for congressional redistricting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 11818. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $3,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself and Mr. HUNGATE):

H.R. 11819. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 11820. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed as judges or justices of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11821. A bill to establish a Small Tax Division within the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11822. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11823. A bill to amend the laws under which Federal financial assistance is provided for schools in federally impacted areas, so as to include in the computations the number of children living in federally assisted low-rent housing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 11824. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself and Mr. HOLIFIELD):

H.R. 11825. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 11826. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11827. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11828. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H.R. 11829. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11830. A bill to assure the safe passage of all students enrolled in institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 11831. A bill to provide for an additional staff employee for each Member of the House of Representatives representing a congressional district which is the only congressional district authorized for an entire State; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11832. A bill to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 11833. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11834. A bill to reclassify certain key positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 11835. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide extra compensation for officially ordered or approved time worked by postal field service employees, on any day designated by Executive order as a national day of mourning; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 11836. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 11837. A bill to require the termination for 1 full year of Federal financial assistance to colleges and universities which are experiencing campus disorders and fail to take appropriate corrective measures forthwith, and to require the termination for 1 full year of Federal financial assistance to teachers participating in such disorders; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 756. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 757. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KING:

H.J. Res. 758. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the power of the Supreme Court to declare any provision of law constitutional; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 759. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the appointment of members of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.J. Res. 760. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Robert Francis Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 761. Joint resolution designating January 15 of each year as "Martin Luther King Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.J. Res. 762. Joint Resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the 30th day of September in 1969 as "Bible Translation Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 763. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August 26, 1969, through September 1, 1969, as "National Archery Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 11838. A bill for the relief of Robah N. Browder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11839. A bill for the relief of Parviz Faramarzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 11840. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Anastasia Mendoza and her minor children, Gavino Nora Mendoza and Maria Nora Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 11841. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Pickering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 11842. A bill for the relief of Ludger J. Cosette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

134. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Zora B. Hays, Asheville, N.C., relative to the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRIZE LETTERS CALL FOR RETENTION OF NATIONAL ANTHEM

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, each year the Anita, Pa., Post Office in Jefferson County sponsors a letterwriting contest for the sixth-grade class of the Parkview Elementary School. Dorothy J. Nelson is the postmistress at the Anita facility. With the assistance of the sixth-grade English teacher, Mrs. Zimmerman, the children choose a topic they wish to write on, do their own research, and submit letters for judging.

This year 29 letters were submitted on the subject of the national anthem. All the letters express very clearly my own feeling that it would be a terrible mistake for Congress to change our national anthem. I am sure that after reading the prize letters, Members of Congress will be as impressed as I am that these representatives of the younger generation are concerned with saving the valuable traditions of our country.

I have appended to my remarks, the

prize-winning letters in the two divisions of the contest. First prize for the girls was captured by Cindy Brown; second prize went to Becky Young; and third prize went to Pam Brady. Douglas Lyle captured the first prize for the boys; Tom Kurtz received second prize; and Kevin Baranoski won third prize.

The prize letters follow:

FIRST PRIZE—GIRLS

ANITA, PA.,
March 26, 1969.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: We are facing a problem. Should we change our National Anthem? Some people want to change our National Anthem just because some notes are too hard to sing. I think this is a very poor way to feel. Everything has to be easy to do these days or no-one is interested in doing it.

Another reason I have heard of its being changed is because it is not modern, which may be true, but the words tell a story that is part of our history. I think it would be very wrong to change our National Anthem because everyone all over the world is familiar with the tune and the story it tells.

Sincerely yours,

CINDY BROWN.

SECOND PRIZE—GIRLS

PUNXSY, PA.,
March 26, 1969.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: I don't think the National Anthem should be changed. It was our first National Anthem to be written, and should be the only one. It was based on what our men were fighting for. It is based on the flag which stands for freedom and what is right. If we changed everything our forefathers have done, we won't have anything to stand for later on in life.

It is like removing a root on which the country was built. It would be like removing something the older people cherished for so long. It would be like parting with an old friend or something that could never be replaced. So I don't think we should change it.

Yours truly,

BECKY YOUNG.

THIRD PRIZE—GIRLS

ANITA, PA.,
March 26, 1969.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: Have you heard that some people would like to change our National Anthem. They would like to change it to My Country 'Tis of Thee, or America the Beautiful. They said it was easier to sing these songs.

I don't think this is right. I don't think we should change it when we have had it for about forty years.

I think Francis Scott Key would be very proud of his poem. But just think how he would feel if someone changed it.

Just as every country has a National flag, every country has a National Anthem, and the one we have now is very beautiful.

John Stafford Smith wrote very beautