances in the metropolitan urban areas;

Fifth. The effect, directly or indirectly, of crime on the commerce of the Nation;

Sixth. The treatment and rehabilitation of persons convicted of crimes;

Seventh. Measures for the reduction, control, or prevention of crime;

Eighth. Measures for the improvement of detection of crime; law enforcement, including increased cooperation among the agencies thereof; and the administration of justice; and

Ninth. Measures and programs for increased respect for the law.

The prime author of this legislation, Mr. PEPPER, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, has outlined the special areas of concern of the committee as being crime in the District of Columbia, police complaints against Supreme Court rulings on the rights of accused persons and violence on college campuses which involves violation of the law.

But the whole focus of the investigation must of necessity be the present outcry of decent people who feel threatened by our rising crime rate. This includes inner-city residents here in Washington, D.C., and all across the country who fear for their safety, suburbanites who find their homes vandalized, add parents who hear that crimes among our young people, both the privileged and the underprivileged, are continually on the rise. No element of our society seems to feel safe. In fact recent national statistics show the greatest percentage increase in crime to be occurring in the residential suburbs.

This problem is too big to ignore any longer. It deserves the most concerted expenditure of our energies and resources that we can muster. Our people are restless; they are truly troubled by the problem and they look to us for help. Some even blame us. If we had only passed this or that law, if we only had overruled certain Supreme Court decisions we would not be faced with our present crime problems. Certainly we must hear them and weigh the suggestions we receive.

As a citizen and a lawyer and as a representative of the people of my congressional district I have searched for answers to these problems as every concerned citizen must. When I or anyone close to me is victimized my temper shortens. Yet beyond this immediate angry reaction, which I think everyone has at one time or another, we must search for solutions that will really work if we are to get at the problem and not just make a lot of noise accompanied by table thumping and hand wringing.

I hear people I know to be otherwise decent, contributing citizens, who out of a

sense of total frustration with crime, advocate actions which come close to the measure of a repressive totalitarian society. Their frustration with the problem is great. They see our present effort to deal with crime, and I am not talking only of organized crime, but crime as it affects the average American citizen, as a miserable failure. They see the courts, not as upholders of the law, but as betrayers of the law.

Knowing this I am pleased to see established a committee, with a distinguished and balanced composition, including our own Congresswoman from Michigan, Mrs. MARTHA GRIFFITHS. This committee can take an overview of present efforts. They can examine the problem objectively and hopefully come up with some sensible recommendations.

Crime has been with us since the dawn of civilization. All of our efforts have failed to eradicate it from our lives. Being realistic, I do not think that in our lifetimes we will see the end of it. Yet it can and must be controlled. Proper approaches can reduce crime rates, can eliminate the environmental conditions in which much crime breeds today, and can return the average citizen once again to a certain sense of security.

There are many avenues of approach to the problem, but I think the committee should address itself first to the ones that we hear most frequently. Although I have strong reasons to doubt that Supreme Court decisions such as the Malloy, Miranda, and Wade cases are causing our rise in crime rate, I think the best way to determine that is to fully investigate the matter. Once we examine the effects of these decisions I think we will find that their impact on the crime rate is minimal. Yet in the uncertain world we live in I am ready to listen and to be persuaded by the facts as they are developed.

It has been my understanding that the vast majority of those who perpetrate "reported" crimes are never apprehended and a majority of those arrested are never brought to trial because prosecuting officials cannot make a sufficient case to justify bringing them to court. This leaves our courts dealing with and applying those Supreme Court cases to a very small percentage indeed of the crime rate rise we hear about.

The recommendations of the District of Columbia Crime Commission offer a model that we would do well to study. If crime is a big business, then let us attack it in a big way.

The interconnection between types of crimes deserves far more analysis. For example, there is strong indication that narcotics addiction causes a rather substantial percentage of the crimes against property, and often against the person. Narcotics addicts commit crimes in order to support a very costly "habit." Our efforts at narcotics addiction control and efforts to go after narcotics suppliers should be greatly increased—not only in an effort to stop addiction per se, but for the resulting reduction that this will cause in crimes such as larceny and burglary.

Murder most often occurs between family members. The New York City Police Department has an exemplary program of special police forces trained

to deal with family disputes. Their example should be carefully examined in any effort to reduce murder rates.

Fifteen-year-olds have the highest crime rates for any age group. The crime rate for men is higher than it is for women. Why? These are all dull dry statistics—but we can learn from them and we should. Along with the war in Vietnam and the need for tax reform, crime is the biggest topic of citizen concern in this country. We should not be afraid to ask unthinkable questions in our search for new solutions. The old solutions are not working and people are disillusioned because of this. It is always hard to adapt to change, but we must, for the present crime situation is just not acceptable.

FULL FUNDING FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, Mr. William Simmons, deputy superintendent of schools for Detroit, testified before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. His testimony related to the necessity of full funding for the educational programs which the Congress has enacted and for which the present administration has scheduled major budget reductions. Mr. Simmons' testimony speaks for itself, but I cannot refrain from adding my emphatic endorsement to the point he makes when he says:

One can but wonder why additional dollars cannot be made available for educational programs for a nation so wealthy as ours. It appears that funds can be found for a variety of activities that pertain to the general welfare, except in the field of education. Yet, it is seldom that our leaders do not cite adequate education for all as the basis for a more progressive and stabilized nation.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in an age when we can always find a few extra billions here or there to send men to the moon or to pay for increasingly complex and expensive weapons systems, it is remarkable that we seem unwilling to provide the kind of schools which are necessary if we are going to have people literate enough to fly spaceships and man complicated weapons. There are better reasons, I believe, than these to support full funding for education, but even if military and space hardware are our primary interest, education pays off in those terms, too.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Simmons' testimony in full at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM SIMMONS, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT, DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS, BEFORE THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, TUESDAY, MAY 20, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am William Simmons, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before this Committee to testify in support of a new nationwide movement for full funding of all educational programs.

My testimony today will be offered in two parts. The first part will be a discussion of the need for full funding of all educational programs in Detroit. The second part will be a discussion of the need for full funding of the impacted area legislation, Public Laws 815 and 874. All programs are fully operative in Detroit and, combined, represent a major part of our educational expenditures.

Before I begin my basic discussion, I would like the Committee to know that I completely endorse the comprehensive statement made by Carl D. Perkins, Chairman of the House Labor and Education Committee, before this body on Wednesday, May 14. This statement of the need for full funding of all educational authorizations is a document that clearly details the case. The fulfillment of the goals enunciated rests now in the hands of this Appropriations Committee.

PART I

The financial plight of the urban school districts is well known to this Committee. The Detroit Public Schools, for example, face a grave fiscal situation that, if not reversed, will seriously impair the educative process for boys and girls served by the School District of the City of Detroit. This fiscal year the school district requires an additional \$8.4 million if a deficit is to be avoided. To begin school in September with a continuation of the present program, an additional \$23.1 million will be required. Where these amounts, totaling \$31.5 million, will come from is a part of the dilemma.

The State has been petitioned for additional funds to help meet this financial crisis. Should funds be forthcoming, it is probable that there will only be some \$5 million made available to the City of Detroit. The local taxpayers, in November of 1968, were asked to approve a millage increase with no success. This situation is typical of the situation in most of the large city school districts. The only difference is a matter of degree relating to numbers of pupils and the rate of decline in local taxation. Upon consideration of the monetary demands that are now being made on the school district from the community and from professional organizations, combined with existing deficits, it can be concluded that the fate of the schools is not hopeful.

In the midst of fiscal crisis, federal funding from such pieces of legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has provided the only monies that the Detroit Public Schools have had for program improvement for several years. Funds allocated to the school district under the various pieces of legislation, especially ESEA, have made possible a concentrated attack on problems related to the education of educationally and economically disadvantaged children of the city. The funds received have provided the only dollars available for some beginnings in the explorations necessary in the area of compensatory education especially as it relates to curricular improvement and teacher training. The major difficulty has been that the funds available from federal sources have not been sufficient. Indeed, the funds have only produced "pilot" or "demonstration" programs and, therefore, do not speak to the total needs of students in the school district, particularly so-called disadvantaged students.

Public education, especially urban public education, must, in the midst of inadequate local and state funding, look to federal grants-in-aid to help remedy the multiplicity of problems which confront it. This is true for all public education, but especially true for public education as it relates to urban centers which have become the depositories of the economically disadvantaged children of the nation.

The extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for two years represents a step in the right direction; that direction is the provision of funding assurances for local school districts for more than one year at a time, allowing for more sensible planning and greater continuity in programming. Inasmuch as action in the United States Senate on this matter is still pending, the possibility of a five-year extension is still hoped for.

The school community and staff are agonized and perplexed with the "on again, off again" planning that is experienced by public school systems. Greater understanding of educational planning and the solution of educational problems would be a result of assurances of funding for longer periods and the more effective programming that could take place.

Education as a behavioral science must have the opportunity to operate long-term projects as necessary to accomplish definitive results in modifications of pupil behavior. This longer funding assurance and program life will provide the opportunity for modification of program elements to favor the inclusion of only those elements that show signs of success. This implies that more reliable information about successful program components would be possible through more carefully applied and longer lasting evaluative techniques.

Where forward funding exists, it exists in only a modified way. That is, funding guarantees are uncertain and dependent on annual congressional action or they are limited to a percentage of the present funding level. Not even is there an allowance for normal "cost-of-the-program" increases experienced as a result of wage and product cost increases. Indeed, there is not the kind of assurance that would lead to planning which can guarantee at least continuity of the existing degree of service to clients from one year to the next.

Federal funding legislation, therefore, must begin to establish forward funding statements within their text which will guarantee the continuity of program that leads to more effective solutions to educational problems.

The problem of inadequate appropriations to finance federally funded educational programs is well known. Authorizations passed by Congress are realistically recommended and are based on known needs. Final appropriations, on the other hand, are almost always far less than the amount originally authorized. This immediately indicates that existing needs will be met only to a limited extent. At no time during the operation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have adequate appropriations been made to meet the needs of those who expected to be served. Indeed, the appropriations for the present fiscal year were not adequate to continue the federally financed programs of the prior year because the maintenance of the same level of appropriations did not take into consideration the increased cost of doing business that is experienced in every part of the private and public sector.

The restricted allocations of federal funds have put the conduct of most programs under an operational uncertainty that strikes at the effectiveness of the program itself and simply invites unrealistic criticism.

Therefore, one of the decisions that must be made if we are to expect anything other than minor degrees of success with federal funding is the establishment by the Congress of higher levels of appropriations as compared with authorizations.

The appropriations by the Congress for federal educational programs administered by the State have not been sufficient to maintain educational programs in the State of Michigan or in the school districts of the state. The 1966-67 expenditure for all school districts in Michigan for federal educational aids for all programs was approximately \$125.48 million. In 1967-68, the appropriation

level provided only \$121.5 million to Michigan, and in 1968-69 the appropriation had declined to \$112.5 million. The decline in the allocation to the State of Michigan, in effect, caused a shrinkage of funds in the local units. ESEA, Title I, has barely maintained its average allocation, and the only program with a constant increase over the three-year period was the impacted area program, Public Law 874.

The Nixon budget for fiscal 1970 reduces even further the allocations for the State of Michigan, which, without question, will mean less funds for the local educational agencies. A review of that budget shows that there will be \$3.85 million less to spend on educational programs in Michigan in fiscal 1970 than in the current fiscal year.

The effect of the decreases in Michigan on the Detroit Public Schools is especially significant, since Detroit has 16% of the total school population and 39% of the children who qualify as educationally deprived under Title I programs. Should the Nixon budget be adopted, there would be no funds for ESEA, Titles II and III, or NDEA, Titles III and V-A. The only programs where there might be a possible increase in allocations to Detroit would be ESEA, Title I, Vocational Education, and Adult Education. The increases in these programs, based on the statewide allocation, would be insignificant.

The recommendation for the elimination of all but "A" category pupils under Public Law 874 would remove an allocation of approximately \$1 million to Detroit, and almost double that amount should the public housing pupils be added to the act. The point which must be made is when allocations in a budget are shifted from one program to another without additional funds being added to the total, urban school districts suffer the most because these districts participate fully in all of the federally funded programs. What we need in the urban school districts is full funding of all educational programs. A table showing the effect of the Nixon budget on certain of the educational programs in Michigan that have provided substantial amounts to Detroit is shown in Attachment No. 1. The allocations to Detroit for the ESEA programs are shown in Attachment No. 2. Needless to say, the decline in the state allocations will mean discontinuation of certain program elements in the Detroit Public Schools.

The impact of the cuts in ESEA, Titles II and III, NDEA, Titles III and V-A, and LSCA, Title I, were described by Dr. Ira Polley, State of Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction, in a letter to all members of the Michigan congressional delegation. The reasons for continuing of funding these programs, to which reasons Detroit concurs, are dramatically described program-by-program in his attachment to that letter as follows:

Regarding Title II, ESEA:

1. 400 libraries have been opened in public school buildings.

2. 2½ million books have been purchased for those libraries.

3. Districts with very limited resources, or with large numbers of poor children have been able to obtain special help to provide learning materials to their children.

4. School systems have expended their own funds to train library aides and to support the education of additional professional school librarians.

5. Librarians are personally convinced of the value of this service, as the following quote from a librarian to the state department indicates: "The Title II materials have given us much more flexibility in the classrooms, many more supplementary materials and excellent resources for the children's studies. We are not conducting classes in the traditional manner where children all sit in rows and recite from memory. Instead, children are taken on field trips out of the institution to become familiar with community living. Title II supplementary books, such

as "Who Will Milk My Cow" and "Bin-Bang Pig" or lovely big colored picture charts of animals, give tremendous motivation to the children. Traditional textbooks are also outdated for most retarded children. Instead, the teachers use many creative materials which are most applicable and encompass many of Title II materials."

Regarding Title V-A, NDEA:

1. In 1967-68, 339 school districts, including 680,000 students, participated in NDEA-supported counseling services, and 388,000 students participated in NDEA-supported testing.

2. In 1967-68, over forty schools experimented with elementary guidance programs for troubled young children.

3. Under a new approach by the state department, four community colleges have employed recruitment counselors who recruit and help poor students go on to college.

In the words of this program's director, "Total loss of NDEA V-A will terminate counseling and guidance services to students in several communities where such services have recently been implemented, and the LEA cannot yet carry programs without help."

Regarding Title III, NDEA:

1. Requests for NDEA funds received from the local school districts have been double the amount of the allocations by the federal government; out of present federal appropriations, the state department, therefore, is able to match only one-half of the requests for equipment.

2. The number of submitted projects has ranged from 480 to 575 each year in this decade.

3. Participation in the program has averaged 93.2% of the public school membership. Those schools which have not participated are the smaller school districts which do not feel they would receive sufficient funds to make the effort worth-while.

4. This year, 462 school districts with 1,825,390 pupils requested funds under the "regular" NDEA, Title III, distribution. In that distribution districts which have a lower SEV behind each child receive a larger share of NDEA funds.

5. This year, for the first time, the state department has made a separate distribution of funds to schools which have large percentages of poor children. Under this program 39 school districts in the state are using \$975,000 in equipment grants to improve instruction in schools serving many poor children.

6. In the words of the NDEA, Title III, program director: "With the present economic situation in the State of Michigan and the voter resistance to voting extra allocated operational millage, the elimination of NDEA, Title III, will merely compound the problems in local districts of providing sound educational programs. It is also our feeling that NDEA, Title III, is one of the better federal programs because equipment and programs developed under this Act are financed by the cooperation of federal funds and matching local funds. The matching of federal funds by local school districts, I am sure, means that much more effort and thought is given to the need, type and use of equipment in the educational process."

Regarding Title III, ESEA:

1. A cutback of approximately 30-32% being proposed by the United States Congress in the FY 1970 Title III funding levels will require the state department to reduce the budgets of most Michigan projects by 40% with the following implications:

Approximately 500 school districts are being served by Title III projects. Thirty-five districts, acting as fiscal agents, will receive reduced budgets.

There are over 1.7 million public and non-public school children touched in some way by these projects. These children will receive less.

The two areas critical to the success of

Title III, dissemination and evaluation, will be reduced or eliminated.

The number of children and professional personnel receiving innovative services will be reduced.

Some excellent projects will decide to terminate and have so indicated such action at this date.

Overall quality, a distinguishing feature of Title III, will be reduced.

2. Other cuts may be:

An out-door learning laboratory in Traverse City, where potential school dropouts find a way to stay in school until they graduate.

A Metropolitan-Flint program to help the parents of deaf children help the child learn at home during his first years of life.

A program which brings learning specialists to Kent County rural schools to work with individual children who seem unable to achieve in their classes.

A seven-county effort in the midpart of the state to strengthen elementary and junior high instruction in seven districts.

A program in an urban center to cut class size sharply in schools serving poor children. A program in the Upper Peninsula to help retarded children learn new job skills.

Regarding LSCA I and II:

1. As a result of federal aid, the state has been able to grant from \$350,000 to \$400,000 to libraries throughout the state for books and for hiring of additional librarians and library aides. These libraries have employed staff, rented space, and started services in anticipation of continued federal support.

2. The state legislature has raised the level of its spending for the libraries of the state, partly in response to the federal presence.

3. The state department of education has employed consultants to work with local library people in improving their services to all citizens.

4. Magazines and other periodicals are purchased by the state libraries and circulated statewide, a service particularly useful to isolated rural libraries.

5. Films and records are made available where none would be otherwise.

6. The construction program has provided over 44 new public libraries, including both branch libraries in the inner city and new facilities in rural communities.

PART II

The extension proposed for the impacted area legislation coincides with the extensions proposed for all other educational programs enacted by the House in H.R. 514. Public Laws 815 and 874 are now scheduled to expire June 30, 1972. The extension proposed will make possible full implementation of forward funding and will remove many of the uncertainties that will undoubtedly affect the level of appropriations for fiscal 1970 and future years, while, at the same time, providing local educational agencies with an opportunity to achieve program continuity that is not possible under shorter extensions. Since the federal revenues provided under Public Law 874 become part of the general fund operating budgets of local school districts, such assurances are necessary at an early date because of their impact on the total school program. The dependence of local educational agencies on this vital revenue source has become increasingly important as school districts across the country are planning educational programs in the face of serious revenue deficits.

The appropriations for the impacted area legislation have been a hotly debated issue before every session of Congress since the laws were enacted in 1950. The regular appropriation process generally has not provided for the funds necessary to permit 100% payment for all applicants. It is only through the supplemental appropriation process that adequate funding has been made possible.

This year, the impacted area legislation is faced with a most serious situation. The

Johnson budget recommendations for fiscal 1970 propose that the expenditure level of Public Laws 815 and 874 be limited to \$300,000,000. The Nixon Administration further reduced the \$300 million to \$187 million. The latter budget limitation, if enacted by the Appropriations Committee, would, in effect, eliminate payment to all school districts except those with large concentrations of "A" category pupils. The Johnson Administration recommendation carried with it recommendations for the revisions of the basic legislation to the extent that almost all districts receiving impacted area funds would be eliminated from the program.

The proposed program limitations from the former Administration are detailed hereafter, and it is assumed that the estimated entitlement for full payment would be \$622 million. It now appears that the program would not be fully funded at less than \$650,594,000. Significantly, nothing was provided in either budget for the funding of the major disaster section of the act. Should payments under this section be required, there would be a prororation of payments under the \$187 million limitation to both the "A" category pupil and the Section 6 pupil.

Fiscal year 1970

[In millions]

A. Estimated entitlement under present law.....	\$622
B. Proposed amendments:	
1. Require school districts to absorb the cost of education equal to 6% of enrollment for section 3(b) children.....	-140
2. Reduce the rate of payment to 25% for section 3(b) children where the related Federal property is in another school district.....	-117
3. Eliminate one-half State and National average per pupil payment rates for both sections 3(a) and 3(b).....	-75
4. Eliminate from the definition of Federal property those properties which are outleased by the Federal Government and on which taxes are paid.....	-21
5. Eliminate counting children in 13th and 14th grades.....	-4
6. Savings provision to prevent more than 25% reduction per school district in first year.....	+35
Total reductions (net).....	-322
C. Entitlement adjusted for proposed reductions.....	300
D. President's budget for 1970.....	300

The budget proposals of both the Johnson and the Nixon Administrations are completely inadequate in terms of the impacted area program. Since it is apparent the latest budget intends to fund only a small portion of the program, the inadequacies of the initial budget should be discussed.

The total impact of these drastic amendments, which provide a budget saving of \$322 million, would vary from school district to school district, since there are few instances where all amendments would be applicable to a given local educational agency. It is apparent, however, that the 6% absorption proposed in Amendment No. 1 and the change in the definition of federal property proposed in Amendment No. 4 would eliminate most large school districts now in the program. Proposed Amendment No. 2 would provide a serious cutback in funds to all school districts across the country that could meet the new qualifying requirements. The elimination of the floor provision in proposed Amendment No. 3 would seriously reduce the level of payment to districts qualifying under the new restriction and would have a serious impact on those

southern states which are now participating under the national average floor provision. Proposed Amendment No. 5 would eliminate those school districts that are now counting as eligible pupils in grades 13 and 14. This amendment is particularly damaging to school districts in California and other states where the counting of such pupils is permitted under state law.

These two laws appear to be caught in the revenue cap that has been placed on all educational programs in the proposed budget for fiscal 1970. An analysis of the educational appropriations recommended in the budget for fiscal 1970 reveals what appears to be little more than a shifting of funds. The increases in Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds, particularly in Title I, appear to be made at the expense of other educational programs. The tragedy of this type of an approach is that it takes money from one educational pocket of the local educational agency and places it in another pocket. The philosophy that federal educational funds should be concentrated to do a particular job loses its impact because all federal funds that are received in most school districts are combined in such a way that they have the maximum effect on federally supported educational programs.

The impacted area school districts of this nation are caught in a budget squeeze. The limitations proposed by the Administration are premised on the theory that the large city school districts do not get impacted area school aid. The Committee hearing record on H.R. 514 will show that all of the superintendents from the largest cities in this nation who testified during the second week of testimony supported the impacted area program. They suggested these funds would, in part, permit them to reduce the revenue deficits they are facing in the general fund budgets which must be maintained if they are to adequately satisfy the maintenance of effort provisions in the other programs that produce funds for the disadvantaged.

One can but wonder why additional dollars cannot be made available for educational programs from a nation so wealthy as ours. It appears that funds can be found for a variety of activities that pertain to the general welfare, except in the field of education. Yet, it is seldom that our leaders do not cite adequate education for all as the basis for a more productive and stabilized nation. What we need in the support of all educational programs is more dollars, not dollars shifted from one educational program to another. While one can debate the possibility of combining programs, new programs, and the possibility of greater local and state funds for education, the fact that exists today is that the federal educational dollars, almost without exception, determine whether a school district is making forward progress or whether it has simply deteriorated into a balanced budget approach to education.

The House, in enacting H.R. 514, added a new category to Public Law 874, that of children living in public housing. The thrust of this proposal is to relieve in part the serious situations that have developed in many communities across this nation, particularly in impacted areas, when federal housing brought in pupils and then left school districts to provide school buildings and school services that were not possible without depleting the regular program of the school districts involved. Under the housing provision, this section would require an appropriation of \$250 million.

The need for separate funding of this new provision was made clear in the enacting legislation and the discussion that preceded the adoption of this program by the committee. All categories of this legislation should be fully funded at the rate required for each category, and not one category at the expense of another.

The continuation of the impacted area program in school districts across this na-

tion is not inconsistent with the need for more educational funds for the educationally disadvantaged. Funds provided to most impacted area districts are the funds that make the difference between a marginal educational program and a complete educational program. Pupils with expectant mobility must have a complete education if they are to fit into new school situations without becoming a burden to the receiving district.

I would make one further plea in behalf of the school construction provisions of Public Law 815. School districts presently qualifying under this law which has provided so many classrooms for the children of the nation are in a fiscal bind. Even though they have qualified for grants under this law, construction programs are not possible in many cases because of budget limitations during the fiscal year in which the classrooms are most needed. Indeed, there is a question as to

whether or not the priority system, made necessary by the lack of funds, will not exclude many school districts who, under the laws as authorized by the Congress, will meet all eligibility requirements. An appropriation of \$255 million to pay applicants eligible during fiscal years 1967, 1968 and 1969 is required if the housing needs of these districts are to be met. An additional \$80 million will be required to pay out in full the requirement for fiscal 1970.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would urge the Committee to report an appropriation bill that would provide for the full funding of all federally authorized educational programs. Less than full funding during these days of educational crisis, in effect, places education low on the list of national priorities when there is little question that the education of our boys and girls should appear in the highest order of any national rating scale.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.—MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EFFECT OF NIXON BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS ON FEDERALLY FUNDED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

	1967-68 spending	1968-69 allocation	1969-70 Nixon budget	Increase or decrease
ESEA I:				
Grants.....	\$34,300,000	\$32,400,000	\$36,400,000	+\$4,000,000
Administration:				
Regular.....	343,000	324,000	364,000	+40,000
Migrant.....	82,000	145,000		
ESEA II:				
Grants.....	4,400,000	2,200,000	0	-2,200,000
Administration.....	226,000	116,000	0	-116,000
ESEA III:				
Grants.....	7,900,000	6,300,000	4,400,000	-1,900,000
Administration.....		474,000	327,000	-147,000
ESEA IV: Administration.....			100,000	+100,000
Adult Education:				
Grants.....	800,000	900,000	1,000,000	+100,000
Administration.....	96,000	104,000	(¹)	
Vocational Education:				
Grants.....	10,000,000	9,200,000	9,900,000	+700,000
Administration.....	298,000	375,000	(¹)	
NDEA III:				
Grants.....		3,400,000	0	-3,400,000
Administration.....		86,000	0	-86,000
NDEA V-A:				
Grants.....	1,000,000	700,000	0	-700,000
Administration.....	77,000	84,000	0	-84,000
LSCA I:				
Grants.....	600,000	450,000	0	-450,000
Administration.....	800,000	900,000	700,000	-200,000

¹ Our choice.

ATTACHMENT NO. 2.—DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT YEARLY FUND LEVELS

	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Title I—Educational programs for disadvantaged.....	\$11,999,074	\$11,221,532	\$11,281,162	\$10,370,415
Title II.....	705,476	712,195	1,069,275	(¹)
Library materials and supplies.....			37,000	
Title III.....			20,722	(²)
Supplementary educational centers and services.....				2,000,000
Adult education ESEA amendment to title III.....		244,767	648,776	501,519
Title V.....				82,154
Grants to strengthen State departments of education.....				(³)
Title VI.....			155,338	113,247
Education of handicapped children.....				(⁴)
Title VIII.....				400,000
Dropout prevention.....				(⁴)

- ¹ Pending allocation from the State of Michigan.
- ² Not elsewhere classified.
- ³ Proposed.
- ⁴ Pending additional funding for a \$202,145 proposal.

MONETARY AND STAFF CHANGES NECESSITATED IF NIXON BUDGET IS PASSED

	1967-68 spending	1968-69 allocation	1969-70 Nixon budget	Increase or decrease under Nixon budget	Remarks on Losses and gains, State Department positions
DECREASE					
ESEA II:					
Grants.....	\$4,400,000	\$2,200,000	0	-\$2,200,000	Lose 4 professional and 8 clerical positions.
Administration.....	226,000	116,000	0	-116,000	
NDEA III:					
Grants.....		3,400,000	0	-3,400,000	Lose 3 professional and 2 clerical positions.
Administration.....		86,000	0	-86,000	

Footnotes at end of table.

MONETARY AND STAFF CHANGES NECESSITATED IF NIXON BUDGET IS PASSED—Continued

	1967-68 spending	1968-69 allocation	1969-70 Nixon budget	Increase or decrease under Nixon budget	Remarks on Losses and gains, State Department positions
DECREASE—Continued					
NDEA V-A:					
Grants	\$1,000,000	\$700,000	0	-\$700,000	Lose 3 professional and 3 clerical positions.
Administration	77,000	84,000	0	-84,000	
ESEA III:					
Grants	7,900,000	6,300,000	\$4,400,000	-1,900,000	Hire 5 professionals and 2 clerical out of funds which were not tied down this year.
Administration	(1)	474,000	327,000	-147,000	
LSCA I:					
Grants	600,000	450,000	0	-450,000	Alternatives are (1) Drop as many as 4 professionals and 4 clerical people, or (2) drop 1/2 of the periodicals distribution program.
Administration	800,000	900,000	700,000	-200,000	
INCREASE					
ESEA I:					
Grants	34,300,000	32,400,000	36,400,000	+4,200,000	ESEA I: Hire 2 professional.
Administration:					
Regular	343,000	324,000	364,000	+40,000	Migrant only: Our choice, hire a professional and a clerical.
Migrant	82,000	145,000			Gain 4 professional and 2 clerical positions.
ESEA IV—Planning and evaluation: Administration.					
Vocational education:					
Grants	10,000,000	9,200,000	9,900,000	+700,000	Our choice: Might be able to add State staff by taking credit for itinerant trainers.
Administration	298,000	375,000	(2)		
Adult basic education:					
Grants	800,000	900,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	Our choice: Hire 1 professional and 1 clerical.
Administration	96,000	104,000	(2)		

Note: Totals, grants losses, -\$8,850,000; grants gains, +\$5,000,000; net loss, -\$3,850,000.

Administration losses, \$631,000; administration gains, partly our choice.

Personnel losses, 10 professional, 13 clerical; personnel gains, 13 professionals, 6 clericals; net gain, 3 professionals, net loss 7 clerical.

¹ Does not apply.

² Estimated.

³ Our choice.

RESTRAINT IN SPEECH

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, recklessness in the use of words—overstatement, exaggeration, describing merely troublesome events as catastrophic disasters—all these contribute materially to public confusion on the subject of freedom of speech. Every thoughtful citizen owes it to himself, as well as his community, to use appropriate restraint in speech whatever the subject.

Unless such restraint prevails, reckless overstatement in speech nationwide can become as calamitous as the lack of judicial restraint has proved to be in many decisions of the Warren Court. In this connection the letter of R. M. Vassel, appearing in yesterday's Washington Star, is deserving of widespread consideration:

LIMITS FOR FREE SPEECH

YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB,
Omaha, Neb.

SIR: The right and privilege of free speech is a precious commodity produced only in those truly democratic nations of this world. America is a mass producer of free speech, and the quality of our product is generally excellent. I say "generally excellent" because there are those citizens of the United States who abuse free speech and who rail against society without sense or reason. If America is ever destroyed, it will be by the cult of the ranters from within and not by ICBMs from without.

The ranters attack the President's peace moves on Vietnam and the strategy of battlefield generals, in the comfort of the dome of the nation's Capitol or on the country's campuses. The ranters do not practice responsible free speech, but loose speech which is unlike responsible free speech. Loose speech will lose the war in Vietnam faster for the U.S.A. than any amount of infiltra-

tors from the Ho Chi Minh Trail. Use the product called free speech carefully, lest it become loose speech, which is a weapon against democracy.

R. M. VASSELL,

Moderator, St. Mary College.

JOB CORPS CAMP CLOSING: FALSE
ECONOMY, LITTLE SENSE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, nobody allows cost overruns for the Job Corps.

Priorities certainly do not seem to matter, not at least when poor and underprivileged persons are at stake. Congress feels free to allocate billions of dollars to longrun investments such as public works, highways, the supersonic transport, but when it comes to human—rather than physical capital—the tendency is to demand huge and immediate returns.

The decision to eliminate 59 Job Corps centers is a hasty, foolish, indeed, costly solution that the Nixon administration has found in its searching of where to pare Government programs. I oppose the President's move; in fact, I would favor expansion of the Job Corps program, and the establishment of even more rural camps.

In April, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors went on record strongly protesting the closing of Job Corps centers in general, and specifically the Fenner Canyon Civilian Conservation Center near Palmdale in Los Angeles County. The board asked that, if the Fenner camp is closed, then it should be turned over to the county for juvenile camp work or possibly for road camp work. The motion

before the board was made by Supervisor Warren M. Dorn, and I would like to put his motion in the RECORD at this point. I would also like to include an article from the May 22, 1969, Los Angeles Times, entitled "Closing of Job Corps Center Causes Rush on L.A. Facility," which is a poignant reminder of the effects that will be seen nationwide from camp closings.

I include the following:

MOTION BY SUPERVISOR WARREN M. DORN,
APRIL 22, 1969

I move that the Board of Supervisors go on record as favoring the retention of the Fenner Canyon Civilian Conservation Center near Palmdale in the Fifth District. This job training camp was established four years ago with the cooperation of the Forest Service and the County Fire Department, based in part upon our county's success with the juvenile camp work in fire prevention and conservation. The U.S. Forest Service has supervision of this job corps center and estimates that over half a million dollars worth of work was done last year by the young men at this camp to help prevent forest fires, as well as to build and maintain camping areas for recreational purposes.

I further move that if the federal government does close down this facility, that it be turned over to the county for juvenile camp work or possibly road camp work. It is my feeling that rather than curtailing and closing down these kinds of training facilities, they should be expanded. If this facility is no longer needed by the federal government, then perhaps the county could lease it for \$1.00 a year, and use it in our welfare training program or in fire prevention, camp construction and maintenance, road building, etc. In any event, there are over 11,000 able-bodied people on welfare in this county today who lack skills or who are just not employable who could be trained at this facility or who could work there in lieu of a mere handout in the way of welfare from the county as directed and controlled by the federal and state government.

I further move that a copy of this board's motion be sent to the Secretary of Labor, to our California delegation in Congress, and to the President and Vice President.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 22, 1969]
CLOSING OF JOB CORPS CENTERS CAUSES RUSH
ON LOS ANGELES FACILITY

(By Jack Jones)

A Los Angeles facility to help former Job Corps enrollees readjust to city life has found itself deluged because of the closing of 59 Job Corps centers around the nation.

Los Angeles Gatehouse at 955 S. Western Ave., established more than a year ago by the federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), had 180 returning corpsmen checking in last week—more than usually appear during an entire month.

As a result, said Larry E. Sommers, Gatehouse director, his staff is scrambling to find jobs and training positions for the young people being phased out of Job Corps—many with training incomplete.

At the same time, regional OEO officials are working with two volunteer groups—Joint Action in Community Services (JACS) and Women in Community Service (WICS)—in an effort to enlist citizens willing to help find jobs, places to live, transportation and other services for returnees.

CORPSMEN BEING HUNTED

Although displaced job corpsmen are being notified by the closing centers to check in with Gatehouse, Sommers said he feels "there are 400 to 500 in town that we don't even know are here."

As soon as notification is received that a Los Angeles youth has left a Job Corps center, Sommers attempts to contact him by

mail. In many cases, it turns out, the address given is phony. Some former enrollees are unhappy and have no desire to be found.

Sommers said locations are then made by staff counselors. Some are lured in by mailed notices that final checks are waiting.

Gatehouse has placement specialists who work closely with the California State Employment Service and private industry to find jobs or training spots for the former corpsmen.

Under a directive from the U.S. Department of Labor, CSES can provide interim stipends of \$52 a week for up to four weeks for those waiting to find work or training.

Sommers and his placement supervisor, Jerry Steerts, indicated they are getting some good community support in the way of volunteer help and job offers—but need much more to catch up.

Neighborhood Youth Corps jobs are now being made available to Job Corps returnees, they said, and some welding program slots have been opened for ex-corpsmen at both the Watts and East Los Angeles skills centers.

Sommers said one problem is that most of the returning trainees live in those areas already with the highest unemployment and the poorest transportation.

"It's hard to shake them out of those areas," he observed.

Gatehouse also is facing some difficulties in compiling all the training achievement data necessary to place numerous returning job corpsmen because paperwork is not always completed at those closing centers where staff personnel are moving out to new jobs themselves.

In the rush on Tuesday, Leon Massey Jr., 17, back from the Oak Glen Job Corps Center 27 days ago, was one who was headed for a job.

Barry Kelly, former football coach at the clearfield (Utah) Job Corps Center and now a placement specialist at Gatehouse, had found him a spot as a cook in a hamburger stand on Vermont Ave.

But Massey was fairly lucky. He had nearly completed his cook training in Job Corps and was about ready to come home anyway.

"It was a good program," he said. "I was there long enough to get something out of it."

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report the passing of a great California legislator and a great American, L. Stewart Hinckley, of Redlands, Calif. Mr. and Mrs. Hinckley were killed in an airplane accident May 8, 1969, a tragedy that saddened their many thousands of friends all over the State and Nation.

Stew Hinckley served as the assemblyman for the 73d District in San Bernardino County from 1946 to 1954 and again from 1962 until his retirement this year. A Republican, he had great support from the Democratic Party and won the nomination of both parties each time he ran for assembly until California abolished the open primary. He never lost an election.

From 1954 to 1961, Mr. Hinckley served the Eisenhower administration as Director of the Farmers' Home Administration for the Western States.

With his military service, when he was

a member of the 63d Antiaircraft Artillery in the Army during World War II, Mr. Hinckley had compiled 26 years of service to his State and Nation.

Mr. Hinckley brought to his legislative duties a broad background with his firsthand knowledge of agriculture, familiarity with business and alertness to labor's needs. His supporters called him "a businessman with a workman's outlook." He was lauded by educators as one whose voting record showed that he had the welfare of schools and children at heart. He fostered legislation to combat organized crime, narcotics traffic, vice, and gambling. He was outspoken in his concern for conserving California's natural resources. He called for stronger support for mental hospitals, and as chairman of the Assembly Fish and Game Committee, he devoted much energy toward improving the legislation so important in that field.

Stew Hinckley counted as his greatest legislative achievement his successful effort in getting the first bills through the assembly which established the Feather River project. This is the greatest public works project ever conceived by man, and it will soon bring vitally needed water more than 400 miles from northern California to the south. This project will stand as a fitting monument to Stewart Hinckley.

Bertha and Stew Hinckley were devoted to their family, their community, and their country, and they will be greatly missed by all.

EISENHOWER LEFT VALUABLE LEGACY

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, during these times of riots, disrespect of law and order, and advocacy of extremisms, the voice of moderation is critically needed. Dwight D. Eisenhower bequeathed to us that creed of moderation.

The general's legacy is reviewed in a May 19 editorial of the Progress Bulletin, Pomona, Calif., which I am inserting in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

[From the Progress-Bulletin, May 19, 1969]

EISENHOWER LEFT VALUABLE LEGACY

Dwight D. Eisenhower accomplished many things in a long and brilliant career of public service. It may be, however, that he will be remembered longest for the legacy of moderation that he has left the nation. Moderation was the basis of the General's Middle-of-the-Road political philosophy. But, moderation was obviously more than a political philosophy to Eisenhower. It was a creed. And, in these critical, turbulent times, the creed of moderation bequeathed to us by the former president is a foundation upon which all Americans can stand and face the future with confidence.

In one of his last messages to his fellow citizens—an article appearing in The Reader's Digest, under the title "We Must Avoid the Perils of Extremism"—General Eisenhower applied his philosophy and his creed to the contemporary scene, and he did so with a heartening sense of optimism. In one passage he said, "... I for one refuse to be-

come pessimistic about America's future. Granted that storm signals are up, I believe nevertheless that we as a people have the good sense to place patriotism and human understanding above the arrogance of personal prejudice—and that we can and will solve peacefully the problems that beset us. I believe that we will do so through our traditional reliance upon the philosophy of moderation—or Government by Common Sense."

As a student of American history, Eisenhower noted that most of our great presidents—Washington, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt among them—were men of the Middle Way. He characterized the extremists of both left and right as people who spill off the "... one-way highway of progress" into the gutters. He believed that extremism comes easily "... to men who have doped themselves with delusions of their own unblemished virtue and the rascality of others ... The Middle-of-the-Road American—Negro or white—has put up with a lot from the extremists." Eisenhower never felt that a Middle-of-the-Road American is simply a fence-sitter and pointed out that it often takes more courage to occupy the center than any other position "... for you are then subject to attack on both flanks."

Eisenhower was not above compromise and considered it a highly useful tool within the limits of basic principles. He was keenly aware of the dangers of today's extremism. On the one hand, he pointed out that there are those who want to socialize everything. On the other, there are the far-out conservatives who want to do away with the graduated income tax, stop social security, abolish all regulatory agencies, smash the labor unions and confine the functions of the federal government to running the military establishment and the post office and conducting our foreign affairs. While accepting a measure of governmental responsibility in social welfare, he warned, "... I have said to those who espouse the completely paternal government that they are advocating the road to national bankruptcy and human ruin ... you cannot place millions of citizens on a permanent dole and leave them there to rot in mind and spirit ... This today is at the root of our tragic difficulties in the slums."

Eisenhower left a word of advice to youth: "It will soon be your country to run ... When you have a just and reasonable cause, protest all you wish, but remember that there can and should be order and decency in democratic protest. Stand up and be counted when troublemakers try to rob you of your right to an education. If it becomes necessary for the forces of law and order to move in and quell such disturbances, give them your support." At the conclusion of his brief article, the General and former President of the United States said, "In this article I have tried to set forth some of the guideposts of the Middle Way. I would hope with all my heart that during the next few years our country will unite under the President in giving this Common-Sense approach a chance."

The Eisenhower legacy of moderation will be considered by many the foundation on which to build an even greater nation in the future.

MEMORIAL DAY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has paused this past weekend to honor its gallant men and women who died in the service of this country. Many citizens have visited the resting places of the hon-

ored dead, others have given but a moment to reflect on the complete sacrifice.

One man, Mr. William Stone of Walnut Creek, Calif., wrote a moving poetic tribute to those we honor on Memorial Day and I submit it for the RECORD and for the edification of all the Members of Congress:

MEMORIAL DAY
(By Bill Stone)

White crosses gleaming row on row,
Ghost like in the twilight glow;
For those who gave their last full measure,
Of their devotion, blood and treasure,
Making resolute our nation great,
Regardless what may have been their fate;
Lying silently in a lonely grave,
Remembered for the life they gave.

The sacrifice so nobly paid,
For freedom's cause were not afraid;
Faced bayonet, heard cannons roar,
Knowing full well what lay in store.
Vigilance the price for liberty,
Compassion for the enemy.
Greater love hath no man than this,
Giving his life for a friend of his.

With thankful hearts we decorate
The grave of our fallen comrade;
Praying to God that He will give
Our nation courage it may live,
Refreshing daily our memory,
This debt we owe to keep us free.
The nation sorrowful with bowed head,
Reverently honor our valiant dead.

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION FOR
LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, on July 20, 1967, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a document issued by the Progressive Labor Party entitled "The Vietnam Work-In," a manual of instruction for radicals directed at reaching and influencing American workers against the war in Vietnam. As is generally realized by now, the PLP is a revolutionary-motivated organization which split off from the Communist Party U.S.A. early in the 1960's over ideological differences involving Red China. The manual outlined the proper approach for radicals to take in securing jobs in industry with a view to winning over workers to PLP's anarchistic goals. Although the project met with little success at that time, the idea of reaching the American worker was not forgotten.

Just recently the work-in manual reappeared again with but minor changes in its text. This time the target is not exclusively the war in Vietnam but any issue which can win supporters to the camp of the revolutionaries. The latest version of the manual is being circulated by Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—the organization which has been the driving force fostering disruptive activities on college campuses.

Leaders in business and industry should give careful attention to this latest program of the SDS. One problem

that our leaders in the business and industrial world can do without is the disorder and violence which paralyzed campuses throughout the Nation in recent months. SDS leaders seek to sow discontent among the Nation's workers as they did among small factions of duped students. Needless to say, it takes but a comparatively small number of malcontents skilled in the science of disruption to amplify worker's complaints, heretofore peacefully mediated, with the hope of creating disorder.

Labor leaders, too, should be concerned with the SDS workers program. The latest issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, the June issue, features a statement by Director J. Edgar Hoover concerning the possible takeover of the SDS by Communist elements oriented to both Moscow and Peking. Years ago labor leaders had the good sense to rid their ranks of a number of unions whose priorities of allegiance ranked Moscow before the United States and the American workingman. Like management, the ranks of labor can well do without the ill will, disorder, and destructive agitation visited upon college campuses in recent months. Management and labor will continue to have their honest differences which are eventually resolved by compromise and mediation. Without vigilance and resolute action both segments of our society might well be faced with a rule-or-ruin force "bent on anarchy and nihilism," to quote Director Hoover.

Barron's, the national business and financial weekly, in its issue of May 19 called attention to the presence of revolutionary elements which, if unchecked, could create serious trouble for both labor and management. Plainly called for here is a joint effort by leaders of both factions to alert all involved concerning the destructive plans of these revolutionary groups. As in the case of the college campuses, appeasement and concessions will result in losses to both management and labor.

I include the article, "Comes the Revolution," from the May 19 issue of Barron's in the RECORD at this point:

COMES THE REVOLUTION—U.S. INDUSTRY HAD
BETTER LOOK TO ITS DEFENSES

Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Co., and Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers of America, may sit at opposite ends of the bargaining table, but they really have a good deal in common. One way or another, of course, they both make a living from the production and sale of cars. Moreover, each man in his own right can point with pride to a richly deserved reputation for social consciousness. A recent head of the National Alliance of Businessmen, Mr. Ford worked tirelessly to find jobs for the so-called hardcore unemployed; in 18 months his own concern has put some 13,000 on the payroll. The redheaded Mr. Reuther is the very model of a flaming liberal, under whose aegis the UAW has proclaimed its solidarity with the California grape workers, contributed to the notorious Child Development Group of Mississippi (which the Office of Economic Opportunity, for legal reasons, once felt compelled to disown); and helped launch the militant Citizens Crusade Against Poverty.

Late last month Messrs. Reuther and Ford, albeit unwittingly, happened to share another distinction: that of being denounced as ruthless exploiters of minorities and racists

to boot. On Friday, April 25, at Ford Motor's assembly plant at Mahwah, N.J., a group of workers known as the United Black Brothers walked off the job, and, with help from Students from a Democratic Society and the Black Panthers, threw up a picket line and temporarily disrupted production. "The fight against Ford's racism and abuse . . . has been joined . . .," shrilled a UBB flyer; "Power to the workers." In an interview published in the Guardian, self-styled "independent radical newsweekly," a spokesman elaborated: "At Mahwah, the watchword is production . . . everything is sacrificed for production. The company doesn't care about human beings, just units. . . . The workers' only tool against management is the union, but under the last contract the local union officials' salaries are paid by management, so who do you think they represent? The UBB is a black organization, but it represents all workers, black, white and Puerto Rican, because all workers are sacrificed equally for the sake of production. . . . We know we have no representation; we have no redress in the UAW."

Life-long champions of the underdog and perennial good guys, Messrs. Reuther and Ford must have been jolted to find themselves so abruptly cast in the unfamiliar role of villain. Along with the rest of U.S. industry, however, and perhaps much of organized labor as well, they had better get used to the idea, "Enlightened" or otherwise, capitalism today has come under direct assault from a hit-and-run coalition of radical students and alienated members of minority groups who seek not to achieve higher wages, improved working conditions or more jobs, but—as in colleges and universities throughout the country—to shake the Establishment and ultimately bring it down. Scorning such bourgeois expedients as collective bargaining, they opt for tactics like infiltration—SDS has issued its members detailed instructions for a summer "work-in"—intimidation, boycott, sabotage and violence. "If production is the central arena in which capitalism will be slain," solemnly explains a Guardian pamphlet called Black Workers in Revolt, "it follows that the hand that holds the wrench shall be the hand that holds the gun." Hard to believe, perhaps—as most Cubans must have found Castro, or Cornell a handful of armed undergraduates. But like their comrades on campus, the revolutionaries on the picket and assembly lines mean business. They also play for keeps.

After the fashion of totalitarians from Karl Marx to date, they make no secret of their aims. At a meeting last winter at the University of Michigan, the national council of SDS endorsed a proposal to "continue efforts to expand . . . beyond the campus and into working-class constituencies." A former SDS leader, now a New Left journalist, went on to observe: "SDS must become more than an organization of college students and broaden its base to include all young people oppressed by capitalism. The proposal urges new efforts in organizing among high school students, young people in the military, dropout and forced-out unemployed young people, and especially young workers in factories." Toward this end, SDS (and an offshoot, Movement for a Democratic Society, or MDS) are working hand-in-glove with various radical labor splinter groups which have sprung up of late, notably among rank-and-file auto workers. Starting with the Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement (DRUM) last summer, the radical coalition, now known as the League of Revolutionary Black Workers, has branched out to embrace Ford and two other Chrysler plants. A spokesman recently was quoted as saying, with more passion than grammar: "I think it's inevitable that there has to be a revolution in this country, that the ruling class has to be overthrown. . . ."

Such rhetoric sounds like the old jokes that started "Comes the revolution. . . ." However, these people are in grim earnest and they are not stopping at words. On the contrary, the past few months have seen one radically inspired thrust after another at corporate enterprise. In February hundreds of students from riot-rocked San Francisco State College joined the picket line of refinery workers striking against Standard Oil Co. of California. (Last week a smaller group picketed the annual meeting of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; "we know the companies are separate," said one, in a new departure on collective guilt, "but they've run by essentially the same kind of people.") In Seattle the University of Washington SDS pinned a United Fruit recruiter against an office wall and forced him to watch a film purporting to depict his company's depredations in Latin America; a GE recruiter was driven off the Queens College campus. In the nation's capital, nine anti-war demonstrators broke into the offices of Dow Chemical Co., ransacked the files and splattered blood over the walls. In Detroit DRUM and its allies have staged a series of wildcat walkouts and are constantly threatening the Big Three with boycott.

The latest outburst of the kind, at Ford's assembly plant in Mahwah, N.J., was ostensibly triggered by a racial epithet which a supervisor is alleged to have hurled at a Negro worker. Be that as it may, the radicals lost no time in exploiting the affair. Within 48 hours—though nobody outside the plant ordinarily would have known about it—a picket line, beefed up by SDS members and Black Panthers, appeared at Mahwah, menacing enough to intimidate workers into staying home and compel management to suspend two night shifts. While things have quieted down, sporadic picketing continues and tension runs high. The United Black Brothers have set forth a list of eight demands. If management fails to meet them, the aforementioned flier warns: "We will not be responsible for any actions taken against the oppressive and racial (sic) policies of the Ford Motor Co."

Mahwah ought to open industry's eyes. For if Henry Ford II, with his flawless liberal credentials, can be attacked as an economic royalist and racist, anyone can. Devotion to good works, including finding jobs for members of minority groups, plainly yields no immunity. Indeed, there is reason to suspect—as Barron's ("The Jobmongers") argued last July—that such efforts are begging for trouble. Turnover among beginners tends to be high, a condition that builds up resentment against both organized labor (which collects a non-refundable initiation fee and several months of union dues) as well as management. Layoffs hit hardest at low-seniority workers recruited from the hard-core unemployed, an unfortunate fact of life into which Ford Motor Co. now has run. To judge by Mahwah, finally, industry is sadly unprepared for what may come. For management has failed to take a firm stand. After warning 16 workers about breach of contract, it discharged only three. Meanwhile, though no witnesses to the alleged affront could be found, the offending supervisor has been quietly removed from the scene—to defuse the situation, so a company spokesman told us—and his future is uncertain. All we can say is that Ford has had better ideas.

Like university presidents and college deans, who until lately pooh-poohed warnings from such careful and courageous reporters as Alice Widener ("Ten Days in April"; "The Detonators"), corporate executives may try to shrug off the mounting evidence of a radical conspiracy against private enterprise. We can only remind them that those who refuse to learn from history—or from what's happening in front of their noses—are doomed.

OBSCENITY IN THE MAILS

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have waited too long to regulate the flow of obscene advertising through the U.S. mail. We must no longer grant free license to advertisers who have no respect for a common code of decency or for the privacy of the average American family, and who use sexual sensationalism to promote their products. For this reason, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 11110, which would not interfere with the right of free expression, but would provide citizens protection against the intrusion into their home of this unwanted, offensive mail.

My measure is patterned after the President's proposal which was recently introduced as a part of a broader bill affecting postal operations. I fully support the administration on this issue, and have introduced this bill because I think that it takes the most effective approach to the problem, and has the greatest possibility of being acted upon by the House.

The people who are probably the most indignant about the recent proliferation of sexually oriented advertising are those parents who wish to protect their minor children from exposure to this literature. Some high State courts have already held that it is the proper role of the government to protect minors from lascivious material, and have supported the absolute prohibition of mailing sexually oriented advertising to children. I think that the Federal Government should go further than this to permit all citizens, whether or not they are parents, to request that advertising of this nature be kept out of their mailboxes.

I do not quarrel with the necessity of protecting our right to free speech, and respect of the court's efforts to safeguard these essential guarantees for a free society. However, I think that in the case of pornographic advertising, the right must be counterbalanced with an equally important right to personal privacy. The American public needs a means of preventing the steady intrusion into their homes of this offensive material.

There are laws on the books which were designed to provide the individual this sort of protection, but they have proven inadequate and unworkable. Under these laws, it is not until the addressee and his family have received and inspected the literature that they have any recourse. Often the envelope is unmarked, giving no clue to its contents. Many residents complain that when they do take steps to have their names removed from a company's mailing list, their postmaster tells them that he has no way of guaranteeing that this can be done or that the individual will not continue receiving such mail. I think that the most workable means of providing protection is to allow citizens to request that none of this mail be delivered from anyone, and have this request respected, by providing stiff penalties to those who persist in sending such advertisements.

I am not advocating that the Federal Government act as a censor of the public's reading material. However, I believe that we must consider how far the freedom of one individual can go before it becomes an infringement of another's right to privacy. This is why I am asking Congress to create a method which will not ban a certain class of literature, but will simply enable the American public to protect itself from the unwanted intrusion of this offensive advertising into their homes.

REPRESENTATIVE EILBERG INTRODUCES THE EXTRAORDINARY TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1969

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Extraordinary Tax Relief Act of 1969. This bill is designed to provide relief to certain individuals over 65 years of age who own or rent their homes and who are paying a disproportionate share of their limited incomes for property taxes. My bill will provide them some relief through a system of tax credits and refunds for that portion of their property tax which is more than they can afford.

Low income and old age is not a transitional problem that given present trends will solve itself. Unless action is taken now in a variety of areas most of our senior citizens will not have sufficient incomes to live out their retirement years in a manner which allows normal participation in community life. Three out of every 10 people who are age 65 and older—in contrast to one in nine of younger people—were living in poverty in 1966. Yet many of these people did not become poor until they became older. Half of all people now 65 and over are 73 and older. In the years ahead, the increase will be particularly great in the older age brackets. With the population 65 and older projected to rise by some 50 percent during 1960-85, the population 85 and older may double. Thus the retirement revolution in this Nation reflects two trends. At one end, there is an increase in the number of persons over 73 and, at the other, more and more early departures from the work force are taking place.

National economic growth, while putting added dollars into the pockets of the working group, increases the pressures on the retiree substantially. A rise in earnings of 4 percent annually—not an unrealistic estimate in view of present conditions—means that consumption levels will approximately double in two decades. This eventuality will place those living on fixed incomes in an increasingly difficult position in the marketplace. Earnings drop as advanced age curtails already limited earnings opportunities. In comparison to the age group 65-72, only half as many men 73 and over and a third as many women worked in 1962 and the earnings of these older workers

were significantly lower. The overwhelming proportion of people retiring today receive total pension income—from both public and private pensions—which is only 20 to 40 percent of the average earnings they received immediately prior to retirement. Of families retiring in the next decade and a half, it can be projected that almost 60 percent of those with preretirement earnings between \$4,000 and \$8,000 will receive a pension income which is less than half these earnings. Projections to 1980 indicate that about half the couples and more than three-fourths of the unmarried retirees will receive \$3,000 or less in pension income.

Figures which I have gathered indicate that there are now some 20 million Americans in the age brackets over 65. Nine million of these are men and 11 million are women. Nine out of every 10 older men and 8 out of 10 women live in their own households either as heads or wives of heads of households. For most older people, the major—and often only asset—is the home they own. Assets readily available for daily living are meager, especially for the aged with the lowest incomes. Financial assets amounted to less than \$1,000 for 37 percent of the couples and for more than half the unmarried men and women according to a 1963 survey by the Social Security Administration. Almost all aged persons saved for their retirement years and have accumulated some resources in the form of liquid assets, equity in their homes or real estate, and so forth. Persons in the retirement ages have more financial assets and less debt than the population generally. Two estimates of asset holding by the aged in 1962 are available.

	Federal Reserve Board estimate	Social Security Administration estimate
Average assets:		
Total.....	\$30,008	\$15,109
Liquid assets and market securities.....	4,957	3,783
Median assets:		
Total.....	9,860	5,840
Liquid assets and marketable securities.....	950	570

These two estimates of asset holding differ because the surveys differ, not only in definitions, but in the units surveyed. The survey unit used in the Social Security Administration's study produces a lower value of assets because each aged couple or nonmarried person is treated as a separate unit. In the Federal Reserve Board Survey, data for such persons who are members of a family—and these are the older persons who have the least assets—are pooled with data for the family unit.

Regardless of which dollar amounts are used, the major asset of older people is the owned home—not readily convertible to cash for daily living—and the lower the income, the lower the assets.

The hope that assets are an important potential for improving the income situation of today's older people has focused attention on the possibility of raising incomes through conversion of assets into income prorated over the remaining

life expectancy. Data from the 1963 Social Security Administration survey provides a measure of such potential income. Each unit's assets were assumed to be capable of earning a 4-percent rate of return. The principal and appropriate interest amounts were then divided over the expected remaining years of the unit's life in equal annual sums so that the assets would be exhausted at the end of that period. The annual amount computed in this way was added to current money income—less income actually received from assets.

Use of this procedure obviously ignores the question of feasibility or desirability of this form of asset management for the individual. Particularly unrealistic, for example, is the conversion of the owned house or farm or other business assets into prorated assets. The effect on median income of assuming that assets are converted into life annuities may be summarized as follows:

Unit	Actual income	Potential income	
		Excluding home equity	Including home equity
Married couples.....	\$2,875	\$3,130	\$3,795
Nonmarried men.....	1,365	1,560	1,845
Nonmarried women.....	1,015	1,130	1,395

The median potential income is about 10 percent greater than actual income when home equity is excluded and more than 30 percent greater when home equity is included. This reflects the fact that asset holdings are greater at the higher income levels than at the lower. The addition of distributed assets to income increases the inequality of income distribution. Of those with incomes of less than \$3,000, fewer than one in four, had asset holdings great enough to shift their income to a higher \$1,000 interval. Use of potential income other than the home equity would still leave more than one-third of the aged couples and about two-thirds of the nonmarried group with insufficient income to live independently at the modest but adequate standards established by the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics for that period.

I have introduced legislation in this Congress which would provide for an annual cost-of-living increase for social security beneficiaries tied to the upward trend in the Consumer Price Index. I have also stated my belief that the President's action in reducing the social security increase request from 10 percent as proposed by former President Johnson to 7 percent is foolhardy. I do not believe that the way to achieve a budget surplus is to take the money for the surplus out of the pockets of social security recipients. Also, I have sponsored legislation which will increase to \$3,000 the amount which a social security beneficiary can earn and not suffer any reduction in his benefit level. Finally, I have sponsored legislation which will improve the Federal civil service retirement system substantially and insure the solvency of the retirement fund. I have striven during my years in the Pennsylvania State Legislature and during my two terms as the representative of the Fourth Congressional District

to initiate and support measures which are designed to increase and at least maintain the buying power of those older Americans living on fixed incomes.

The Extraordinary Tax Relief Act of 1969 which I have introduced today is, in my opinion, part of the answer to assuring that those of our citizens living on fixed incomes can have the buying power of these incomes maintained and increased. From the statistics on increases in the property tax nationwide, and the analysis of the incomes of our senior citizens which I have given here, it appears obvious that homeownership is becoming an increasing burden on our older citizens.

I do not believe that any of us want our senior citizens to sell their homes and convert the money they receive into lifetime annuities if they desire not to. The majority of these citizens have worked most of their adult lives to get these homes and for us to allow them to lose them because they cannot pay their increasing property tax bill would be doing both the Nation and these citizens a grave disservice.

The Extraordinary Tax Relief Act of 1969 which I have introduced is designed to ease the property tax burden on those low-income elderly persons whose property taxes are excessively high in relation to their total income by allowing them a credit against their Federal income tax for that portion of their property tax which is determined to be excessive.

We all know that older people living on fixed incomes have trouble making ends meet and that increasing property taxes have made this more and more difficult. When these people purchased their homes, property taxes were much lower than they are now and they had a regular income. In urban areas especially, the problem of rising property taxes and their effect on the limited-income senior citizen has been substantial. In these areas also, incomes have been substantially eroded by inflation. We know that these elderly people do not want to move from their homes. We also know that moving is a traumatic experience for these people more than for any other group.

To cope with this problem, the bill I have introduced today provides property tax relief to those over 65 who have a total annual income of \$3,500 or less. Those whose incomes are too low to pay Federal taxes will receive a tax refund on the excessive amount of their property taxes while others will receive a tax credit. To assure that the relief which the bill provides will go only to those who need it, applicants will be required to list all forms of income which they receive including: Adjusted gross income, support money, public assistance, the gross amount of any pension or annuity, nontaxable interest received from the United States or any other governmental entity, workmen's compensation, and the amount of "loss of time" insurance payments. Claimants will not have to report gifts from nongovernmental sources, surplus food, or other relief of this kind supplied by a governmental entity.

The maximum amount of property

taxes which can be considered in establishing the Federal tax credit or the tax refund which would be accorded to low-income senior citizens under my bill is \$300. The tax credit or refund will be available not only to homeowners but to apartment dwellers as well. For renters my bill assumes that, to the extent that landlords can shift the property tax burden to tenants, low-income senior citizens in rented quarters also feel the pinch of increasing property taxes. Thus the bill provides the assumption that 25 percent of the annual rent payment will

be considered as the property tax credit for the purposes of the tax credit or tax refund.

Property taxes are considered as unusually high if they exceed a certain percentage of household income. These percentages are increased as household income increases. After determining the amount of the tax which is excessive, a percentage of this excessive part will be relieved under my bill.

To determine how much of a tax credit or refund a claimant under this bill will receive the following formula is used:

I "If household income is—		II Then the allowable claim is the product of—	III times the amount by which eligible property taxes and rent exceed the sum of—	IV plus—	V of household income in excess of—
At least—	but not more than—				
0	\$500	.75	0	0%	—
\$500	1,000	.75	0	3%	\$500
1,000	1,500	.60	\$15	6%	1,000
1,500	2,000	.60	45	9%	1,500
2,000	2,500	.60	90	12%	2,000
2,500	—	.60	150	15%	2,500

Some examples of the tax refund or credit which a household would receive under my bill are as follows: A family with an annual household income of \$400 would receive \$225. A family with an annual household income of \$700 would receive \$221. A family with an annual household income of \$1,200 would receive \$163.80. A family with an annual household income of \$1,600 would receive \$147.60. A family with an annual household income of \$2,200 would receive \$111.60. A family with an annual household income of \$3,000 would receive \$60. A family with an annual household income of \$3,500 or more would receive no refund or credit under the bill.

In States which have enacted legislation similar to the bill which I have introduced today, the fiscal impact on the economy has not been too great. However, I feel that my bill will help the State and local governments avoid even this slight drain on their available resources since it appears that the major reason why more States than Wisconsin and Minnesota have not enacted such legislation is because even the minimal financial impact of the tax credits or refunds involved could well push them over the brink to fiscal disaster.

The Wisconsin law was passed in 1964 and liberalized in 1966. In 1967, it provided tax relief to 69,000 low-income elderly families who own or rent their homes with an average payment of \$94.78. Thus, \$6.3 million was lost to the State treasury even though the amount granted came to about 1 percent of the total property tax collections in the State. About 98 percent of the money paid out under this law was in the form of tax refunds to households whose income was low enough so they did not have to pay taxes.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recognized the need that some property tax relief be provided for the elderly in its reports, State and local finances—significant features. The most serious problem with the property tax, especially as it applies to low-income senior citizens, is that it tends to be regressive and those with

lower incomes tend to pay a larger percentage of their incomes in property taxes than those with higher incomes. I believe my bill will reduce the regressivity substantially without causing the slightest fiscal dislocation to State or local governments. Most importantly, this bill will increase the buying power of our senior citizens living on fixed incomes and allow them to keep their hard-won homes.

INVESTORS LEAGUE INC. WILL RECOGNIZE OUTSTANDING MEMBERS OF HOUSE AND SENATE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the prestigious Investors League, Inc., devoted to the cause of good government, is wielding a wholesome influence in behalf of a lofty cause. The league is advancing the cause of free enterprise—which is the very soul of Anglo-Saxon civilization. This is indeed a commendable objective, for which this organization is being widely acclaimed.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter recently received by me from the Investors League. The letter follows:

Congressman O. C. FISHER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FISHER: In our tours around America, we continually see our fellow citizens, the majority of whom are working, raising families, contributing their money and talent to community betterment, voluntarily paying their taxes, and still having the energy to ponder the many problems of our times.

The American private enterprise system has helped almost 90% of us to enjoy a piece of the American dream. Too often today we are prone to criticize individuals and institutions including our economic system which is based on risks and rewards and has enabled Americans to enjoy a gross national

product larger than the next five countries of the world.

Last fall the Investors League formed a Congressional Awards Committee to honor annually the two United States Senators and two Congressmen who, in the opinion of the Committee, have contributed the most to the American enterprise system in each session of Congress. This is one way in which the 24 million Americans who have invested in our business system can acknowledge the contribution made to strengthen the country.

What a wonderful goal it would be if 100 million Americans could be helped to become investors in the private enterprise system!

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM JACKMAN,
President, Investors League, Inc.
JOHN T. MCCARTY,
Chairman, Congressional Awards Committee.

VIVA CHAVEZ

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, California's Imperial Valley is part of what Nicholas von Hoffman, the astute young Washington Post feature writer, terms "the other California—the valleys, flat, hot, laborious, where they grow the food, the fruit, the grapes."

Two weeks ago, my friend Cesar Chavez led a group of grape strikers on a march through Imperial Valley, through the area in which I was born and where I grew up, through the beauty and the heat over the Mexican border to bring attention to the maneuverings of some grape producers who are bringing laborers across the border in an effort to break the 4-year strike.

I have supported the huelga over these past 4 years, and I will extend my backing—and whatever else I can do—for as long as this vital drive continues to extend and maintain decent working and living conditions for grapeworkers.

Nicholas von Hoffman accompanied the marchers through Imperial Valley. He was there in Brawley, and reported on problems faced by Mexican-American students in the local high school. And, as von Hoffman points out:

The students' complaints are the usual ones you can hear from minority kids if you care to listen to them talk about their schools.

I picture not only the problems of Brawley, but also those same sentiments which are raised almost daily in my constituency of East Los Angeles.

I would now like to insert Nicholas von Hoffman's article, "Viva Chavez," into the RECORD along with a story from the May 23 Los Angeles Citizen describing further the Imperial Valley march.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
May 21, 1969]

VIVA CHAVEZ

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

BRAWLEY, CALIF.—There are two Californias. There is the California of the beaches, the mountains, the good places to eat, the resorts, the places where you do your California dreamin'. The other California is of the valleys, flat, hot, laborious,

where they grow the food, the fruit, the grapes.

Bakersfield, Delano in the San Joaquin are in the second California of stoop-labor and heat. So is this town, Brawley, a green place in the desert of the Imperial Valley, about 30 miles from the Mexican border. It's not too much of a place with its drive-ins and its used car lots, their plastic pennants forever fluttering. It's a town that reminds you a little bit of Greenwood, Miss., except that the Government-subsidized irrigation has made it richer and there are palm trees, those giraffes of the vegetable world.

The other day there was a Mexican man on the highway which runs south from coachella through desert where there is nothing to see but sand, scrub brush and the signs of real estate developers proclaiming the coming of lakes, marinas and planned retirement cities. A robust old man he was, not feeble, but bowlegged, redfaced, wearing a straw hat and carrying a sign which read, "Slow Down, Marchers Ahead." Heavy, articulated diesel semis hauling onions and alfalfa and sugar beets drove with undiminished speed and noise past him. Their wind almost blew him off the hot highway, but he held his position, following them with his head and his eyes as they rolled off into the desert. He wouldn't give up.

A half mile up the road came the marchers. They wouldn't give up either. There weren't many of them, maybe 40 or 50 grape strikers walking down the highway being led by a woman in a straw cowboy hat. She carried the gold and white canvas painting of Our Lady of Guadalupe on a staff. Slightly behind her on either side were men carrying the American and Mexican flags.

For four years the Mexican-Americans have had their strike, their *huelga* as they call it, against the grape growers and for social justice. They and their leader, Caesar Chavez, have marched, picketed, vigiled, struck, fasted, implored and prayed to little purpose. Only 11 companies have signed contracts with the union. But they're like the old man. They don't give up. Instead they think up more tricks and stunts to perform so they can catch the national attention and press their claims on somebody who will honor them.

This latest contretemps which ended on the Mexican border a few days ago is an attempt to hook up with the Mexican labor movement to prevent the importation of strikebreakers from the other side, something the American government is supposed to stop but does not. It is another example of the growing number of complaints that the government primarily serves the powerful and the well organized and not the weak and disorganized.

Recently Washington has paid the farmworker's union some attention. However, Chavez wishes the Secretary of Labor hadn't bothered because he regards the Administration's proposals for new legislation as a union-busting scheme wrapped up in the language of philanthropy. "For 35 years the growers have opposed all legislation, they've been against everything, including child labor regulation and minimum wages, but now they turn around and support this law," says Chavez, a quiet, plous man around whom a cult of admiration akin to Martin Luther King's is building.

Chavez, like King, has integrated non-violence into his working philosophy of life, but unlike King, Chavez can be very specific about law and technicality. He is not only a leader of "la raza" as the Mexican-Americans collectively call themselves, but a man who heads a labor union and wants the protection of government supervised union elections, something farmworkers have never had. He doesn't want what the Nixon Administration is offering because he believes it would put farm workers under the jurisdiction of the grower-controlled Department of Agriculture, would forbid strikes during

harvest time, and then, after defanging and disarming the union, would force it into compulsory arbitration. It would also make secondary boycotts of grapes in supermarkets illegal. It's been the attempt to boycott grapes being sold by supermarket chains that have dramatized the strike and spread the word of it across the country. The marchers here carried signs saying "Abajo Safeway" (Down with Safeway).

"They should give us a Wagner Act as they did the other unions in the 1930s when they were young and weak. They should give us the same protection and freedom the Wagner Act gave the other unions for an equal length of time. If we had an equal chance in the local courts and in the importation of strikebreakers, we could beat them in the fields anytime," says Chavez who emphasizes it was only after the unions were organized under the Wagner Act that restrictions on boycotts and striking were put on them in the form of Taft-Hartley law which was designed to limit the power of overly strong unions, but which effectively destroys new unions.

When the marchers reached Brawley they were joined by several hundred high school kids who are in revolt because the school has forbidden them to wear a button proclaiming the "Mexican-American Revolution," or so says Loupe Sabala, their 18-year-old leader. "They said our button meant violence even after we explained that we meant revolution through education. They said they were for our goals but the button would cause so much turmoil that they had to ban it," he explains.

The students' complaints are the usual ones you can hear from minority kids if you care to listen to them talk about their schools. They say they are discouraged by the teachers from trying to enroll in the academic classes that lead to college and the professions, that they are put down, that their culture and history is ignored and that kids who speak Spanish only are dumped into classes for the mentally retarded. Now they are aroused, imbued with a new sense of la raza that makes them identify themselves with all Mexican-American aspirations and pushes them to take their place in the line of march when their parents hang back with the frightened conservatism of older people whose whole lives have been one long squelch.

They are marching in the valleys of the second California. The laws of Washington or not they will walk on, hopefully without violence, hopefully still believing in our system of government and economics, hopefully still reciting their litany of militance and progress:

"Que Viva La Huelga!
Que Viva Virgen de Guadalupe!
Que Viva Caesar Chavez!
Que viva La Causa!
Que Viva La Raza!"

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Citizen,
May 23, 1969]

LONG MARCH PAYS OFF: ANOTHER GRAPE STRIKE LOOMS WITH "GREEN CARDER" SUPPORT

(By Sal Perrotta)

The countdown for another grape harvest showdown between the United Farm Workers and Coachella Valley growers is ticking off the final days toward a strike in the vineyards.

A meeting set for tonight in Coachella may signal the start of picketing in a matter of days, according to Jim Drake, United Farm Workers organizing Committee (UFWOC) administrative assistant to Cesar Chavez.

Full scale grape picking is slated to begin in early June.

Optimism for a successful strike has pervaded planning especially since last Sunday's

rally in Calexico, which culminated a 100-mile trek by grape pickers through the desert to the Mexican border.

Drake said that Mexican nationals—pickers permitted to work on the U.S. side of the border on temporary green cards—are more responsive than ever to UFWOC's appeal for support.

"We hope to consolidate previous inroads we've made with gains last Sunday in communicating with 'green carder' crew leaders," Drake said.

"We're offering to treat them the same as our own members in asking that they respect picket lines."

This would include a guarantee of seniority in the union once contracts are signed and the possibility of strike benefits, according to Drake.

The UFWOC official said that the strong prospect of greater support from Mexican pickers is the result of a combination of several factors.

The United Farm Workers first of all has taken a different course in communicating with "green carders," Drake said.

"We're not just asking them to stay away," he said, but have appealed to them to join us because our intention is not to shut them out of their jobs."

The Mexican press also has been "more positive" in coverage of the situation and the march was a singularly important element in changing attitudes, he said.

"The march came across as a 'gut issue' to the Mexicans," Drake said. "I think they really saw for the first time the plight of farm workers on this side of the border."

Another major factor was the appearance of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy at last Sunday's rally.

"His personal support of the strike and his urging 'green carders' to listen to Cesar (Chavez, UFWOC director) to respect picket lines and join the union had a tremendous effect," according to Drake.

Kennedy told a crowd of about 1000 in Calexico last Sunday that he had traveled the 3000 miles from Washington to tell farm workers that "the voice of Cesar Chavez is being heard in Congress."

"Injustices to farm workers can no longer be tolerated," he declared.

He also told the cheering throng that it has been 50 years since child labor was abolished in the textile mills in Massachusetts and that it is about time child labor be prohibited in the fields.

Since then, leaflets printed in Spanish and distributed at the border inform readers of Kennedy's position—"respect the picket lines, join the union."

Growers attempting to counter apparent gains of UFWOC with "green carders" are taking full page ads in newspapers painting a picture of lush jobs awaiting pickers in the vineyards.

Sharing the platform with Kennedy at Calexico were Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-Texas) Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Minn.), and Rep. John Tunney (D-Riverside).

Yarborough and Mondale had led the last five miles of the march to the border, started in Indio May 11 to dramatize UFWOC's campaign to organize the Mexican farm worker commuters.

The number of marchers reached its peak Sunday after a low of 35 during the week as the group braved intense heat of the Coachella and Imperial Valleys, at times hitting a sweltering 106 degrees.

While UFWOC officials made final plans for the strike, their boycott of California table grapes gained more international significance.

Dominion Stores Ltd., the largest retail grocery chain in Canada, agreed to support the boycott. Canada represents the largest export market for California grapes, having purchased about \$20 million worth a year in the past.

A GROUP OF QUEENS COUNTY, N.Y., ATTORNEYS PRESENTED BY CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this morning it was my distinct pleasure to sponsor a group of attorneys from the Queens County Bar Association—New York City—for admission to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court.

I was delighted to have been asked to participate in the presentation of these individuals to the Court, and am taking the liberty of listing their names herewith in the RECORD, as follows:

A GROUP OF QUEENS COUNTY, N.Y., ATTORNEYS PRESENTED BY CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL

Harry Berlin, Lee H. Bostic, Thomas J. Dillon, Terry S. Eleftheriades, Albert I. Gilman, Miss Patricia F. Gilmartin, Ira M. Harlton, Kenneth R. Hendra, Eli Katz, John W. Kenny.

Robert P. Leighton, Arthur W. Lonschein, Robert I. Mandel, James J. McDonald, Harold B. McLaughlin, Raymond F. O'Brien, Miss Marjorie O'Connell, Andrew J. Orensky, Miss Joan E. Osterdorf, John F. Osterdorf.

Joseph J. Regan, Jr., Milard K. Roper, Lawrence R. Schneider, Ronald J. Schwartz, Jocelyn E. Smith, Francis J. Valentino, Donald Warren, Jerome M. Weinberg, Fritz Weinschenk.

KILLED

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Robert M. Higginbotham, an outstanding young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD.

HIGGINBOTHAM, MATHEMATICIAN, DIES IN VIETNAM

Army Spec. 4 Robert M. Higginbotham, a promising theoretical mathematician who was named the outstanding senior in the University of Maryland's 1967 graduating class was killed in action in Vietnam last week, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

The father of the 23-year-old Rockville soldier called his son's death "a complete and tragic waste. His life has gone for nothing in a senseless military adventure."

Specialist Higginbotham, a member of the Americal Division, was killed May 14, the Pentagon said, when the armored personnel carrier he was driving was hit by enemy rocket fire near Chu Lal in Quang Tin province southeast of Da Nang.

TANK, APC DRIVER

"Bob left here feeling he was never coming back," the soldier's father, Charles A. Higginbotham, said yesterday. "He thought things were looking up, but his first feelings were right."

Specialist Higginbotham had been in the Army for a year and a half and for the past

eight months had been driving tanks and the lumbering personnel carriers around Vietnam.

"His greatest fear," his father said, "was that he would get caught in one of those carriers when it was hit. The survival rate of their drivers is almost zero."

PLANNED GRADUATE WORK

The Rockville soldier had joined the Army after college graduation when his draft deferment ended.

He had planned to do graduate work in theoretical mathematics—where his talents had won him honors at Maryland—but decided to delay his further studies when he was reclassified, his father said.

"We never could understand," Mr. Higginbotham said, "how the Army decided to make a tank or personnel carrier driver out of him. The Army's placement people must have majored in stupidity, it always seemed to us."

Specialist Higginbotham, who was born in Washington and lived in the metropolitan area most of his life, was a graduate of Our Lady of Good Counsel High School in Wheaton, Md.

He is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Higginbotham, of 14416 Pecan drive, Rockville; a sister, Pamela, and his grandmothers, Mrs. Ida Higginbotham, of New Martinsville, W. Va., and Mrs. Florence Evert, of Santa Rosa, Calif.

ACT NOW TO PROTECT THE U.S. SHOE INDUSTRY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the time to act to ward off the threat of extinction to a major segment of our national footwear industry is now. Not only are there many domestic jobs at stake in this situation—a factor which should be a principal consideration when the Federal Government enters into import agreements—but also involved is the prospect of economic chaos in those small towns and cities across the Nation which literally survive from local shoe plants. Supporting industries are also concerned and the danger signals for these are flashing.

The evidence is undeniable that the products of many of our factories cannot compete with low-labor costs overseas. The wage disparity factor involved results in a general loss of American production due to reduction in demand for the product produced under the necessarily higher wage scale.

The answer should rest on what will best benefit the American industry. This does not require a complete cutoff of foreign imports. But we should make certain our domestic interests are protected in this matter. All that is needed is a fair competitive situation—and I am certain American industry, given this opportunity, will still come out ahead.

The following two articles written by Lloyd M. Hampton, Washington editor of Leather and Shoes magazine, are illustrative of the chaotic condition in certain segments of the footwear industry at this time. There is no doubt but that, unless something is done now to offset this situation, the same conditions will spread

throughout the entire footwear industry and into supporting industries.

Congress can and should act on H.R. 7696 to achieve orderly marketing in place of the chaos now prevailing for much of the American footwear industry.

The above-mentioned articles follow:

[From the Leather and Shoes magazine, Feb. 1, 1969]

TARIFF FAILS TO MENTION WAGE DISPARITY FACTOR

(By Lloyd M. Hampton)

The sobering testimony offered by domestic shoe industry witnesses before the U.S. Tariff Commission in the fall of 1968 indicated repeatedly that the crux of the rapidly escalating imports crisis lay in the existing chasm-like U.S.-versus-foreign wage differential.

As succinctly expressed last Oct. 28 by Alan H. Goldstein of the National Footwear Manufacturers Association, "The price advantage of imports is due entirely to the difference in labor costs between American factories and factories in Europe and Asian countries. Practically all imported footwear is produced at wage and hour costs that would be illegal in the United States."

In another statement, Irving R. Glass, representing U.S. tanners, made it clear to Tariff hearing panel members that "The strength of import competition and the growth of shoe imports rests on comparative labor costs."

Yet interestingly, a careful review of the Commission's Jan. 17 report to the President on its probe of the economic state of the U.S. nonrubber shoe sector failed to turn up any reference—cursory or otherwise—to the wage differential question, this despite the important consideration it would seem to deserve if expert testimony by high, responsible industry officials is any criteria.

According to industry spokesmen, the U.S. footwear manufacturer views the wage difference factor as something with which he is unable to cope. This, in addition to the shoe trade's admitted inability to offset higher labor costs here, although the industry enjoys a 25 to 30 percent greater productivity than any other nation, would appear to provide an adequate incentive for any force investigating trade, Tariff included, to want to study in-depth an issue as pertinent as the wage disparity matter.

Unfortunately, however, this most central wage question about which many say the shoe imports situation primarily revolves apparently was not held by Tariff at the time of its investigation to be of sufficient significance to warrant even mentioning in its recently-released report to the White House.

As a result, the report's incompleteness becomes a matter of sizeable concern. Why? Because it was widely understood at the probe's outset last year that the study was to be as President Johnson termed it a "comprehensive" one. It would appear to have fallen short of that request. Thus, a report that was supposed to thoroughly acquaint the new Chief Executive and the Congress with all facets of the footwear imports problem instead supplies only part of the information required—hardly a sound basis upon which to form the right, most equitable judgment relating to the mounting imports situation.

To say, as Tariff sources told this column, that the wage imbalance question was not discussed in the report because such foreign data was not readily available, is amazing in light of figures unearthed by the footwear industry.

For instance, during the October 1968 Tariff proceedings, domestic shoemen laid before the Commissioners such "not readily available" foreign footwear information as Italy's basic hourly wage of 50 cents, plus all fringe benefits coming to about another 50 cents;

Spanish footwear plants being reliably reported to be paying their workers approximately a total of 40 cents per hour; Japanese hourly wages amounting to around 35 cents which, including fringe benefits, total less than one quarter of U.S. wage and fringe considerations.

Also, in Hong Kong, a female footwear employee is doing good to earn \$50. a month for a 10-hour day, 60-hour week; in Taiwan, a footwear girl worker may earn from a low of \$13. to \$14. monthly to a high of 11 cents per hour for a 60-hour week; and, in France, with the hikes made a short time before the October Tariff hearing, wages and fringes were placed at less than half those in this country.

The government agency's footwear probe covered more than an eight month span—beginning April 29, 1968—yet time limitations, it maintained, prevented the gathering of the overseas wage data. Further, sources pointed out, even if wage figures from abroad had been assembled in time, they would not have produced a valid comparative picture. In order to achieve this it was explained, other required—but equally unobtainable—information such as productivity, etc., was needed.

The wage disparity factor is what the growing imports peril is said to be all about. Being at the root of the U.S. imports flood, it certainly provided one of the more basic reasons for the Tariff shoe investigation. Because it was not even touched upon in the final Commission report, the study can be seen to be lacking in vital content critical to comprehensive review, evaluation and comment by the just-installed Administration.

[From the Leather and Shoes magazine,
Feb. 1, 1969]

SHOE IMPORTS WILL TOP U.S. OUTPUT, TARIFF SAYS

(By Lloyd M. Hampton)

WASHINGTON.—As seen by the U.S. Tariff Commission, domestic consumption of non-rubber footwear will probably continue to expand at a pace somewhat higher than the Nation's population growth rate; both U.S. production and imports are likely to continue to increase, with imports outstripping this country's output on an annual basis.

These and other projections were included in the Commission's recently-completed report covering its investigation of the economic condition of U.S. nonrubber shoe producers and what effect imports have on the domestic industry, including the competitive relationship between foreign footwear deliveries received here and their products.

PROBE STARTED IN APRIL 1968

Over eight months in the making, the 110-page report was sent to the President Jan. 17.

Basically a fact-finding study, it offers no recommendations. If any move is made to alleviate the imports crush, it will have to come from the White House and Congress after both sectors have had a chance to review the report.

Ordered by President Johnson last April 29, the report covers a broad spectrum of information on U.S. producers of nonrubber shoes, including their financial experience and participation in foreign trade; U.S. consumption, production, sales, imports, exports and prices of the articles; U.S. Tariff treatment; channels and methods of distribution; the impact of imports on the domestic footwear industry.

NO CUT IN PROFITS AHEAD

As viewed by Tariff, increasing imports held no added threat to the U.S. shoe producer's profits.

According to the Commission's report, technological developments and ingenuity of design and style are seen as "substantially" advancing the competitive position of U.S. manufacturers, this in the face of a likeli-

hood that imports will "somewhat" outdistance domestic yearly production.

Taking this into consideration along with the prospect that both U.S. production and imports are likely to go on climbing, Tariff was moved to comment: "Under these circumstances, the anticipated rise in imports might have no greater effect on the profitability of domestic producers' operations—in the overall—than at present."

Referring to smaller footwear operations, the Commission felt that some of these producers "probably would continue" to function "at low levels of profit." However, many of them, the report stated, "would likely be significantly affected by competition not only from imports of nonrubber footwear, but also from sales of nonrubber footwear by their larger domestic competitors and from sales of other types of both imported and domestic footwear" such as canvas-rubber.

SHOE IMPORTS UP "MARKEDLY"

Other remarks contained in the Tariff report included the following:

U.S. consumption: Since 1955 the annual U.S. consumption of nonrubber footwear has grown at an average annual rate slightly greater than that of the U.S. population—about two percent compared with 1.5 percent. Since the mid-1950's, consumption of the shoes in this country has increased less rapidly than other types.

U.S. production: The annual growth rate of nonrubber footwear since the mid-1950's has averaged around 0.8 percent. Thus, the average annual output of such footwear was about a tenth greater in 1965-67 than in 1954-56. The output in 1966—a record year—was about seven percent larger than that in 1963. Output dropped in 1967 to about the 1963 level, but recovered in the first eight months of 1968 to an annual rate slightly greater than the record level of 1966. In recent years, footwear for women and misses has accounted for nearly 50 percent of the annual output of the nonrubber articles. About half of the domestic nonrubber footwear sold in the U.S. in 1967 was marketed at wholesale at less than \$4 per pair.

U.S. exports: The volume of U.S. shipments abroad of nonrubber shoes has gone down almost annually since the mid-1950's. Yearly exports of such footwear, which have been equal to less than one percent of domestic production for some years, declined from 4.6 million pairs in 1955 to 2.2 million pairs in 1967. Overseas shipments in 1968 were probably at about the same level as those in 1967. Footwear with leather uppers have made up most of the U.S. exports of nonrubber shoes.

U.S. imports: Annual imports to the U.S. of nonrubber footwear "have increased markedly" in recent years, and have supplied an increasing share of domestic consumption of such goods. Deliveries here in 1967 were double those in 1963 and many times those in the mid-1950's; moreover, imports in 1968 probably were nearly 40 percent greater than those in 1967. Imports accounted for 12 percent of the nonrubber footwear sold in the U.S. in 1964, 18 percent in 1967, and probably 22 percent last year. Imports generally supply a larger share of the women's and misses' nonrubber shoes marketed here than they do of either men's, youths' and boys' or children's and infants'—23 percent compared to 11 percent and 10 percent, respectively, in 1967. Vinyl footwear, marketed mainly through retail outlets, offer very inexpensive shoes to the consumer; these outlets include the discount chains, dime-store chains, drug stores, and other stores featuring low-price merchandise.

MERGER ROLE CITED

Additional observations by Tariff indicated there has been a decrease since the mid-1950's in the number of U.S. firms and individual plants making nonrubber footwear. These developments, however, started long before nonrubber footwear was imported in appreciable volume, the Commission said,

further noting that they resulted, in part, from a substantial number of mergers.

Most of the establishments stopping production of nonrubber shoes were small plants that employed less than 250 workers the government agency said, adding: "Consequently, the share of U.S. output concentrated in firms producing more than two million pairs each is moderately larger currently than a decade ago."

RETAILERS EYE IMPORTS

On price trends, the report emphasized that since the mid-1950's the wholesale prices of leather footwear have upped more sharply than those of nondurable manufactures and of wearing apparel. "Rising wholesale prices have stimulated retailers' interest in imports," Tariff pointed out, continuing that "retailers, like producers, are reluctant to alter their price lines."

Where employment and wages are concerned, the report mentioned among other things that (1) U.S. nonrubber footwear producers employed about the same number of production workers in 1968 as in 1963 but about six percent fewer than in 1954-56; (2) the average number of weekly hours per worker, however, was slightly higher, and the wages earned were materially higher, in 1968 than in 1963; (3) the rise in weekly hours per worker probably reflected in part a short labor supply; (4) to the extent labor shortages limited U.S. output or delayed deliveries such shortages probably stimulated imports here of nonrubber footwear.

In the area of profit-and-loss experience of U.S. manufacturers, Tariff held that "The profitability of the domestic producers of nonrubber footwear has improved materially since 1963."

Total annual net profits of all producers were estimated to have doubled between 1963 and 1967. Large firms turning out non-rubber shoes reported generally that earnings were higher in the first half of 1968 than in the corresponding 1967 period, the Commission said.

SOMALIA—FOREIGN AID AFFLUENCY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in the remote African country of Somalia, its citizens are subjected to competitive foreign aid.

So far, the U.N., Soviet Russia, Communist China, the United States, Italy, and 16 other countries are all contributing financial assistance to gain preferential influence.

And not unlike other foreign aid projects, where political considerations take precedence over economic aid, no one is benefiting.

I insert a report from Berbera, Somalia, by C. C. Miniclier, as follows:

SOMALIA IS TOP RECIPIENT OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID—COUNTRY IS GEOGRAPHICALLY STRATEGIC SPOT

(By C. C. Miniclier)

BERBERA, SOMALIA.—Two Soviet destroyers tied up at the new, Soviet-built port here, and took on water as their crews watched Soviet films ashore and visited with countrymen running the port.

Berbera, opposite the former British strategic port of Aden, is the best natural harbor in Somalia and the Soviets have built excellent dockside facilities to handle machinery repair, administration and storage.

A fenced, air-conditioned Soviet compound of modern apartment buildings is nearby and three radio transmitters, including one said by experts to be powerful enough to communicate easily with Moscow or Vladivostok, are in working order.

All this is of strategic convenience to Soviet naval, fishing and oceanographic vessels. It is also one of the few major aid projects in Somalia which is a success.

HIGHEST AID

The United Nations, Soviet Russia, Communist China, the United States, Italy and some 16 other countries have poured more than \$400 million in aid into Somalia since it gained independence in 1960. A U.N. official estimates this is the highest aid, per person or per square mile, than any country has received in its first nine years.

But casual visitors, and Somali citizens, are hard put to show where it went.

On the sand-strewn streets of Mogadiscio, the capital, and in Hargeisa, the country's second largest city, water is still sold by the gallon from small wagons drawn by donkeys.

In March, before some rain fell, water in Hargeisa was down to a five-day supply and was selling for the equivalent of \$1.42 for 16 gallons.

This is a country where the average income is \$60.

There are no railroads; only 10 communities are connected by telephone; only 17 of the 86 doctors in the country are Somalis and there are only about 31,000 students in all the country's schools. The population is about three million.

AID GRAVEYARD

"Somalia is the absolute graveyard of aid schemes," a Western diplomat told a reporter.

It also offers a study of what too much aid too quickly can do to a country's balance of payments.

Rice, petroleum, cement and gray sheeting, a particular type of cloth used in most Somali clothing, can be imported only from specified aid-giving countries to meet Somalia's debt to them.

Although Somalis prefer the texture and price of rice from Thailand, only Egyptian and U.S. rice may be imported—to meet credit demands.

American and British service stations in Somalia distribute Soviet petroleum because of Somalia's debt to Russia. Only Egyptian and Soviet cement and Soviet gray sheeting are imported for the same reason, say government sources.

Several aid projects stand as monuments to poor planning.

The United States financed a major fish processing plant at Alula, on the Gulf of Aden, after a fisheries man noted large numbers of tuna in the area.

But someone forgot to tell him that tuna move about. They'd left by the time the plant was finished. It is now idle among drifts of sand. A quick trip down the beach to two smaller Italian fish plants would have shown that smaller, seasonal plants work best with the fish in the Gulf of Aden.

MAJOR EXPORTS

Meat and bananas are Somalia's major exports.

The Soviets have completed what visitors report is the ultimate word in a clean, efficient meat-packing plant at Kismayu. But someone forgot to tell the Soviets that Somalia's customers don't buy tinned or sausage meat, such as the plant produces. The customers are largely Islamic and meat exports of camels, goats and sheep are live, on the hoof.

Agriculture research projects, educational efforts and medical assistance by several foreign countries have had varying success.

Why so much aid to an arid, undeveloped country of largely nomadic peoples?

It is a strategic spot geographically, controlling southern approaches to the Red Sea, and everyone would appear to be afraid of being outdone.

The Soviets followed the Americans and built a fish plant; the Americans built a port, too, at Kismayu near the Soviet meat plant. Americans and Communist Chinese have rice growing schemes. Communist China plans to improve Hargeisa's water supply as the Americans improve the water supply at Mogadiscio.

The final draft of the Somali Republic's Planning Commission program for 1968-70 took a hard look at Somalia's wealth of aid and less than rich results:

"More often than not political considerations had to take precedence over economic and, in the process of decision making, inadequate attention was given to the requirements of plan implementation."

ILL CONCEIVED

Noting that a number of aid projects "turned out to be ill-conceived" due to a lack of feasibility studies, the report adds: "Perhaps the single most important factor responsible for the disappointing performance of the five-year plan was the deficiency of the administrative machinery of government."

ABE LEVINSON

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people the article on Abe Levinson, one of the three founding brothers of the Levinson Steel Co., as an outstanding industrialist and a fine member of his good community. We are glad to include this article by Aaron P. Levinson, a nephew and president of the Levinson Steel Co., as a fitting tribute to this fine American:

When I heard Rabbi Goldblum's eloquent eulogy of Abe Levinson, I was touched. There was so much about Abe that was captured so beautifully—the comparison to the sabra, tough on the outside and soft and sweet on the inside; his description of Abe's distinctive trait of making great demands on himself before he made demands on others; his love of family and friends. But as I listened, I knew that Abe's greatness could never be really captured in a short eulogy. Abe was not a simple man. Even though a flowery treatise on Abe's life would not befit the man, one cannot be too brief even if only to touch on the highlights of his character, his temperament and his personality.

To accept Abe you had to accept the whole man. Some of his principles and convictions and the things on which he placed emphasis might have been different than yours, but his total impact on those who really knew him and on his family and his company was great. He was not a man who needed blue ribbons or fancy titles. He went about the business of helping to make Levinson Steel a great company in his own way—in the final analysis, a very effective way. His direct and sometimes seemingly blunt style was sometimes not fully understood by those who did not know him too well. But no one could know Abe Levinson for a long time without loving him. He truly passed the test of time with those who knew him best.

In the early days of the company's history, Abe and his brothers in the business were a great team. They complemented each other.

Brother Sam had a great business mind and was the out-front member of the team. Jack was the buyer and the man with great merchandising ability. Monnie learned the administrative skills and ran the office, and Abe achieved excellence in production. He understood his men and knew how to get the shop team working together. It is true that Abe never asked a man to do a job he couldn't do himself. In the early part of his career, he welded and operated a burning torch and bucked up rivets and ran a crane. He knew every skill required to fabricate a finished steel structure. Without any formal engineering education, he could often spot an error in layout or fitting. He knew the details of every contract on the company's books, and he knew every man in his shop. He knew their families and he knew their problems. Those in the shop who have been around long enough to know Abe, really loved him. Abe Levinson never went for fancy management terms, but he didn't have to. All he really had to do was talk the language of his people and at that he was an expert. An expression on his face or a little gesture with his hands could sometimes say more to his men than the fanciest of fancy speeches.

I will never forget the time some of the men gathered around Abe on one of his birthdays. Freddy Pfeffer, one of the men in Abe's layout crew, sheepishly handed Abe a package crudely wrapped and covered with greasy finger marks. As he shoved it into Abe's arms, he said simply, "This is from the boys." There was a long moment of silence as Abe fingered the package, then tore off the paper to discover a beautiful Browning shotgun. They knew Abe enjoyed fishing and hunting. Abe looked at the gun and then looked up at the men gathered around him and said, "you clowns," as everyone grinned from ear to ear.

Abe knew his men—he worked with them, fought with them, hunted and fished with them and visited them in their homes. The overflow crowd which poured into the Schugar Funeral Home the morning of the service was a great tribute to Abe and to the esteem which the community felt toward him. Not only were there personal friends and business friends and family, but scores of the men who work in the Levinson shop came to pay their last respects—even some men long retired like Luther Powell and Louis Tallero. Eddie Wright, chief shop steward, when he heard about Abe's death bowed his head and said to Harry Stein, "Whatever success I have had in my life, I owe a large part of it to Abe Levinson." As Charlie Reed walked by the casket, he said to me, "Abe was the best friend I ever had."

But Abe Levinson wasn't just a shop man. He knew the psychology of people in every walk of life. My Dad, when he was President of the company, often asked Abe to accompany him on business trips. His straightforward style and Sam's great personality complemented each other. Abe was often a great help in winning customers for Levinson Steel. His knowledge and understanding of production instilled confidence in prospective buyers.

Abe, for many years, was a seven day a week guy. He often said, "That shop is my life." Every once in a while he stayed in the shop all night when something wasn't just right. He attended his shop and his shop problems much as a mother would watch over a sick child. Abe's special kind of spirit and dedication caught on with every person on his team. I remember so vividly the words of wisdom which came out of his mouth. When I was just learning something about the Levinson plant and about supervision, he said, "Our men really are pretty smart if you just give them a chance. If a new man isn't doing his job right, it's usually your fault, not his. New men are sometimes ashamed to tell you if they don't understand." Then he proceeded to tell me how

to be sure they did understand. Even in the early thirties, Levinson had night crews and Abe knew so well the fundamentals of correlating the work of the first and second shifts. I would always watch with amazement as he and his right hand man, Yossell Goldstein would instruct second shift men, never missing a detail—and then painstakingly have it all played back to be sure he was understood. He knew the basic elements of industrial psychology and training and motivation. He just called them by other names and his methods worked. Everyone was anxious to prove himself to Abe and this added up to a loyal, hard working team.

Even though he often said, "That shop is my life," there really was another part of Abe's life equally important—his family. Nothing and no one was more important than Bess and the kids and the grandchildren. Even though Abe was strong willed and when he made up his mind, he was hard to deter, there was always one person he listened to, the one person who really watched over him and made sure that he didn't neglect his health—Bess. I think I knew a little about that relationship because you see, Abe was my Dad's brother and Bess is my mother's sister. Besides that, Abe and Bessie were my godfather and godmother. If there was ever a woman of strength, quietly behind the scenes, giving a man a feeling of self-confidence, it was Bess Levinson with Abe. A historian could have written a book about the Abe-Bess Levinson team.

And Abe was so pleased and proud of his son, Joel, and his sons-in-law, Morry Podolsky and Harry Stein. The partnership he had with his boys in Levinson's production team added richness and joy to his life. Abe had outstanding children and he knew it. Like his brother, Sam, it was not always easy for Abe to express praise and admiration, but privately to me, he talked much about the accomplishments and the sense of responsibility of Joel, the understanding and common touch of Harry, and the pragmatism, persistence and diligence of Morry. His daughters and daughter-in-law, Natalie Podolsky, Judy Stein and Toba Levinson, were exactly the kind of women he loved and admired—sweet and loving, devoted to their husbands and children—and very important people in their own rights. Every grandchild had a special place in Abe's heart: Morry and Natalie's Sharon, Barbara, and Gary, Sharon's husband, Stephen Freedman, and great granddaughter, Randi Sue; Judy and Harry's Steven, Robin and Mitchell; and Joel and Toba's Jeffrey, Eric, Andrew and Mark. This was Abe's family. He left them a rich heritage and great memories.

But the thing that is closest to my heart about Abe is the personal relationship I developed with him. There were times in his life when I thought Abe was from the old school and was holding us back. I realized later that often when he held us back, we needed to be held back. But despite brief periods of orneriness and stubbornness, when the chips were down, when major decisions had to be made, when others were pushing the panic button, all of us could always count on Abe to bring reason into focus. In the 36 years I worked with Abe, he never once let me down. During the past eight or ten years, since my father became ill and died, Abe was of invaluable help to me. I needed Abe's advice. I needed his words of encouragement. I needed his kind of wisdom. Even though when he reached his 70th birthday, there was an automatic retirement written into many of the corporation's legal documents, I knew that we all needed Abe's presence on the scene as long as he had the physical capability to be there. We changed the legal documents and I went to Abe's home right before his birthday and asked him not to retire. Abe stayed on. He showed up at the office and at the plant daytime and nighttime, sometimes when the pain in his leg was almost unendurable. And then quickly

and quietly, he died, but he died the way he wanted to, with his boots on.

There was greatness in Abe Levinson—the greatness that is made of humility, love of fellow man, love of family, simple tastes, diligence and hard work. His memory will always be an inspiration to those of us who were privileged to know him.

A. P. LEVINSON.

HON. WILLIAM ORVILLE DOUGLAS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Times of May 26, 1969, is an excellent short biography of the distinguished Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, William Orville Douglas:

AT 70, THE "YOUNGEST" JUSTICE OF ALL:
WILLIAM ORVILLE DOUGLAS
(By Sidney E. Zion)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—During a recess at the trial of Dr. Benjamin Spock in Boston last year, word filtered out that the Supreme Court had upheld the Federal statute making it a crime to burn draft cards. "What was the vote?" a dejected radical lawyer asked. "Seven to Douglas," an observer answered. Everyone chuckled but nobody was surprised. In his 30 years on the Supreme Court, William Orville Douglas has often stood alone in defense of civil liberties that other justices could not or would not recognize.

And now he stands alone again, under fire for receiving outside income as an officer of the Albert Parvin Foundation. The Justice, who resigned from the organization Friday, has replied to critics by charging that a Federal tax investigation of the foundation was "manufactured" to force him off the bench.

Seventy years old, of middle height, ruddy complexion, and Spencer Tracy style, Justice Douglas, his heartbeat aided by a pacemaker, is seen by his admirers as "the youngest man on the Court."

"Bill is the only one of them that has consistently kept faith with the kids," a lawyer friend says. "He's an existentialist figure, really, always his own man, fearful of neither people, forces nor establishments. Who else would have tried to stop the Army from sending boys to Vietnam, just as he once tried to keep the Government from executing the Rosenbergs? When the heat is on—and it's on now—the only guy on that Court I'd bet on to stand up is Bill Douglas."

His enemies, political and racial conservatives ranging from distinguished Harvard law graduates to rural Southern segregationists, would not disagree with that estimate. Indeed, for many of them his penchant for "standing up" is enough reason to impeach him, an effort that was made in 1953 in the House of Representatives after he issued a stay of execution to Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the convicted atom spies.

FOURTH MARRIAGE

A less serious but perhaps just as heartfelt attempt to impeach him came in the summer of 1966 when Justice Douglas married his fourth wife, the then 23-year-old Cathleen Heffernan, less than a month after his third wife, 26-year-old Joan Martin, had divorced him and remarried.

The Justice was first married in 1923 to Mildred Riddle. The marriage produced two children, William Jr. and Mildred Riddle Douglas (now Mrs. Frank Welles Jr.). The couple were divorced in 1953 and the next year Justice Douglas married Mercedes Hester Davidson. After their divorce, in 1963,

he married Miss Martin, and three years later Miss Heffernan.

But despite some sniping in the House at his "moral character," Justice Douglas has remained as unconcerned, apparently, as he has always been over criticism from all quarters.

His professional critics are mostly lawyers and professors who continue to follow the philosophy of the late Justice Felix Frankfurter, roughly defined as "judicial restraint," or as President Nixon likes to call it, "strict constructionism."

They have long accused Justice Douglas of being "result-oriented." By this they mean that he assertedly ignores established precedents in order to reach results that he favors.

He dismisses this criticism as frivolous, stating that his rulings are based on his interpretation of the Constitution, which he believes is firmly planted in history.

"The American Government," he once wrote, "is premised on the theory that if the mind of man is to be free, his ideas, his beliefs, his ideology, his philosophy must be placed beyond the reach of government."

In the early 1950's this view, held also by Justice Hugo Black, came into sharp conflict with that of a majority of the court. Led intellectually by Justice Frankfurter, the Supreme Court upheld one after another governmental incursion on free speech and association, aimed at what was widely termed the "menace" of domestic Communism.

Arguing that the First Amendment was intended to protect all speech, including the Communists', who he once described as "miserable merchants of unwanted ideas," Justice Douglas spent most of these "McCarthy years" in dissent.

The phrase "Black and Douglas dissenting" became a commonplace, and at the same time a banner to which a generation of law students rallied, much as an earlier generation had marched to the music of "Holmes and Brandeis dissenting."

BORN IN MINNESOTA

William O. Douglas was born in Maine, Minn., on Oct. 16, 1898, the son of a circuit-riding Presbyterian minister who died when his son was 6. The family moved to Yakima, Wash. in 1904.

A childhood victim of polio, Mr. Douglas strengthened his legs by mountain climbing, a diversion that has occupied him ever since and that led him into a lifetime devotion to conservation.

Young Douglas was the valedictorian at Yakima High School, then president of the student body and a member of Phi Beta Kappa at Whitman College in Walla Walla. His education was financed by a scholarship and odd jobs including window washing.

He arrived in New York in the early twenties with six cents in his pocket and an admissions slip to Columbia Law School. In 1925 he graduated second in his class, worked for a while with a Wall Street law firm and then joined the faculty at Yale.

From there he was recruited in 1934 by Joseph P. Kennedy, the late President's father, to work on the Securities and Exchange Commission, of which he became chairman in 1936, and in 1939, at the age of 40, he was named to the Supreme Court by President Roosevelt.

In 1944, Mr. Douglas came close to being nominated for the Vice Presidency of the United States. President Roosevelt, agreeing to drop Henry A. Wallace, said he would take either Justice Douglas or Harry S. Truman. The nod, of course, went to Mr. Truman, who became president in April of 1945.

In an interview two years ago in Parade magazine, Justice Douglas said that had he become President instead of Mr. Truman, "there would have been no Hiroshima" and the Cold War with China as well as the Korean and Vietnam wars might have been avoided.

On the other hand, the Supreme Court

would have been without its most liberal member, its quickest and many feel most brilliant mind, its fastest writer and surely its most colorful and controversial character.

It is authoritatively reported that William O. Douglas, having written a dissent in a case and being impatient to leave town on one of his many world tours, dropped in to see the Justice who was supposed to be writing the majority opinion.

"I just can't seem to write the damn thing, Bill," the jurist said.

Whereupon, Justice Douglas offered to write the majority opinion. And he did, thus becoming the first Justice to write a ruling to his own dissent.

If the story is apocryphal, the fact is that they don't tell stories like that about anybody else but Bill Douglas.

L. R. LINDGREN RETIRES

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, when L. R. Lindgren joined the staff of the Pittsburgh Press in 1945, he was told by his editor: "Write it the way you see it."

For the past 24 years as a columnist and correspondent covering the Pennsylvania State Legislature in Harrisburg for the Press, and for 26 years before that as a reporter for other newspapers, Mr. Lindgren has written it as he saw it. This week, he retired from the newspaper business, wrote "30" to his column writing, and has embarked on a well-earned and well-deserved retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I first met Mr. Lindgren when I was a member of the State Legislature in Harrisburg. He was one of the most respected and most admired of the newsmen covering the capital legislature. His column, called "State Commentary," was widely read, his facts were accurate, and he was respected not only by the men and women about whom he wrote, but by his colleagues in the news business as well.

We are all sorry that he will no longer be reporting for the Press but we wish him well in his retirement and assure him that the doors of our offices and homes as well as our hearts will always be open to him.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper profession will miss one of its great journalists.

Under unanimous consent I submit his final column, "Reporter's Adieu," for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATE COMMENTARY: REPORTER'S ADIEU

(By L. R. Lindgren)

HARRISBURG.—This is my last column for The Pittsburgh Press—the last of more than 1200 I have written from beneath the dome of the Capitol.

After more than 50 years as a reporter, at age 65, I am retiring effective today and turning over my beat-up typewriter to Patrick Boyle, a young (33) and aggressive (wow!) writer who, I predict, will ring a lot of bells in the years to come.

I am leaving the staff of one of the great newspapers of the world, published in one of the great cities of the world.

The people of Pittsburgh have every right to be proud of The Press—just as The Press

is proud to help them forge a better community in which to work and play and live the good life.

The Press is great because it has a great staff and I'll miss everybody on it, with the possible exception of that unknown figure who, like an automaton, has kept an eye on my extremely modest expense accounts through the years.

I am grateful to The Press for giving me a free hand in reflecting Capitol goings-on for our readers. When I joined the staff in 1945, I asked if there was any particular policy I should know about.

"Write it the way you see it," I was told.

And that's the way it has been ever since.

I am grateful, too, to the people who have read me and especially to those who have taken the time and trouble to comment on my pieces.

I have been praised to the skies and laid low in spades. The plaudits have nurtured the ego bruised by the blasts.

As I come to the end of the road—"30" we call it in the newspaper world—somehow I can see again in my mind's eye a framed motto which hung above my father's desk: "Most of my troubles never happened."

Most of mine didn't either. And those that did were my own fault.

"30."

TREASURY SECRETARY DAVID M. KENNEDY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Treasury, David M. Kennedy, is one of the Illinois contributions to the administration team and he is held in high regard in my home State by all who have had the opportunity to associate with him.

Therefore, I deem it of special interest to the Members to insert into the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Illinois Bankers Association commending Secretary Kennedy:

RESOLUTION—TREASURY SECRETARY KENNEDY

Whereas, one of the great strengths of our nation is the ability to attract highly qualified, knowledgeable individuals of excellent character and bearing to serve the high offices of government; and

Whereas, the people of the State of Illinois are justifiably proud of their tradition and heritage in sending to our Federal government in Washington extremely capable people, one of the outstanding of which, we sincerely and firmly believe, is David Matthew Kennedy, Secretary of the Treasury; and

Whereas, Secretary Kennedy is eminently qualified through years of service in numerous capacities both in private industry and in prior government positions; and

Whereas, his qualifications have been previously reviewed in accordance with Constitutional procedures and have been adjudged unblemished and of the highest calibre;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, we the Illinois Bankers Association in annual meeting assembled this 27th day of May 1969, does hereby commend the Secretary not only for his willingness to make the sacrifice necessary to serve his country and for his conduct of the Treasury Department, but also for his forbearance. We call to the attention of the elected representatives of our Federal Government the fact that the continual abuse heaped upon him does damage to our system of government by tending to make public office unattractive to those people

best qualified who unselfishly contribute their time, devotion, and talent to their country's service.

NUCLEAR ACCIDENTS AND THE ABM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, proponents of President Nixon's Safeguard ABM always seem to have another reason favoring their position whenever a previous argument seems to be doubtful.

If ABM is not effective against the Russians, then, of course, it can always be aimed against Chinese threat. And, if there is not any Chinese danger which might be relevant, then there is the chance that somebody might accidentally set off a stray missile which would have to be stopped—and only ABM could do it.

The logic may be simple. So then, also, is it ridiculous. It does not take much figuring to realize that as you increase the number of nuclear weapons available, the probability of "nuclear accident" also rises. And there is no safety in numbers when one is dealing with nuclear warheads.

Last week's Saturday Review contains a valuable analysis of the problem of nuclear accidents and the ABM as written by Dr. Joel Larus of New York University. Under unanimous consent I submit the article, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows.

[From the Saturday Review, May 31, 1969]

NUCLEAR ACCIDENTS AND THE ABM

(By Joel Larus, professor of politics at New York University and the author of *Nuclear Weapons Safety and the Common Defense* (1967))

The current debate about the utility of deploying an anti-missile system to protect this country's deterrent capability has again raised a number of basic questions about the possibility and consequences of an American-caused nuclear weapons accident. Because the safety of our atomic and hydrogen arsenal relates so closely to top-secret command and control procedures, reliable information about U.S. anti-accident techniques and experiences is most difficult to obtain and even more ticklish to evaluate sagaciously. Yet the public fears the possibility of such incidents, and their anxiety is not assuaged by the events of recent years. Last fall, for example, when Washington announced that the Sentinel system was going to be located in Chicago, Detroit, Seattle, Boston, and New York, local residents determinedly challenged the wisdom of installing missiles close to urban centers when an inadvertent detonation of a nuclear warhead could not be discounted. One Congressman reports that this fear dominated all other considerations in the hundreds of letters he received from constituents protesting the Pentagon's decision.

The more recent announcement of the Nixon Administration that it planned to deploy a limited ABM system, Safeguard, in the remote areas around the Minuteman silos, primarily in Montana and North Dakota, has lessened the general public's concern about nuclear weapons safety, but there is no reason for indifference or complacency. Even though the Safeguard system may be located in thinly populated states and not near lead-

ing industrialized centers, it does not necessarily follow that a mishap at such a site could not affect the lives and well-being of Americans residing in cities far from Montana and North Dakota. If an ABM accident should take place, the site of greatest probability is the area near the Safeguard system, but a computer running amuck or an unfavorable wind pattern could mean plutonium poisoning for many people hundreds of miles from the missile location.

One way to estimate the chance for an ABM failure and also to have some background information about the safety features of this country's nuclear arsenal, is to review our successes and failures in twenty-four years of watching over atomic and nuclear bombs (in military parlance, "safing the nukes"). When America's record of nuclear mishaps—"Broken Arrows"—is examined, one conclusion is inescapable: the human mind has been unable to construct a safety system for nuclear weapons that is accident-free, no matter how much time, money, and technological genius are assigned to the project. (According to military terminology, a Broken Arrow is any unplanned occurrence involving the loss of, destruction of, or major damage to a nuclear weapon or its components that results in an actual or potential hazard to life or property.) It is well to remember that mechanical and human failures are as much a part of the age of nuclear technology as mushroom clouds and fireballs.

There are two types of nuclear mishaps that could bring about accidental radioactivity. Most serious is the unauthorized, unintentional, or inadvertent nuclear explosion that results in a full-scale chain reaction. This type of detonation might be the result of a mechanical error, a human failure, or a combination of both, but no matter what the source of the accident there would be a Hiroshima-type explosion replete with the multifold problems of toxic radiation.

It is generally agreed that an American-sponsored accidental chain reaction detonation has a very low probability. In the years since the first atomic bomb was dropped, this country has produced thousands of nuclear weapons of all shapes, sizes, and yields. They have been transported about the entire world, and in the process they have been assembled, disassembled, inspected, loaded onto delivery vehicles, unloaded, checked and rechecked to maintain their efficiency. Squadrons of Americans of various temperaments and emotional characteristics have been trained to detonate both strategic and tactical systems under a variety of conditions and circumstances, many of which have not been especially conducive to the good mental health of the personnel involved. In spite of the innumerable opportunities for an accidental Hiroshima to have taken place, America's safety record insofar as this first category of possible failures is concerned has been perfect. The technicians who designed our safety controls (essentially a complex interacting arrangement of locks and switches that must be triggered in sequence) have established a safety record unequalled in the history of military technology.

Were it not for two Broken Arrow incidents that took place in 1960 and 1961 it would be possible to be even more sanguine about our future record of no-yield incidents. These accidents dramatically illustrate why there is always a possibility that as a result of extraordinarily bizarre circumstances there could be an accidental chain reaction.

In the Goldsboro, North Carolina, failure, which took place in January 1961, a SAC B-52 bomber on a training mission was carrying two 24-megaton bombs. The pilot, realizing that his plane was going to crash, had sufficient time to jettison one bomb. It was parachuted and landed in a field completely intact. There was no explosion of any type. A terse and uninformative Air Force press release stated that one of the unarmed nuclear devices the plane carried

had been dropped safely by parachute and had been recovered undamaged. The second bomb was found in the plane's wreckage.

For the last eight years physicist Dr. Ralph Lapp has maintained that the Pentagon's investigation of the Goldsboro incident had revealed a frightening situation. He alleged that in falling to the earth five of the six interlocks built into the bomb had been set off and that only a single switch prevented the 24-megaton weapon from producing a yield detonation. Washington adamantly refused to offer any more particulars concerning the post-accident condition of the safety system. Recently the Air Force was forced to come clean and reveal just how unpredictable mechanical safeguards on nuclear weapons can be, even those designed with infinite care and tested meticulously. Goaded by Congressman Sydney R. Yates of Illinois, who was determined to prevent the installation of the Sentinel system near Chicago, the House Appropriations Committee recently asked for an authoritative answer to the Goldsboro bomb mystery. In reply, the Air Force admitted that their inspecting teams in 1961 had found that four of the six safety mechanisms during the accident had moved to the "go" position. In other words, only two safety systems remained in a locked position, and the remaining group of four had acted in a completely unscheduled and potentially dangerous fashion. Pentagon and AEC officials prefer to call attention to the two devices that remained uncompromised, but a more relevant issue is to determine why there were so many failures and whether it can happen again.

An earlier Broken Arrow incident took place at McGuire Air Force Base (New Jersey) in June 1960. This accident is especially noteworthy in view of the extended debate about the reliability of the computer-programmed Safeguard system and its hair-trigger reaction time. If information available from nongovernmental sources concerning the McGuire mishap is authentic—and in my opinion the source of the account is highly reliable—the incident highlights the problem of protecting an incredibly complex weapons system from being triggered by totally unexpected sources.

Some of the facts about McGuire are not in dispute. At 2:51 p.m. smoke and fire began to emerge from one of fifty-six Bomarc missile shelters. Two minutes later local fire crews arrived, and by 3:05 the entire missile complex was evacuated. For the next several hours, officers and enlisted personnel, reinforced by firemen from adjacent communities, fought heavy flames and smoke. According to *The New York Times's* account, the missile's propellant fuel ignited, its atomic warhead fell into the molten pool of fire, split open, and released radioactive material into the environment. The Air Force admits that radioactivity was present during the incident, but maintains that the fire started when a high-pressure bottle of helium exploded from unknown causes.

The uncorroborated version of the origin of the fire is considerably more alarming. This source alleges that while the Bomarc's crewmen were at dinner, they noticed that their unattended missile was preparing itself for an unauthorized launch. Rushing frantically to their station the men succeeded in aborting the erection. The account continues:

"Even after detailed investigation there is no real understanding what series of factors caused the electronic brain controlling Bomarc firing . . . to issue the fire order to that nuclear weapon. The hypothesis is that a combination of the radio signals from passing police cars plus the tunes being played by a local disc jockey happened, in one of those occurrences of statistical probability, to combine into a signal that fed itself into the electronic brain as a fire order."

To date, the Defense Department declines to comment on this version of the McGuire accident.

As mentioned earlier, there is a second category of nuclear mishaps that can cause accidental radioactivity. In my opinion it has a much higher probability factor than the full-scale yield detonation accidents and consequently is the greater menace. It involves the nuclear bomb or missile that becomes ruptured when unusual energy inputs or physical stresses react unfavorably with the TNT component of the weapon. The heat or shock causes the TNT girdle enclosing the plutonium to explode, and the entire weapon blows apart. As soon as the integrity of the outer metal casing is destroyed, fissionable (not fissioned) material is strewn about the situs of the accident. Radioactive plutonium dust contaminates everything it contacts, and all human and animal life is endangered in this "hot" area.

Since 1945 the United States has caused an indeterminate number of this type of accidents. If the Pentagon's figure of thirteen nuclear weapons accidents is complete and accurate, this country has been responsible for one Broken Arrow incident every two years on the average since Hiroshima. If the tally is closer to twenty or twenty-two mishaps, as some non-governmental sources believe, this country has had approximately one potentially catastrophic emergency every year since the end of World War II. Whatever the exact number, there is no disputing the fact that American bombs or missiles that have been accidentally blown apart (but not detonated), have jeopardized the lives of residents of at least three countries, injured an unknown number of homes and factories, and contaminated the natural resources of at least three parts of the globe. No one has died or experienced lasting injury as a result of these Broken Arrows (at least not according to the unclassified information), but each failure exemplifies the radioactivity crisis that arises when a nuclear weapon scatters undetonated plutonium.

In January 1966, for example, four hydrogen bombs fell on Palomares, Spain, an isolated farming hamlet on the Mediterranean coast. Before this incident was over, the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission, assisted by a small army of civilian experts, had staged the most expensive, intensive, harrowing, and feverish land and sea search for a man-made object in world history.

The accident took place when a B-52 on a training mission and a KC-135 tanker collided about 30,000 feet above the Mediterranean. Either a fire broke out in the tanker during the refueling mission and spread to the bomber, or the planes failed to rendezvous properly. In any event, both planes plummeted to earth, scattering wings, fuselages, engine sections, wheel assemblies, and jet fuel over a wide area.

The four hydrogen bombs are believed to have been either the 20- or 25-megaton variety, and all were being transported in the customary unarmed condition. Each bomb landed in a different impact area in or about Palomares. One embedded itself in a dry river bed east of the village. It was found within hours after the crash and was undamaged except for some severe dents. It caused no radiation contamination problems. The second and third bombs slammed to the earth with such impact that the TNT exploded. Within seconds millions of particles of plutonium dust blanketed wide areas of Palomares.

Because plutonium is one of the most toxic substances known to man, American and Spanish authorities lost no time in beginning emergency clean-up operations. Plutonium has a half-life of 24,000 years, and the maximum permissible burden that the human system can tolerate is a speck-like amount described as two-billionths of a gram. Persons who inhale or ingest as little as 2/10,000ths of an ounce of plutonium dust can become deathly ill. As an added complication, alpha radiation from the plutonium is considerably more difficult to detect than

any other type of radiation. An Air Force publication advised search teams to hold detection instruments within one-eighth inch of the surface to be tested in order to obtain a reliable Geiger counter reading. The booklet adds that it is nearly impossible to secure an accurate count when surfaces such as plowed earth, wheat stubble, and gravel roads have to be checked for radiation exposure.

For the next three months the 234 families of Palomares became internationally famous as the soldiers, airmen, and civilians scoured the countryside for evidence of radiation contamination. The economy of the village all but collapsed because hundreds of pounds of tomatoes, which normally would have been sold throughout Spain, were thrown away or left rotting on the plants because the Geiger crews could not work quickly enough. Local farmers within a 640-acre zone were barred from entering their fields. Teams of medical specialists examined each man, woman, and child, testing in a variety of ways for traces of plutonium poisoning. Only a few of the local peasants could understand the situation; for the rest it was simply *el desastre*.

Before the land was returned to the owners, the United States had packed 1,750 tons of radioactive Palomares soil and vegetation into 5,000 sealed metal drums. The contaminated pieces of the two planes were similarly encased. This debris—the dung of the nuclear age—ultimately was brought back to the United States and buried in a nuclear graveyard in South Carolina.

The fourth hydrogen bomb that fell at Palomares caused even greater complications. This weapon came to rest about five miles offshore on a ledge 2,500 feet below the surface of the Mediterranean. A force of sixteen ships was assembled and included several midget submarines, scuba teams, underwater specialists, sonar experts, and oceanic photographers. For about eighty days the 3,000 men carried out this aspect of the recovery assignment. It was imperative that the fourth weapon be returned to American custody not only because of security considerations, but also because we needed to know if the bomb had ruptured and plutonium had contaminated the sea and its marine life. When brought to the surface on April 7, the bomb's outer casing was deeply dented but, miraculously, without a rupture. It is alleged that the underwater operation alone cost this country \$6 million.

The Palomares incident does not end with the recovery of all the bombs. In the succeeding three years press reports occasionally have told how the accident has changed life in the area. A battery of four Geiger counters still runs continuously to monitor the region for signs of plutonium radiation. Each villager continues to receive \$66 per month if he permits Spain's Nuclear Energy Committee to check his body daily for evidence of overexposure to radiation. Up to now the farmers have received \$700,000 on various claims they presented to the United States, and eleven cases are still pending. What cannot be altered with American bounty is the attitude that the Spanish people now have about the village and its farm products. All that grows in Palomares is suspected of being radioactive, and so there is no market for its fruits and vegetables. Fifty per cent of the people are reported to have been forced to migrate to more attractive farm areas. According to one resident, life has gone from the town and within a few years it will be quite empty.

The most recent Broken Arrow to be reported took place in January 1968 near a runway at the Thule Air Force Base in northern Greenland. A B-52 crashed and exploded while attempting to make an emergency landing. The plane admittedly was carrying four 1.1-megaton hydrogen bombs. On im-

pact all broke into fragments and scattered plutonium over the frozen surface of North Star Bay. Winds up to 27 miles per hour, temperatures in the 20-30 degree-below-zero range, daylight for only three or four hours at a spell, and continual swirling snows and Arctic storms added to the general emergency situation. In fact, this recovery operation was carried out on the most inhospitable site yet encountered by a Broken Arrow task force. The impact area was about a mile long and half-a-mile wide. Within this region were found thousands of pieces of the plane, all highly radioactive and dangerous to the body.

Immediately following news of the crash there was considerable concern that plutonium might have entered the ice and waters of the bay. The Danish government placed a prohibition on all fishing in the seas near the accident site, and this restriction lasted for three months. In addition, it banned local fox hunters from any trapping whatsoever in the Thule area, and this order remained in force for nine months. Available sources do not mention what steps were taken to protect the Eskimos from eating the meat of seals, walrus, and polar bears, but presumably such procedures were necessary because these animals might have been contaminated from eating radioactive marine life.

As in all Broken Arrow mishaps, the most complex and costly problem is cleaning the ground area so that it is no longer "hot." At Thule, tons of radioactive snow and ice were an immediate hazard and had to be removed and secured. Teams of men were assigned the task of gathering the snow, ice, and the remains of the B-52 for shipment to the United States.

The main reasons why Congress should not authorize the Safeguard system have been explained at length elsewhere and need only be reviewed here. They are (1) that the ABM deployment could escalate the arms race at a time when there may be a real opportunity to achieve a nuclear détente with the Russians; (2) that the system is predicated on invalid assumptions concerning the strategic options open to the Chinese and Russians in the coming decade; and (3) that the estimated \$6-to-\$7-billion cost of the system ought to be used to help remedy our domestic problems. A fourth reason against the ABMs has been offered here: Nuclear weapons have a propensity to become involved in human and mechanical error situations, and when these Broken Arrow mishaps take place, the impact area and its environs are contaminated with toxic plutonium. The deployment of more nuclear weapons than is uncontroversially necessary to maintain America's deterrent posture is unwise because it invites future accidents.

ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY—JUNE 2, 1969

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1946, the people of Italy endorsed the democracy of the Italian Republic and ushered in a new era in Italian history. By building upon the lessons of defeat, they hoped to reconstruct an Italy of peace and prosperity. The obstacles to the achievement of this goal were great. The end of the Second World War left Italy ravished and demoralized. One-quarter of the railroad tracks were gone, one-third of the bridges destroyed, one-

half of all powerplants had been bombed, and almost two-thirds of the nation's road network no longer existed.

Today, just 23 years later, we are able to witness the products of Italian industriousness and creativity. Italy is once again surging ahead. She has rebuilt her economy with such great success that she now ranks eighth among the world's industrial nations. She is also one of the world's top trading nations. Unemployment has virtually disappeared. Italian goods and services are internationally applauded. Some of Italy's most important and well-known products include motor vehicles, tires, typewriters, textiles, and leather goods.

Italian creativity has also excelled during the postwar period. In 1946, with the return of democratic institutions, came the return of artistic freedom. The result has been an impressive list of Italian accomplishments in literature and art, in music and dance, in film and fashion: Names like Giacometti and Balla in art; Quasimodo and Silone in literature; Fellini, Antonioni, and Ponti in films; and Pucci and de la Renta in fashion.

The wonderful versatility of Italian creativity and the industry of the Italian people are characteristics which the Italian immigrants brought with them to our own country. From Christopher Columbus, through colonial times and the industrial revolution, to our modern society, Italian-Americans have given color, richness, and vitality to the United States.

Thus, on the anniversary of the Italian Republic, I am proud to honor the creativity and charm, the beauty and intelligence of Italian culture which has made a lasting contribution, not only to our own history, but to all the world.

ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1946, a national election brought the promise of democracy to wartorn disillusioned Italy. Twenty-three years later, that nation stands beside other great democracies of the world as awesome proof that the courage, culture, and convictions of a people can overcome unbelievable odds and rise to the heights of prosperity and accomplishments. For the Italian Republic, whose anniversary we celebrate today, holds the esteem of all persons who know the virtues of democracy or look with envy at the gift of freedom that they themselves may never possess.

The success of Italy as a Republic, it should be noted, was not merely a result of fortuitous events. On the contrary, Italy and her people, as they have done since the time of the Roman Empire, contributed the totality of abilities, manpower, and idealism to shape her into a model of economic, cultural, scientific, educational, and commercial success. The results clearly speak for themselves.

Today Italy ranks eighth among the world's industrial nations. The Government, however, has not chosen to rest on this plateau, I would like to point out. She is currently involved in a second phase of a policy to improve the economy of predominately agricultural southern Italy where poverty persists. She is determined that the entire nation will have the fruits of economic prosperity.

It is not only in this area that the Republic has flourished and shown leadership skills. Virtually every area of life has been touched with Italian genius. Music, art, science, banking, and fashion are just a few of the endeavors in which she has shown like a brilliant jewel. And like a precious gem she has enhanced all who have come in contact with her. We of course have grown into a prouder more capable nation because of her contributions and the contributions made by Americans of Italian ancestry.

Indeed, few other nations can boast of having offered so much to so many areas of civilization. From the time of the Roman Empire and the Renaissance until the nuclear age, she has continued to weave her unique abilities into a distinct design in the fabric of civilization.

Certainly not all of her history exemplifies continual triumphs and discoveries. She has known the anguish of world wars, the brutality of political tyranny, and the shattering disillusionment of abject poverty and occupation. Unlike some other nations, however, she has chosen to enfold these trials as a learning experience and use them to attain latter successes.

This day is particularly meaningful, I feel, inasmuch as the United States has played an integral role in many events which have led to Italy's present estimable position. For in exchange for the rich infusion of talent and energy brought to the shores of the United States, we have helped to break the chains of Fascist tyranny which once bound her, and subsequently nurtured her attempts to achieve maturity.

I am proud that our Government has shown friendship, sympathy, and generosity throughout these 23 years. Moreover, I am pleased that we as a nation have had the opportunity to benefit from the vast contributions of our Americans of Italian ancestry.

And on her anniversary, I would like to send our respects and best wishes to her and her people, who arduously have attained maturity, and will ultimately continue to show the rest of the world how capable, cultured, and courageous a republic can be.

POSTAL REFORM A MUST

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been holding hearings since April 22 on the need for a vast overhaul of the postal service. It is essential that the Congress act promptly to remove the

shackles from postal management so it will have the authority to do the job which it has been assigned.

Responsibility without authority is shallow, indeed.

There is really relatively little dispute as to where the weaknesses lie in the present postal organization. The essential disagreement is whether the corrections can be made within our present Post Office Department, or whether it will be necessary to convert the Department into a nonprofit corporation.

Postmaster General Blount, after 4 months in office, now has the backing of the President in his decision that the answer lies in converting the Department into a corporation.

The Postmaster General comes before our committee on Tuesday for the first of what we expect to be three or four sessions to explain his views to our committee in open session.

My own view was made clear on the opening day of the 91st Congress when I introduced H.R. 4 to accomplish all of the improvements recommended by the Kappel Commission, yet keeping the postal service within the framework of the present Government Department.

Mr. Blount is entitled to his views and we will hear them, also those of Frederick Kappel, the Chairman of the Presidential Commission which made the study during the Johnson administration.

Perhaps the most important development so far in these discussions of postal reform is that there has surfaced such widespread agreement that the Department does need surgery—it does need reform.

The question becomes really whether we are going to do it with a scalpel or with a meatax. My preference is the scalpel.

Mr. Speaker, my hometown newspapers in Buffalo, N.Y., are adding their views to the picture, and although I do not agree with their conclusions as to the necessity for going to a corporation, I believe it only fair that their views be aired as follows:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, May 25, 1969]

CORPORATION MIGHT IMPROVE POSTAL SERVICE

President Nixon has given his tentative approval to the creation of a public corporation to operate the United States mail. All details of the plan have not yet been revealed but all we can say is that if it will improve mail service, we're all for it. For more than a decade we have been paying more and more money for less and less postal service. A reversal of that trend would indeed be welcome.

Postmaster General Winton M. Blount has recommended the plan and has scheduled meetings for next week with members of Congress to explain the operation. We don't know how much of this time schedule is due to the work of Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski, Buffalo Democrat who heads the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

But we should note that when Rep. Dulski called for a hearing on postal reform, Mr. Blount urged a delay on grounds that the department couldn't get ready for a hearing then. He asked for immediate consideration of a boost in postal rates but no talk about reform. Rep. Dulski refused to delay the hearing and now the postmaster general—less than a month after he said the department couldn't get ready for a hearing—is proposing reform which goes far beyond the scope of Rep. Dulski's suggestions.

The Blount plan is similar in many respects to the recommendations submitted last year by a commission on postal organization headed by Frederick R. Kappel. One of its principal objectives is to insulate postal operations from political influence.

Politics undoubtedly contributes its share to the problem, but eliminating political influence is not going to cure the situation by itself. Most postal employees are, for the most part, outside the political sphere now, protected as they are by the Civil Service law and by the grievance procedure of a strong union, but the level of service varies greatly from station to station. In some offices the employees are courteous, hard-working and efficient; in others they are just the opposite.

However, if a corporation could—as Mr. Blount suggests—keep postal service from deteriorating and keep postal charges from skyrocketing, we certainly are all for it.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, May 29, 1969]

PUSH POSTAL REFORM

The Nixon Administration proposals for sweeping postal reforms now prove beyond any doubt that the troubles crippling our present postal system—as seen from the presidential level and regardless of political party—require drastic institutional change.

The Nixon recommendations agree in substance with those first advocated by Lawrence F. O'Brien, former postmaster general, and backed both by President Johnson and by a presidential commission he appointed.

What all these Republican and Democratic figures in the executive branch agree upon is that a TVA-like corporation should replace the existing Cabinet-level postal department.

The suggested corporation, administered by a nine-member board, would be self-supporting, where the present system gobbles up \$1 billion a year in taxpayer subsidies, and would be authorized to borrow money for capital improvements, to handle employe relations and pay free of now-dominant political considerations, and to fix postal rates, subject only to congressional veto.

A key figure in the impending debate in Congress, by virtue of his chairmanship of the House Post Office Committee, is Rep. Dulski of Buffalo.

He has his own recommendations about postal reform, many of them excellent, but he is as yet unconvinced of the merits of the Nixon-LBJ-O'Brien idea of a postal corporation. Rep. Dulski sees lawmakers probably unwilling to surrender control over postal rates and wages. Moreover the postal unions and the third-class mail lobbies oppose the presidential reforms.

But we believe reasonable objections to the corporation idea can be overcome. It would free Congress from intense and sometimes unhealthy lobbying pressures on raises. Since lawmakers would retain a veto, they would be surrendering no significant control over rates. The soaring volume of mail mitigates against any cutback in the 720,000 postal employees. And the Nixon plan pledges that all employees would be transferred into the new corporation with essential rights intact and with fair grievance procedures.

What must not be allowed to happen is that some generalized and blind fear of change, either by entrenched postal unions or by the lobbies for subsidized junk-mailers, should determine the character of a revitalized postal service. The present system verges too close on collapse for that.

Mr. Speaker, Jack Wilson in his Potomac Fever column in the Washington, D.C., Post, has had several pungent comments on postal reform, including:

Ford recalls 382,000 cars—GM says its truck wheel collapse—Lockheed's helicopter goes sour. Mr. Nixon, are you sure you should turn the Post Office into a corporation?

Of course, there's one thing about a corporation—you can't get a job through politics unless you're related to the boss.

There'll be some advantages if Nixon turns the Post Office into a corporation—every big stockholder can be sure of getting a low ZIP code.

A WORD FOR ADMIRAL SHARP

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, another indignant American has come to the defense of Admiral Sharp.

I insert an article from the Honolulu Advertiser, written by George D. Synon, rear admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, retired, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF ADMIRAL SHARP

(By George D. Synon)

Your May 8 reprint of the Washington Post editorial, slyly titled "Admiral Sharp's Knife," casts an unearned slur on a brilliant and dedicated officer. It is doubly unmerited since the views expressed in Sharp's Reader's Digest article are widely held by countless military experts.

The Post editorial, however, is consistent with the record of that newspaper for denigrating the military profession at every opportunity. No newspaper, with the possible exception of the New York Times, has done more to undermine the confidence of the public in the conduct of the Vietnam war by the military than has the Washington Post.

As you well know, the strategy and to a great extent the tactics of the Vietnam effort were more significantly influenced by the coterie of liberal-intellectuals which surrounded President Johnson than by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the principal field commanders.

This group was a legacy from President Kennedy. It included not only such people as Secretary McNamara, the Bundy brothers, Walt Rostow, Dean Rusk and the rest, but the liberal press, as well. It was they who thought we could fight a limited war, employing limited means and with limited objectives, against an enemy for whom the war was unlimited. They believed that by whitening away at the enemy's forces in South Vietnam and pacifying the countryside, but restricting our airpower mainly to interdicting enemy movement from north to south the enemy would finally become discouraged and quit.

By this strategy, we would avoid giving unnecessary offense to either Russia or China. Instead, it is we who have become discouraged and are now about to emerge from the Vietnam conflict with few, if any, of our original objectives accomplished and at the cost of a bloody and humiliating loss of life and treasure.

Now that Sharp comes forward and pins the blame for this "no-win" strategy exactly where it belongs, he is accused by the Post of "rewriting history" and has his "competence and his intelligence" impugned as well. The use of language of this sort is in keeping with that of the racial leftist press and is unseemly if even so left-leaning a journal as the Washington Post.

It is useful to take a look at the situation as it existed at the time of President Kennedy's assassination to see what basic errors were made by the Johnson Administration that led to the later strategy of graduated response which has proved so abortive and ineffectual.

Kennedy, following Eisenhower, had made a limited but increasing commitment in

South Vietnam having as its main objective support of the Diem regime, which despite its many faults had considerable genuine support among the South Vietnamese people. No decision had then been reached to augment our so-called advisers in Vietnam—who at the most numbered not more than 15,000 officers and men—by significant larger numbers having a direct combat mission.

If he realized the folly of committing U.S. troops to a land war in Asia, as did Eisenhower, it is likely that Kennedy would have drawn back, rather than become more heavily engaged, despite the pressures of the Gulf of Tonkin incident and others.

Not so, President Johnson. When Johnson came to power he sought diligently to capture the popularity that had been enjoyed by JFK. He made it plain that none of the former president's policies was to be disturbed. But he also knew that the then-existing commitment in Vietnam was fraught with unfavorable political repercussions if handled improperly. Rather than take a chance and see South Vietnam go down the drain, Johnson made the fateful decision to go in, in force.

It was at this point that the possible consequences of that decision must have been carefully evaluated, at least by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If we were unwilling to risk a confrontation with China or the Soviet Union, or both, as a result of sending in combat forces the proposed action should have been rejected. Instead, we either misguessed or underrated the determination of the enemy and the degree to which his allies would support him.

Let it be granted, however, that the Joint Chiefs concurred in the basic decision to commit combat forces in Vietnam, once it became apparent that Russia and China intended to provide North Vietnam with weapons and important logistic support, surely it must have been obvious, not only to the Joint Chiefs, but also to others having a voice in the direction of the war that North Vietnam should be brought to her knees in a hurry, before her outside support could become a telling factor in the war. This is just what Admiral Sharp sought to do.

Aside from Sharp's Reader's Digest article, the best evidence indicates that the Joint Chiefs were in accord with him that the only way of reaching an early military decision was to employ airpower to knock out the logistical and military installations, including roads, harbors, bridges, in addition to the not-yet-ready missile sites, from which the North Vietnam war effort was supported.

Instead, we laid off targets whose destruction was likely to disrupt the North Vietnamese civilian economy or cause excessive loss of civilian life. We studiously avoided the destruction of targets that might give offense to China or Russia. Our strategy degenerated into one of graduated response, stepping up our own war effort only as the enemy increased his. We gave him control of the timetable; he has not relinquished it yet.

The source of this Fabian strategy can be ascribed only to the civilian overlay between the president and the Armed Forces, with Robert McNamara its leading exponent. The president, of course, made all the final decisions but it cannot be doubted that he was swayed by the people closest to him.

During this time, true to his oath of office and to our tradition of civilian control of the military, Sharp kept his silence and did his best to implement a strategy with which he did not agree. Now that he is retired Sharp is speaking out, as is his right, "to warn the American people against the folly of conducting a major war on a piecemeal basis."

The Washington Post and the liberal-intellectual overlay of which it is a part know

that they have much to answer for as a result of the tragic disaster that has overtaken us in Vietnam. The Post rightly predicts that others will come after Sharp with a similar purpose "to re-write history." For the Post to seek to silence them by invective and vituperation is unworthy of the American press. It makes one wonder just who wields the knife.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S POSTAL REFORM MESSAGE

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, the official seal of the Post Office Department shows a galloping pony in full stride, a reminder of the great days when the mail was delivered on horseback by courageous men who defied danger in order to do their job. The spirit which that symbol represents still characterizes our postal employees. It is reflected, too, in what has become a kind of unofficial motto for the postal workers. I am thinking, of course, of those famous words adapted from those of the Greek historian, Herodotus, which appear on the front of the general post office in New York City:

Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

Like the galloping pony, those words represent the dedication of our postal employees.

Unfortunately, however, the way in which our Post Office is organized does not do justice to the spirit of those who work for it. It saddles them with inefficient techniques, with impossible financing arrangements, with machinery long out of date, and with a promotion system that often fails to reward ability. It is a system left over from the days of the pony express, and it cannot do an adequate job in modern society. What snow and rain and heat and gloom of night cannot do, the organizational structure of the modern Post Office has brought about. As a result, there are many occasions when the appointed rounds of our postal couriers are not swiftly completed, their spirit and sense of responsibility notwithstanding.

What can we do about it? Men have asked that question for some time. And those who have asked it most frequently and most intelligently, have generally come to the same answer: make the Post Office into a public corporation with new arrangements for finance, for employee bargaining, and for general direction. These recommendations are expressed clearly and persuasively in the recent message on postal reform which the President has sent to the Congress. I trust that all Members of this body will read that message carefully and ponder both the problems it discusses and the answers it suggests. Let us be sure that the galloping pony which symbolizes our postal system does so because it sums up the morale and courage of our postal workers and not because it represents our failure to introduce modern techniques and a modern organizational structure.

CORPORATE CRIME

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Nader provides an excellent example of how much good can come from one man's efforts. The American marketplace has been much improved because of his work in behalf of consumer justice.

Mr. Nader has recently made some statements that deserve the attention and thoughtful consideration of the Congress and the public. The statements follow:

[From Business Today, Summer 1969]

CORPORATE CRIME

(By Ralph Nader)

On September 10, 1968, the General Accounting Office presented the Congress with a report on enforcement of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. The conclusion was startling: the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is the enforcing arm for the Act, had never requested the Justice Department to prosecute a single case in 13 years. "This was true," the GAO stated, "even in instances where repeated major violations of the law were cited by the Agricultural Research Service." The Report showed that of 2,751 samples of products tested and reviewed during fiscal 1966, 750 were found to be in violation of the law. Of these, 70 percent or 520 were in "major" violation of the law.

The GAO report on pesticide non-enforcement did not provoke outrageous editorials or concerned commentary from Congress. No cries for law and order were heard for these corporate violators. For anyone who has observed the decline of moderate statutory penalties and their decreasing imposition, this double standard—one for individuals and the other for corporations or officials acting behind corporate frameworks—is not surprising. But it is exceedingly unjust and can lead to even more serious public harm than already has been the case.

For corporations, increasing in size to rival many nation states, impact the society in far more profound ways than a few decades ago. They can rapidly destroy the biosphere with their pollution of air, water and soil. Their products are sped to market in great numbers before adequate tests are conducted for direct and side effects on consumers. Ford Motor Co. jars a region's ecology by dumping 20% of all industrial wastes into Lake Erie whose deterioration may be irreversible. Drug companies can affect the lives, health and genetic inheritance of thousands of people before detection if rigorous standards and deterrents are not operating.

A few examples will illustrate this double standard and the absence of effective sanctions for deterrence of corporate irresponsibility. A few months ago, an elderly man was caught stealing \$6 from a telephone booth in Maryland. He was sentenced to three years in jail. Horse thieves in Colorado—especially if they are Indians or other minority group members, have been sentenced to 15 years in jail. Two men robbed a sailor, without physical violence, of \$1 late last year and were given 10 years in jail by a Virginia judge.

These instances of individual crime represented primarily the theft of something of economic value and were not characterized by violence, though the potential could have materialized in two of the three cases.

Consider, by comparison, the following examples of corporate crime. In the Spring of 1967, a Lake Central Airlines plane, a Con-

vair 580, crashed in Ohio, killing 38 people. The subsequent investigation by the Federal Aviation Administration proved beyond any doubt that the crash was caused by a "soft piston" defect leading to the separation of the propeller and penetration of the fuselage. Allison Division of General Motors built this component and, although knowing of this serious defect before the crash, did not advise the airlines with the 18 defective Convairs to ground the planes and disassemble them for inspection. Thirty eight people died. The FAA fined Allison \$8,000. That was the only penalty even though Allison had been cited many times by the FAA in the past for irregularities in propeller production quality and safety. This was the taking of something of economic value and deprivation of life by such corporate negligence and knowing failure of warning after the company discovered the defect.

Greyhound Corporation—a highly profitable company in diversified activities—has had a practice of repeatedly regrooving rear tires in a pattern that gives little traction to these rear-heavy, high speed buses. Crashes have occurred with loss of life owing in whole or part to such slippery tires. There have been no enforcement actions urged by the federal government until a Greyhound crash occurred with worn tires in May 1967 in New Jersey with one fatality and many injuries. The case still has not come to trial but the maximum fine under the law is \$500.

The trend against even the provision of adequate penalties in the law—quite apart from their use on corporate crime or criminal negligence—has been alarming. What every corporate lawyer in Washington now aims at in any new consumer protection law is to delete any provision imposing criminal penalties on companies even when they knowingly and willfully violate the law in such a manner as to take human life. Thus, the auto safety, radiation control, gas pipeline safety and other recently enacted statutes have been stripped of criminal penalties even for knowing and willful violations.

Companies that refuse to call back dangerous products—whether in the auto, food or drug area—or take inordinate time to do so, are not subjected to criminal penalties in the auto cases and trivial criminal fines in the food or drug area.

The struggle for the rule of a just law against street crime and avoidably dangerous products and lethal pollution of our environment is a struggle against violence. Violence comes in many styles from corporations producing their products. It is incumbent for citizens to react with concern and indignation as they do now for street crime. When gas pipelines explode owing to knowingly dangerous maintenance, when tires fail because companies do not recall them for defects, when toys burn or maim children because of the most dangerous design and materials, when meats are doused with illegal chemicals to make them palatable and presentable, when people breathe air filled with toxic elements and gasses, a civilized society must see such acts as acts of violence and apply sanctions on companies and their officials. Sanctions go beyond traditional penalties and deter by meticulous adaptation to the particular corporate act. Thus, sanctions can include recall orders, suspension of company officials or of a particular plant, or a temporary public trusteeship of part of a company's operation deemed seriously contrary to public health, safety or interest—to name only a few.

It is clear that as this double standard becomes more and more unjust, those at the bottom of the economic ladder will take their cue increasingly from the lawless privileged at the top of the ladder. The moral and law-abiding tone of a society takes its depth from the top of the economic hierarchy. If violence and property theft is conceived only in terms of street crime, the law will

never bring under its rule major sources of violence proceeding from the workings of an industrial society.

WHAT WE ARE MADE OF?—TIME FOR A DEEP LOOK AND A STEADY RESOLVE

(Remarks by Ralph Nader before the 1969 convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 17, 1969, Washington, D.C.)

It is with some dismay that I find myself addressing this distinguished gathering just before lunch. For my topic is that most basic of consumer products—food—and my theme is that it needs a most basic cleaning up. If what I have to say upsets you in a gritty sort of way, let me state at the outset that you have every right to be upset. For food becomes us in a very short while and our relationship to this consumer product could scarcely be more intimate.

The \$100 billion food industry is in need of thorough public scrutiny and reform. The only difficulty is that it does not know this as it continues to increase its prices, its profits and its myths. This is an unfortunate delusion for this industry to be harboring.

In the short time available, I would like to describe aspects of the deepening malaise, deception and indifference to the responsible exercise of very considerable power by the performance of the food industry and its subgroups.

The decisive motivations that drive the food processors and the maximization of their sales, profits (which includes progressive reduction of costs) and the avoidance of undesirable regulatory and consumer feedback. This all seems innocent enough until one observes more closely just how spacious an arena for maneuvering against the public interest has been staked out by the industry. This has been accomplished incrementally over the years by the rapid development of technologies, chemicals, merchandising and packaging techniques to deny the consumer the information for critical feedback, to divert his attention to wholly extraneous, emotional appeals having nothing to do with the quality or price of the product, and to mask the true condition of the foodstuffs from the consumer's natural detection facilities. Thus, the dimension of most peoples' reaction to the food they eat is narrowed to an appreciation of just those responses that the processors can manipulate so easily. These deal with palatability, tenderness and appearance cum acceptable or not repugnant odor. If the particular food product can satisfy the narrow evaluations, it is home free, quite apart from any serious lack of nutrition, wholesomeness and purity. Home free, that is, as far as the consumer is concerned. Try this test on yourself next time someone asks you how a particular meal was and see if your reaction is restricted to one or more of these three responses. Such induced and meekly accepted conditioned response by most of us makes a mockery of consumer sovereignty and the disciplining force for quality of the marketplace implicitly in an opportunity for intelligent choice or rejection.

What is the consumer consuming? Let a few representative illustrations do for the many that time does not permit to be discussed at length:

1. The little consumer—infants—are being exposed to nitrate residues from the heavy use of nitrogen fertilizer in various farm acreage. Professor Barry Commoner of Washington University in St. Louis reported last year on the increasing incidence of nitrate poisoning discovered by European public health officials among infants that was traced to the consumption of unrefrigerated American-processed baby food. The more precise extent of this toxic hazard to infants is not fully known in this country because no one is trying to find out in any systematic way. The food industry is not in-

terested in being burdened with this knowledge.

2. The rapid rise in antibiotic utilization for artificial growth stimulation and health promotion in poultry and red meat animals is raising the risk of residual transfer to the human organism, particularly if antibiotics are applied a few days prior to slaughter. Even the placid National Academy of Sciences and the FDA are worried about this one. What are the direct and synergistic effects on humans of such ingestion and how effective will these drugs be when they are needed for medical purposes? Existing regulations are too weak and poorly enforced. But these antibiotics sure make for a growth industry.

3. Fat content in meat is an acknowledged major contributor to heart disease. Fat content in many processed meats has been going up in recent years, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Why? Because fat is cheaper than meat and since they are mixed together, the consumer rarely can tell the difference. How bad is the situation? Well, the USDA issued a few months ago (December) a proposal to set a maximum fat content of 30% for the class of finished sausage products that includes frankfurter, wiener, vienna, bologna, garlic bologna, knockwurst and similar products. The meat industry, led by the American Meat Institute, is strongly opposing this requirement. Fat as a cost reduction technique is terribly congenial to the industry's tastes. Look how well it works with the most expensive breakfast meat product called bacon. Some people, it may be, may want to pay hard dollars for fat in their bologna, but they have a right to know how much fat they're buying and other more fastidious consumers should not have to buy meat with a high, latent material that isn't meat at all.

4. Consumers Union went out shopping for fresh pork sausage recently. CU subjected the sausage samples to laboratory tests. Thirty percent of the federally inspected sausage and forty percent of the infrequent Illinois inspection failed CU's tests for absence of filth or acceptably low bacteria counts. (Last month 60 persons came down with trichinosis in Missouri). CU also found that one-eighth of the federally inspected sausage and more than one-fifth of the other sausage contained insect fragments, insect larvae, rodent hairs and other kinds of filth. The sausage samples tested included most major brand names.

5. USDA reports in 1962 and 1967-68 covering non-federally inspected plants (a category accounting for 25% of the nation's meat supply) showed evidence of selling 4D animals (dead, dying, diseased and disabled animals) for human consumption, repulsively unsanitary conditions in the plants (rodents, vermin, etc. have access to the meat preparation and storage areas for example) and the use of illegal additives or untested additives to color, season and preserve the putrid meat so as to render it palatable. Other USDA reports on poultry preparation revealed substantial prevalence of diseased poultry being sold to unsuspecting buyers throughout the country. Much of this substandard meat and poultry is routinely funnelled into city slums. USDA inspected plants are not without their problems. The meat industry likes to throw away only bones; all meat, no matter what its condition is a tempting subject for "reconditioning" or "doctoring". Not even the better companies, such as Hormel, are above doctoring such once-rejected meat by the first retail buyer for subsequent resale to supermarkets in the slums and some in the suburbs. Millions of pounds of meat are destroyed by federal order every month but many more get to market. Bad meat is still good business.

6. The fish inspection bill is once again before Congress. The fish industry, backed by such law firms as Covington and Burling, is confident that the bill will go nowhere this

year. The confidence is based on the industry's power to lobby, not on conditions in its plants. Two years ago, FDA's Deputy Commissioner Rankin offered data, since re-confirmed, on conditions in the smoked fish industry: an examination of 15 plants disclosed that 13 were operated under conditions judged to be potentially dangerous and six of these were judged to be imminently hazardous to consumers of the finished product. The FDA, severely limited in resources for inspection, still manages to seize numerous shipments every month involving decomposed fish and fish products, the presence of coagulase, positive staphylococci, and parasitic copepods. Frozen breaded shrimps containing bacterial filth, leached canned fish, frozen whitefish with parasitic cysts, caviar containing borates, imported dried fish containing maggots are some other illustrations.

Consumers Union has conducted several tests over the past decade and will conduct more shortly. Here is part of CU's tally: Ninety-eight of one hundred twenty samples of frozen raw breaded shrimp tested contained coagulase positive staphylococci (1961); 55 of 120 samples of cod, haddock, and ocean perch filets judged substandard quality (1963); 85 percent of 646 cans of salmon (51 brands) showed a tendency toward mushiness or discoloration (1966); 17 samples of 18 frozen salmon steaks (three brands) were so rancid that no cooking method could disguise the bad flavor (1966). Like so many foods that are unwholesome they are bad bargains in an economic sense.

7. Water pollution—sewage and industrial waste—in bays and off-shore areas, where shell fish are harvested, is a mounting peril. The FDA just recently seized 21,000 pounds of frozen fish out of the Great Lakes because of dangerous pesticide levels in the salmon. Environmental pollution finds its way in other food products as well. Is the food industry pushing for pollution controls? No. Is the food industry adopting and developing techniques for detection of such pollution? Only very slowly, at best.

8. Every week, FDA puts out its little known "Weekly Recall Report." It is little known because FDA does little to publicize it. Some food recalls of late include Cookies (rodent filth) Egg Yolk Solids (contamination, Salmonella—a fast spreading food-borne menace generally). Imitation Pistachio, lemon, mint etc. Flavors) contained decertified color FD & C green #1). Candy (high acidity), a Sugarless, pre-sweetened Drink (mislabelled, contains 24 to 30% dextrose), assorted frozen pastries (for contamination, petroleum hydrocarbons), Chocolate flavored drink (contamination, mold & insect fragments), Plain Chocolate Candies (M&M's, Contamination, Salmonella), Peanut candy (contamination, Aflatoxin), Kidney Beans (Insect infested), Evaporated Milk (rusty, leaking and exploding cans).

9. Cyclamate, an artificial sweetener in diet soft drinks is beginning to cause the FDA worry after years of assurances that it was safe. Tests have shown that it leads to chromosome breakage in rats; humans are just being tested now. Other less serious afflictions are known to result from not overly generous consumption of these artificially sweetened drinks. Like many other additives to food and drink, the FDA has permitted a sell now, test later posture by the companies. FDA has admitted that it has heavily relied on summary assurances by food companies about additives and has not checked in detail the raw test data. FDA now recommends that a child drink no more than two 10-ounce diet drinks a day containing cyclamates.

10. More and more additives are pouring into our foods. The growth of chemical additive use in foods is being stimulated by the fast rise of convenience foods—so-called. Joseph G. Jarrell of Hercules, a producer of additives, declared that convenience foods are more likely to require "special flavorings,

flavor enhancers, color and other additives to make up for the partial loss of flavor, color, texture and other properties caused by processing." The food industry is moving rapidly into developing food substitutes—simulated meats, simulated orange juice, simulated coffee all of which will require a wide variety of food additives. The industry's attitude toward the consumer is epitomized by the following advertisement which appeared in the magazine Food Technology:

"With Western Dairy Products' new *tasteless* (their emphasis) sodium caseinate called Savortone, you can now successfully use sodium caseinate as an emulsifier and binder for sausages, salad dressings, oil emulsions and egg substitutes . . . You can use it whenever you like, and never wonder for a minute what the consumers will think. They'll never know."

The industry's attitude toward its own responsibilities in testing the various effects, short and longer range, of their additives is reflected in the tragically low research and testing budget, most of which goes to developing new convenience foods using more additives and not on the effects of these additives on the human organism. The level of technical competence in the food laboratories is low, as judged by the producers of food additives who sell to these companies. (See Chemical and Engineering News, Oct. 10, 1968.)

One of this century's greatest geneticists, Dr. Hermann J. Muller put this kind of problem in proper focus:

"What we are concerned with . . . is the possibility of (food additives, drugs, narcotics, antibiotics, pesticides, air pollutants and water pollutants) being mutagenetic, that is, producing mutations in the genetic material, and being thereby damaging not only to the directly exposed individuals but even to their descendants.

"It is now important to know what substances have such effects, how they may be recognized and dealt with, and in what ways the effects will be expressed in the exposed and subsequent generations."

Over the past several years, leading geneticists and biologists meeting at scientific symposia have expressed alarm at the lack of national policy and commitment to learning what the somatic and genetic impacts on people are from the thousands of chemicals including food additives; that are confronting us. When scientists such as Dr. Rene Dubos, Dr. Richard A. Kimball (Oak Ridge Laboratory), Dr. Marvin Legator (FDA) and Dr. Matthew Meselson of Harvard show deep worry, it is time we all became concerned about the need for safety guidelines and monitoring procedures.

What permits the food industry to manipulate its products for sales-maximization (including preservation over time for nationwide distribution) and cost reduction in ways that place the risk of harm on the consumer is the absence of comprehensive, operating standards of evaluation. It is also the difficulty of tracing the cause and effect of this silent type of violence to tissue and cell structure over long periods of time or even in cases of food poisoning outbreaks, the search for the responsible agent is difficult because of the many variables or inputs. This very difficulty requires a strategy of prevention at the source, not a wait and see attitude resulting in disastrous consequences of the type foreshadowed in the thalidomide tragedy.

There is still a widespread impression that government is watching out for the consumer ever since the pure food law was passed early in the century. The fact is that FDA neither has the resources, nor the regulatory dedication nor adequate authority to keep up with the proliferating abuses in the food industry. To conduct research, inspection, review test results and enforce the law, FDA was provided with \$23,056,000 for 1969—less than a fourth of the cost of one atomic

submarine. According to Dr. S. S. Epstein of the Children's Cancer Research Foundation, (Boston), there are only three laboratories in this country specifically evaluating the potential health hazards of chemical mutagens—all small efforts. A 1967 Health, Education and Welfare report, "A Strategy for a Liveable Environment," bewailed the fact that unlike most government regulatory agencies, the FDA "does not have subpoena authority either to summon witnesses or to require firms to divulge pertinent records." Hundreds of firms, which the FDA is supposed to monitor routinely refuse every year to allow the FDA to conduct or conduct inspections or furnish quality or quantity formulas or to review safety or health control records. In 1965, 216 firms refused to give the FDA permission to review shipping records. This prevents FDA from getting at hazardous situations early in the time of their development. FDA has itself been unduly meek, failing to publicize its drastic needs for the protection of the consumer and reflecting a passive enforcement policy. Its educational function has lagged greatly, even with reports by the National Academy of Sciences and the AMA Council on Foods and Nutrition warning about the loss of essential nutrients in foods, and the Report of the National Commission on Community Health Services warning about existing food hazards and inadequate public health controls that "have created the potential for massive nationwide outbreaks of food-borne illnesses."

The time has indeed come for the public to expect the food industry to shoulder its burden of proof of health and safety in its products, to end its secrecy, to extend its inspection, testing and research and to emphasize wholesomeness, purity and nutrition above gimmickry and packaging appeals. The issue of food safety and quality will be a large one in 1969!

STATEMENT OF RALPH NADER BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, MARCH 20, 1969, ON S. 860—TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr Chairman, distinguished Members of the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, thank you for the opportunity to express my views on S. 860 and the needs out of which this proposal emerges.

It is clear that this subcommittee intends to establish a record during these hearings that will not only document the necessity of a major organizational proposal for consumer protection but also help sharpen the shape which any such organization should take to fulfill such a mission. My statement will strive to keep this objective in focus.

Consumer abuses come in two basic forms—(a) they reduce real incomes and misallocate resources by way of frauds, snoddy merchandise and other deceptions or bilking schemes and (b) they inflict violence on consumers by way of hazardous products, unprovided services or environmental pollutants. The spectrum of consumer abuses in the health and safety areas must cover the involuntary consumption of toxic or otherwise dangerous man-inflicted materials in air, water and soil.

Any discussion of consumer abuses must also include the critical issue of corporate irresponsibility. The economy of this country is a corporate economy. The corporate institution is by far the major manufacturer, processor and vendor of goods and services. What external and internal incentives and restraints obtain for the corporate entity and the people who work in a corporate framework are fundamentally related to the protection and fairness or lack thereof that are accorded consumers. Likewise, what privileges, immunities and defenses prevent the public accountability of corporate behaviour

and divert it toward antisocial practices are pertinent to fairness and safety for consumers.

It is useful at the outset to itemize a number of abuses, practices and phenomena—in no way exhaustive of the corporate predations but in a small way reflective of conditions that merit the profound concern that has convened this subcommittee. Subsequent to the completion of this list, a few lessons will be drawn on a more general plane.

1. During the winter of 1967-1968, Montgomery Ward mailed notices to its charge account customers in some 32 states telling them about "Charg-all Insurance Protection." "I think you'll call it great," said Ward's President, Edward S. Donnell in the cover letter. The customer was told that he soon would receive a certificate evidencing the insurance of his indebtedness to Ward for amounts between \$30 and \$3,000. The coverage provided for payment of the indebtedness in the event of death or disability of the customer. Ward would be the beneficiary.

The insurance plan was a means of protecting Ward's claim against the customer while avoiding costly collection expenditures against the estate of a deceased customer or directly against a disabled customer. The premium was to be .10 per month per \$100 or fraction thereof owed to Ward. Contrary to the usual contractual doctrines, the failure of the customer to make an affirmative refusal of the coverage obligated him to pay the insurance premium. In order to avoid the coverage, the customer was told he must (a) deduct the premium from his bill or (b) call Ward or (c) fill in an enclosed card. If one of these courses of action was not taken, the customer was covered. Only the first bill listed the insurance premium separately. Customers complained of nearly discarding the announcements because they were sent out on bulk mail rates and appeared like junk mail. They also complained that the mailings did not include postage paid envelopes to facilitate refusals. Insurance Commissioner Hunt of Minnesota said that:

"It is unreasonable to believe that all of Ward's charge customers will read the letter from Ward's President, E. Donnell and will understand that they are going to be charged for the credit life insurance unless they take affirmative action to reject it. It is outrageous for people to be coerced into paying for something they don't want." Maryland Insurance Commissioner Newton Steers called the plan "high-handed."

A burst of criticism followed and a number of insurance departments investigated the matter along with the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee. But despite all this activity, the operation of the plan was virtually unaffected, with the possible exception of its operation in Minnesota. Company representatives agreed to print boxes on the bill so that the customer can refuse the insurance by checking the appropriate box. However, the customer still must take affirmative action to refuse coverage. The bill form required in Minnesota is slightly different. It requires a more explicit bold face type explanation of the charges. However, the customer must still decline the insurance coverage. And the explicit explanation is only on the first bill.

A class suit against Montgomery Ward's "revised" plan is now pending in Illinois and demands recovery of the premiums. The suit alleges that the plan is virtually identical to the original one and that the customer is still not given an adequate explanation of what the coverage is (e.g. age limits, pre-existing conditions void the coverage for disability, etc.). Worse, if the customer neglects to check either the box indicating refusal or acceptance, he is assumed to have accepted. In any event, the choice of boxes is only on the bill for the first month of coverage. The abuse remains.

2. Last year the Federal Trade Commission released a report on lumber grading, inspection and marketing (lumber prices have skyrocketed to a 50% increase in the past year in many lines). The report stated:

"The masquerading of low grade lumber for high grade lumber has bilked consumers of millions of dollars, has lowered the margin of structural safety in innumerable dwellings, and, in the affected market areas, has impaired competitive mores among surviving wholesalers, retailers and contractors." The abuse remains.

3. Last April, during the week of disturbances which took 37 lives throughout the nation, a negligently maintained leaky pipeline blew up in Richmond, Indiana, taking 41 lives and seriously burning over 100 other persons. No federal or state law applied to this disaster. The Indiana Public Service Commission didn't believe it even had authority to investigate formally this explosion. No law and no order was applied to the gas company and its induced violence.

4. Antitrust officials at the Justice Department know that price fixing is rampant throughout the economy but simply do not have the manpower to deal with this criminal corporate violation. Price fixing keeps prices higher for consumers than they would be if competition prevailed. The electric price fixing conspiracy involving General Electric, Westinghouse, Allis Chalmers and other companies was prosecuted in 1960-61 by the Justice Department. It cost consumers over a billion dollars. It cost G.E. Westinghouse et al about \$500 million in punitive damage settlements and this sum was promptly written off as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses. Corporations who pay out such damages after criminally violating the antitrust laws can share their pain with the general taxpayer under present Treasury rulings.

5. Oil import quotas, by keeping high the domestic price of oil and blocking the importation of cheap and less polluting foreign petroleum, are costing the U.S. consumer at least \$3-\$5 billion a year according to Executive Branch estimates. These and other quotas are consumer issues.

6. Automobile bumpers—those chrome, ornamental, eyebrows—are designed to maximize repair costs and knowingly so. Fender sections and other captive parts sell well with bumpers that cannot protect the vehicle in collisions exceeding 2 mph and some bumpers fall that standard. Recently, Edward Daniels, an Automobile Club of Michigan insurance executive, released a study that indicated an annual loss to motorists of \$1 billion due to ornamental bumpers. A functional bumper—designed to protect against impacts up to a modest 10 mph—would save the motorist that much money, he said. Do the auto executives know this? Of course they do. But they go on looting the public by design. A billion dollars is diverted from other purchases such as food, furniture, medicine, clothes. This is an illustration of the misallocation of resources as a result of corporate venality.

7. Over a year ago, Dr. James Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, predicted that the federal government would force withdrawal from public use about 300 drugs—some of them "family favorites"—found to be ineffective for the treatment of the medical conditions for which they had been prescribed. Both prescription drugs and patent medicines—under 1,600 brand names—were to be involved. Hope is still springing eternal.

8. The U.S. Department of Agriculture is proposing a rule limiting fat content to 30% in various processed meats. The meat industry is opposed. Hams with 30% water content abound in parts of the country such as California. What is the dollar buying here? Does the consumer know? Here is an advertisement from the magazine Food Technology which reflects the prevailing spirit:

"With Western Dairy Products' new tasteless (their emphasis) sodium caseinate called Savortone, you can now successfully use sodium caseinate as an emulsifier and binder for sausages, salad dressings, oil emulsions, and egg substitutes. . . . You can use it wherever you like, and never wonder for a minute what the consumers will think. They'll never know."

What's on the labels is not all that is in the meat product. Last year, *Consumer Reports* tested fresh pork sausages—including leading brands and found some distressing things. One-eighth of the Federally inspected sausage and more than one-fifth of the other sausage contained insect fragments, insect larvae, rodent hairs and other kinds of filth. In typical samples, CR found that 30% of the federally inspected sausage and 40% of the sausage subject only to infrequent Illinois inspection failed the tests for absence of filth or acceptable low bacteria counts. CR stated that such findings suggest "unclean packinghouses, unsanitary ingredients and inadequate inspection." These tests even jarred the U.S. Department of Agriculture—not an inconsiderable accomplishment.

9. William B. Keiser of Allison Park, Pa., was driving his new Pontiac on October 25, 1968, when his left front wheel bearing failed. The repairs did not come under the warranty, according to his dealer. Mr. Keiser objected and wrote to Pontiac's home office. He wrote again. He still has not received any answer even though his original letter stated that he had purchased a mere 13 Pontiacs since 1953 for his family use.

10. In 1962, the Surgeon General submitted a list of 150 physicians and scientists who were candidates for the Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health to the Surgeon General, to the Tobacco Institute. The Tobacco Institute was given the right to veto anyone on the list without any reason given. Although the final committee came out with a report that was critical of cigarette smoking, this unique access of an industry trade group appears at least inappropriate.

11. Congressman John Dingell obtained information during his recent inquiries into the effectiveness of private industry standards that the formula observed by the American Hotel and Motel Association does not produce hygienic linen. Under these standards the bacteria count in laundry is only slightly reduced after being washed in one of the more highly advertised home laundry preparations. Rep. Dingell stated that the evidence showed "pathogens such as staphylococcus to be only slightly deterred by the very laundering process that we rely upon to remove them completely. Our European brothers are rather more advanced than we are in that their home laundry equipment contains a booster unit to increase the temperature of the water. This increases the bacterial kill rate considerably. However, as indicated in a letter from the DuPont Company, this higher water temperature has a softening effect on plastic pipe which quite probably would damage a plastic plumbing system.

12. The flammable fabrics act, the truth-in-packaging act, the oil pipeline safety act, the regulation by the IOC of household moving van practices, the pesticide act, and drug advertising enforcement have been serious or colossal failures. Consumer legislation is highly vulnerable to deceptive packaging. It is also often starved for funds. This deprivation, of course, is not new. The combined budgets of the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department have always been trivial as compared with the task they are given to accomplish and the size of the economy. The record budget for the two agencies combined was about \$22 million last year—less than 10 hours gross receipts of General Motors. As discussed earlier this week, the FTC does not even use its funds to full effect.

13. For several decades, interstate motor carriers like Greyhound have had their accident reports kept secret by the Federal Government. Until late last year, the Government accident reports on carrier crashes were secret. This secrecy has shielded both carriers and the IOC (now in the Department of Transportation's Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety) from public evaluation and contribution. It has also kept the facts from the victims of these crashes, thus protecting the carriers from legal accountability. It is not surprising, therefore, that defective conditions and hazardous practices (such as Greyhound's use of repeatedly and poorly regrooved rear tires) have persisted.

There are a number of lessons to be drawn from such situations as briefly noted above.

The idea that consumer abuses stem overwhelmingly from fringe or marginal firms is utterly untenable, notwithstanding FTC Chairman Paul Rand Dixon's self-serving declarations to the contrary. Whether it is drugs, automobiles, lending, packaging, cigarettes, pesticides, flammable fabrics, pipelines, air and water pollution—big business is intensely implicated in the abuses and industrial violence directly and consciously.

Present Federal authority leaves out many areas of consumer protection from any form of attention or action. The National Commission on Product Safety—established last year for a two year period—has illustrated this well in its short existence. The Commission has found startling hazards in many toys—of an electrical, mechanical or thermal nature. It has found child deaths through refrigeration entrapment and nibbling leaded paint peeling off slum walls continuing without remedy. It has found that many sources of existing information—such as that held by insurance companies on product hazards—have not been tapped by any level of Government. It found that the Federal Housing Administration was not requiring safety glass in all F.H.A. approved homes—a simple step that could save many lives and thousands of injuries every year. It found that there were no adequate standards to prevent serious burns, particularly on children, from gas-fired floor furnaces. The Commission has documented durable failures in private standards groups and certifying groups such as Underwriters' Laboratories. No standards by Government exist for power lawn mowers, washing machines, stoves and other appliances which literally cause hundreds of thousands of injuries every year.

The level of non-enforcement of laws against corporate transgressions is most disturbing for those who believe that law and order should apply to the rich as well as to the poor. The U.S. Department of Agriculture sits on serious violations of the pesticide laws for years and does not refer them to the Justice Department for prosecution. General Motors waits for as long as three years, shunning its own inspector's reports, before recalling 2.5 million Chevrolets. No Government official calls for law enforcement here for such delay in recalling vehicles with exhaust leakage into the passenger compartment. The elitist mores are such that, instead, G.M. received praise for *not* delaying further and waiting for more deaths to be documented as carbon monoxide victims.

The attached supplement dealing with the Hormel Co. plant in Southern California discloses hitherto unrevealed information of gross abuses relating to the sales of rotten meat, even though Federal inspectors are at the plant presumably enforcing Federal laws.

The articulated sanctions in laws dealing with corporate crime are deplorably weak. Wilful and knowing violations, for example, of the auto safety law, the gas pipeline law, the radiation control law—to name a few—do not carry with them criminal penalties. Lawyer-lobbyists had them deleted. The penalties for violations of the air and water pollution laws are encumbered with incredible

delays which when endured then leave the Government with only the crudest and thereby difficult to apply sanctions.

The Federal Trade Commission, for most of its enforcement work, can only order cease and desist decrees which lets the violator keep his ill gotten gains and frees him to try and design around the decree. Corporate violations affect far greater numbers of people than the conventional street crime in fact and in potential. Pollution of the air with deadly contaminants is a continuing assault in the streets—to name but one hazard outside the plants. Yet while the penalties for individual crime (three years in prison were awarded two youths last year in Maryland who stole 300 lbs. of tobacco and admitted their guilt when apprehended, returning the tobacco as well) outside the corporate framework far exceed the feather swishes that go for corporate penalties—even those not deductible or passed on to the hapless consumer.

A great tool of government for consumer protection has been rarely used—that is, prototype research and development for safety and health purposes. Non-polluting engines (external combustion for instance) have not been developed by the auto companies for other than technical reasons. The government could have done so for a fraction of the amount soaring away in the ill-advised Super-Sonic transport program. The same exemplary and motivating function could have been performed for safer cars, a less noiseless environment, fire preventive techniques and retardants. The sums expended would have been returned manifold in lives saved and diminished waste. The federal government has still not developed a policy toward individual inventors, both without or within companies. Thus the nation is losing much of its citizen inventiveness to the stifling environment of corporate collectivism. Yet, the data are impressive in still showing that major innovations still come from individuals, often working alone, and not committees within corporations.

Particularly in the era of the computer, the government's consumer information function is very weak. It is weak in not utilizing and disseminating existing data in its possession but also gathering additional data. The situation reaches almost ludicrous levels when the inspection and procurement (school lunch) branches of the Department of Agriculture do not communicate over contaminated food coming to the attention of one or the other. The tremendous, deceptive waste of advertising that is selling not distinctive qualities but brand name identification could be reduced sharply with objective, point of sale consumer information from a central computer bank. Similarly, many such displays of waste and misallocation of resources could be diminished by such information programs.

Corporate executives are not called upon to answer for these consumer frauds or asked to testify before the Congress, I am referring to the top two corporate executives, not subordinates. Such executives insulate themselves from these and many other dialogs. They should not be allowed to do so. It is striking what a difference there is in having them present. It is also striking how few committees of Congress demand their presence. Your subcommittee showed this clearly when it demanded that the heads of General Motors, not the subordinates, show up if that company were to testify. The impression made on these gentlemen—Messrs. Donner and Roche—at the hearings led to their ordering the energy absorbing steering column into production. They received an education in vehicle safety design in Washington, not in Detroit or New York behind cloistered offices. Top corporate have preferred access to government—advisory committees, social occasions at which key business is discussed, top appointments, quick

response to their inquiries for appointments or information. It is time that citizens, through Congress, had comparable access to corporate executives in public.

As presently organized, the Federal Government has not engendered the creative ideas for consumer protection that are so badly needed. Problems begging for detailed remedies include the handling of complaints, but their bucking over from one agency to another; the decentralization of enforcement, the development of local and State consumer protection bodies, the process by which problems can be anticipated at their earliest stages through early targeting that could come from a freer flow of information; the lack of due process and freedom of dissent in the corporate structure which leads to incalculable damage; the best way to resolve conflicts between buyer and seller that simply are excluded from the judicial arena owing to time, expense and other factors.

There is a high priority in investigating the so-called lobbying infra-structure that undermines and could continue to undermine any consumer activity in Government. Included are trade associations—such as the Automobile Manufacturers Association and the American Iron and Steel Institute and the National Coal Policy Conference—and corporate law firms such as Covington and Burling and Hogan and Hartson and Arnold and Porter. The gentlemen who run these operations are eminent specialists in cutting down consumer programs in their incipency or undermining them if they mature. They are the masters of the ex parte contact, the private deals and trade-offs, the greasing of the corporate wheels and the softening of the bureaucrats' will. They could tell this Committee a great deal about the obstacles and tactics which consumer drives and administration must deal with. Without such knowledge, the administrative structure cannot be devised and implemented effectively. I am sure that such citizens as Lloyd Cutler and Thomas Austern and Edwin Rockefeller—all of whom deal with the consumer in their distinctive ways as corporate attorneys—would be pleased to come before this Subcommittee and provide its members with their views and experience.

The stresses to which consumer interests have been subjected to in the marketplace, in the environment and in policymaking arenas have brought about in recent months a number of proposals to defend his interests. Senator Metcalf has introduced legislation to create an agency that would represent consumers at rate-making hearings for utilities. Senator Hart has proposed an independent consumers information foundation. Congressman Ottinger has proposed a Federal "environmental ombudsman" to protect natural resources from damage and destruction resulting from Federal agency actions. S 860 envisages a more comprehensive institution, assuming that its concept of consumer interests is sufficiently broad.

There is much in this bill with which I agree. There is a definite need for a distinct arm of the Federal Government to promote and represent the consumer interest by performing the following functions—*investigation, research and testing, information dissemination, handling complaints and advocacy before agencies and courts* and presentations before Congress. I do not find persuasive, however, the depositing of various regulatory functions including the transfer of several consumer laws from other departments and agencies to the proposed Department. Giving the Department of Consumer Affairs such a regulatory role would (a) simply refocus the entire lobbying environment on the Department; (b) weaken the Department's strong advocate role because it would have to referee between competing interests in its administrative hearings and rule-making roles; (c) further lighten any

public interest burdens from other Departments and regulatory agencies and (d) generate needless opposition to any Department by established agencies apprehensive of losing their programs. To be effective, a consumer agency must not have anything to give to industry or commerce, as it most assuredly would if it had a regulatory role. Having something to give would attract the same forces that undermined or controlled other agencies. The thrust of a consumer agency, in my judgment, is to assist in the reform of other agencies to perform in the public interest, not to progressively relieve them of that horizon in their deliberations.

The prospects for any form of consumer agency or Department receiving the support of the present Administration are readily dim. There is nothing in the campaign literature and the interregnum to assure the public that the Administration's leaders understand consumer problems much less expect to do something about them. In fact, on more than one occasion just the contrary was the case.

Since taking office, the Administration has confirmed its pre-inaugural stance. The debacle in trying to fill the President's special assistant for consumer's affairs office continues in low key by the absence of any candidate for the post. It is now clear that the Attorney General is going to abolish the Office of the Consumer Counsel in his Department. This Counsel was to have a key role inside and outside the Justice Department as an advisor, advocate and idea-generator for consumer protection in areas ranging from policy-making to development of a Consumer's Bulletin that has been also called a Consumers' Federal Register. There is no one holding the post now as it has been kept vacant since the Johnson appointee resigned.

In other Departments and agencies, consumer protection proponents are running for cover or being eased out from top to surprisingly lower staff levels. In the Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administrator, Francis Turner, is having a field day, with the permissive support of the Secretary, in rooting out all people who questioned in the slightest the advisability of paving over America with highways, balancing the nation's transport system, reducing the voracious appetite of the highway lobby, staying the irrational misuse of land in cities and country and striving to make vehicles safer. Mr. Turner's relentless drive is now placing the National Highway Safety Bureau, with whom he battled as Director of the Bureau of Public Roads, under the grip of his concrete-asphalt minded administration. The Food and Drug Administration has suddenly mellowed rapidly in its enforcement and rule-making activities. Appointments of a high caliber in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare are being held up by retrograde medical merchants with strong lines into the new Administration.

About the only contribution to the protection of the consumer by the new Administration was the inadvertent public exposure given to the transparent nullity that is the Good Housekeeping Seal. An Administration composed of leading Presidential advisors from advertising agencies, ex-lobbyists for industry and multi-millionaire construction and manufacturing magnates can be forgiven a short period of transition from one role to another. But the forces building up in this country for clean air, water and soil, for product safety and justice in the marketplace will not long wait upon an Administration which continues such a blend of indifference and callousness. Your hearings will afford a needed forum for conveying the word down Pennsylvania Avenue—if indeed anyone down there is listening.

Thank you.

SUPPLEMENT

The George A. Hormel Co. plant of La Mirada, California is almost new; in fact less than two years old. It is considered a show-place of modern meat preparation. And indeed the stainless steel atmosphere would appear to be an ideal setting for the preparation of such appetizing items as Buffet Ham Loaf, Sunday Bacon, Smoked Polish Sausage, Sirloin Steaks and Prosciutto. The Hormel Company (based in Austin, Minnesota) is a leader in the industry averaging about 1/2 billion in sales each year. A good example from Hormel sets a standard for the industry. Unfortunately, however, the escorted guests in this Hormel plant at La Mirada do not get to see all. What they miss would be more enlightening than what they are shown. If the guests were permitted to see all, they would see Hormel scalers repacking old meat in new packages with recent code dates in order to disguise the true age of the product. These visitors might also see, if they were permitted to, the storage area which holds the Hormel meats obscurely referred to as #2 meat. This innocent-sounding name is actually the plant euphemism for rotting and adulterated meat which will be sold to some Southern California supermarkets, with their knowledge, and to some school districts without their knowledge. And if our visitors were permitted to stay long enough they would witness a host of other deeply upsetting practices.

Some regular buyers of Hormel products seek to protect the persons they serve by requiring all meat to be code dated upon arrival. This is obviously a prudent measure on the part of buyers of a perishable commodity and this requirement no doubt gives them a sense of security. One such buyer is Certified Grocers of California. The sham quality of the dating becomes clear whenever the shipping instructions say: "Do not short smoked hams to Certified Groc. If lots are too old, rebox and put new code date on each box." And a more general instruction regarding demanding buyers: "As a reminder—try to enter Code Dates on recap (the repackaging) for Certified, Safeway, Market Basket and accounts who require a close call date."

Another tough customer for the Hormel plant is nearby Vandenberg Air Force Base. This is a lucrative and active account so that a special procedure was set up to service it and at the same time avoid the inconvenience of Vandenberg's dating requirement: "On all Smoked Meats, Sliced Bacon, Wieners and Packaged Lunch Meats, there must be a current code date not past seven (7) days. This is according to the rules and regulations of the Air Force Base. The Pork Loins and Spare Ribs should be left uncoded until time of shipment. Each Friday (x employee) will notify (y employee) the amount of fresh pork products that will be delivered to Vandenberg on the following Thursday. On this basis we should do the coding two days prior to shipment."

These buyers, despite their efforts, are getting stale meat and there is reasonable probability that it cannot or at least should not be eaten. Many other buyers, however, are certain to be getting meat which is not edible. This is Hormel's #2 meat. Officially #2 meat does not exist. The price list contains no designation or prices for anything list #2 meat. The pricing policy with regard to #2 meat was best explained by a Hormel salesman, who sells a great deal of meat to San Diego schools. This salesman responded to a memo from his superior which complained that he had not been getting enough for the #2 meat. The salesman retorted: "I sell all the junk (emp. in original) I can for as much as I can get for it. I can't do more."

The accepted practice for disposing of spoiled meat is destruction or sale to rendering plants. Sales by the La Mirada plant to

rendering plants consist almost wholly of bones. Decayed meats need not be wasted in this way. They can be sold directly to supermarkets, many of them in Los Angeles ghetto areas but some in Orange County (map referred to not printed in Record¹), to processors who "doctor" the product and in turn sell to ghetto supermarkets and even to unsuspecting school districts. One supermarket, not far from the Watts riot area, is among the plant's best customers. It buys virtually nothing except #2 meats. Number 2 Kolbase bought at \$.30/lb. is sold at \$.90/lb. to the area's poor residents. Here again, the poor pay more for less—much less.

Recently hundreds of pounds of inferior #2 meats—specifically wieners—had to be returned by a half dozen schools at least. They were black and full of fat. Not even doctoring at the La Mirada plant could save this shipment.

Specifically what is #2 meat? The words of the original buyers who rejected the meat speak for themselves:

1. Moldy liver loaf.
2. Sour party hams.
3. Leaking bologna.
4. Discolored bacon.
5. Off condition (euphemism for rotting) hams.
6. Slick and slimy spare ribs.

These are the actual reasons given by customers for rejecting meats. In each case credit was given the customer and each company credit memorandum contains the notation "transfer to #2." In one case the customer's shipment arrived in such a bad state that slimy and rotten spare ribs had to be dumped on the spot. A few from this batch were actually returned to the plant. They also were transferred to #2. In two other cases customers returned ribs for "sliminess, discoloration, stickiness." They received special treatment. They were marked "transfer to cure and smoke." This resurrected meat will emerge as "Windsor Loins", which actually sell for more than fresh pork chops.

On January 22, 1969, Von's grocery rejected a shipment of hams, saying that they were "discolored—excessive moisture." The meat was resold the same day to a supermarket which regularly buys number 2 meats. The plant lost only \$4.47 on an original sale of \$23.18. Better Foods on that same day rejected 4 pieces of ham because of "discoloration, internal fat, and cavities." A cash sale of the meat as #2 for \$11.00 meant that the plant lost only \$5.98 on a \$17.79 sale. In one case a store returned meat saying it was "black—extremely discolored." It was cured and smoked and sold at only \$1.82 under the original price of \$22.80. Occasionally, things get even too bad for regular #2 buyers. One of them recently returned boneless party hams because they were sour. They were sent back to #2 for another resale attempt.

There are a number of other buyers who regularly purchase meat which is not quite #2 but yet is not quite meat. The Hormel plant, obviously operating without compunctions, obligingly supplies these quasi-meat products. One very large restaurant located on the site of a famous Los Angeles tourist attraction regularly orders frankfurters with almost no meat. There is a special recipe and denomination for these franks, which are even inferior to the standard franks with large quantities of cereal. This same outfit's regular orders, for one of its other sufficient dishes, something called "ham trim" which insiders say is floor sweepings. Another interesting item supplied in large quantities to processors and supermarkets specializing in

ghetto trade is pork melts. Pork melts sell for about 10 cents per lb. and have no obvious culinary value. Yet one processor recently purchased 3,000 lbs. of pork melts. This had nothing to do with food fads. Pork melts are a staple item for processors. When mixed with fat ground meat, pork melts "melt" and give the whole mixture a red appearance.

School children, the poor and, with surprising regularity, rich suburbanites in the Los Angeles area are eating these sub-meat products. And even the Federal Government is not immune. At mentioned earlier, the La Mirada plant supplies Vandenberg AFB on a regular basis. The evidence is that authorities at the base are careful to see that the men are receiving meat of adequate quality. The date coding system, as we have seen, offers no protection of quality. But the deception goes further. For instance, on January 23, 1969, the appropriate officer at Vandenberg rejected a large shipment of beef patties. The reason for the rejection was simple. The order had stated that the patties were to be delivered frozen. The meat was shipped back to the La Mirada Plant, refrozen and shipped back to Vandenberg the next week. The inspecting officer, knowing nothing of the deception, accepted the meat as a different shipment.

TWO MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Ernest J. Hughes and Sp4c. William L. McGowan, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their bravery and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO FROM STATE DIE IN VIETNAM—SILVER SPRING INFANTRYMAN, ESSEX SERGEANT KILLED

An Army career sergeant from Essex and an 18-year-old infantryman from Silver Spring are the latest Maryland casualties in Vietnam, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

They are:

Sgt. Ernest J. Hughes, 28, the husband of Mrs. Shirley Hughes, of Middletown, Ky.

Spec. 4 William L. McGowan, son of Oscar D. McGowan, of 12508 Atherton drive, Silver Spring, and Mrs. Evelyn Hammond, of Hagerstown.

Sergeant Hughes, a member of the 21st Infantry was killed May 12 during an attack on his base between Da Nang and Chu Lai.

A 10-year veteran of the Army, Sergeant Hughes had been in Vietnam since last October. He had previously served in Korea and Germany, among other places.

He was born in Essex and was graduated from Stemmers Run Junior High School.

SIX SURVIVORS

In addition to his wife, his survivors include a 5-year-old son, Joseph; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Hughes, of Deep Point, Md.; and two brothers, Edward Hughes and James Hughes, of Essex.

Services will be held at 9 A.M. tomorrow at the Connelly funeral establishment, 300 Mace avenue.

Specialist McGowan was killed May 14 in Phu Bai, his stepmother, Mrs. Oscar McGowan said yesterday. She said no details were given.

He joined the Army in July, 1967, after dropping out of Hancock High School near Hagerstown. He was born in Hagerstown.

Specialist McGowan received his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C. He spent nine months in Germany before being sent to Vietnam in September, 1968.

In addition to his parents, his survivors include a brother, Seaman David McGowan in the Navy at Pensacola, Fla.

NORTHERN VIRGINIA CITIZENS GROUP SLATES ABM DEBATE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that all citizens—throughout the country—realize all the implications behind the struggle now occurring both in Congress and across the Nation concerning deployment of President Nixon's proposed ABM system.

Washington, D.C., ended up as one of the lucky areas to receive protection from Safeguard, but so far, public debate here has been minimal. Hopefully, though, that situation is changing.

Tomorrow night, Tuesday, June 3, the Northern Virginia Coalition of Citizens Concerned About the ABM will hold a town meeting to discuss the President's proposals on ABM. The recently formed coalition consists of nine citizens groups—seven opposing ABM and two which have taken no stand but wish to have public airing on the question.

I view the town meeting concept as a powerful means of presenting the many aspects of the ABM debate, and I urge those persons here in the Washington area who feel they need to know more about ABM to attend the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following press release describing the town meeting to be in the RECORD at this point:

FORMATION OF NEW COALITION OF NINE NORTHERN VIRGINIA GROUPS TO SEEK INCREASED PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF ABM

In mid-March, President Nixon announced his plans for the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system. Although 15 cities had formerly been chosen for ABM sites (including Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Detroit, Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco and Seattle) the sites were removed from population centers due to citizen concern and public education.

Among the remaining missile sites are the countryside of Montana and North Dakota and one city, Washington, D.C.

The governors of Montana and North Dakota have expressed their opposition to the Safeguard in their backyard and the citizens in these states have organized in protest.

In the absence of initiatives by local governing bodies, The Northern Virginia Coalition of Citizens Concerned About the A.B.M. have requested the Arlington, Alexandria, Fairfax and Falls Church city councils to hold hearings on the ABM.

Since there has been no response from the Council fathers we are now, publicly, asking for open hearings.

Concern is mounting so rapidly, however, that we have planned a Northern Virginia Town Meeting for Tuesday, June 3rd at T. C. Williams High School to debate the ABM.

¹ Map does not show markets outside the Los Angeles area (San Bernardino, Riverside) and does not show processors who specialize in selling to markets in low income areas.

The members of the debate team supporting the ABM are:

Charles Lerch, Institute of Defense Analysis.

Richard Fryklund, Special Advisor to the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Members of the opposing view are:

Dr. George Rathjens, Professor of Political Science, M.I.T.

Dr. Jeremy Stone, author, member of Council, Federation of American Scientists.

Robert Goralski of NBC News will be the moderator of this debate.

We deeply regret the silence of our elected and appointed Virginia leaders. Although the ABM vote is scheduled for mid-June, we sincerely hope that the Town Meeting will be the beginning of an 11th hour intense round of discussions and hearings on this most controversial and critical of issues.

Sponsoring Groups: Langley Hills Friends

Meetings, New Democratic Coalition of No. Va., Northern Virginia Action Committee, Northern Virginia Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam;

Parkfairfax Citizens Association; Support Christian Action House Church of the Little Falls Presbyterian Church; Spectrum, George Mason College; Virginia United Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns, and Washington Area SANE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 3, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Louis Kaplan, Congregation Ohav Shalom, Nether Providence, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord:

In commencing this session of the House of Representatives,
Begin we must by expressing gratitude for being alive.

Even as we have risen from sleep,
Rouse us, too, we pray from our shackles of yesterday—

The fetters of ignorance, resistance to worthwhile change,
Yielding complacency, inertia, and other shortcomings.

Aid us to attain a healthy discontent
Now concerning what we have done, as well as a

Determined and renewed enthusiasm for what we can do.

Joining high resolve with noble goals,
Understanding with genuine compassion,
Spur these leaders, especially to translate
The Biblical challenge "to do righteousness and justice"

Into legislation enabling more
Children and adults, in this Nation and elsewhere, to

Enjoy their "unalienable rights" in the human family.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 684. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to make certain technical corrections therein, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2718. An act to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk;

H.R. 2940. An act for the relief of Henry E. Dooley;

H.R. 10015. An act to extend through December 31, 1970, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum; and

H.R. 10016. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 83. An act for the relief of certain civilian employees and former civilian employees of the Bureau of Reclamation;

S. 275. An act for the relief of the village of Orleans, Vt.;

S. 499. An act for the relief of Ludger J. Cossette;

S. 728. An act for the relief of Capt. Richard L. Schumaker, U.S. Army;

S. 901. An act for the relief of William D. Pender;

S. 1010. An act for the relief of Mrs. All Kallio;

S. 1193. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent terminations of oil and gas leases in cases where there is a nominal deficiency in the rental payment, and to authorize him to reinstate under some conditions oil and gas leases terminated by operation of law for failure to pay rental timely;

S. 1236. An act for the relief of Homer T. Williamson, Sr.; and

S.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to amend section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 431) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 431

Resolved, That Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., of California, be and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Science and Astronautics.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON URBAN GROWTH, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Urban Growth of the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit during the session this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE TRUMAN WARD, MAJORITY CLERK

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of Congress and congressional employees in mourning the passing of the majority clerk of the House of Representatives, Mr. Truman Ward. Mr. Ward passed away this past Sunday. This fine gentleman was born and raised in Clarke County, Miss., the district which I represent. He served the Members of Congress with great devotion and loyalty. He held the position of either majority or minority clerk for some 48 years. Mr. Truman Ward assumed his duties in 1921 at the age of 29. In talking of his work on Capitol Hill, Mr. Ward recently pointed out there were no longer any Members of Congress still serving that were here when he first came to work. We will all certainly miss his warmth to people, his professional ability, and the outstanding service he rendered to his country.

I am sure all Members of Congress join with me in sending our sincere condolences to Mr. Ward's wife, daughter, three sons, and 12 grandchildren. Members of Congress may pay their respects to Mr. Truman Ward's family at the Joseph Gawler's Sons Funeral Home from 2 this afternoon until 9 tonight. The funeral will be held at 11 tomorrow morning in the sanctuary of the Capitol Hill Metropolitan Baptist Church.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened on learning that our good friend and valuable employee, Truman Ward, had passed away.

I had not been a Member of this body but for a day or so when I first became acquainted with Truman. In fact, he went to the trouble of making a personal visit to my office that we might get acquainted. Then and there he made suggestions and gave me the benefit of counsel which I as a new Member found most helpful. This was typical of Truman Ward. He was unselfish. He was tender and kind. He was never too busy to advise with me or other Members about the printing needs of our offices. He did a good job for all of us.

Truman was good to the employees, too. Scores of them found their way to and secured employment on Capitol Hill through his personal efforts. For all who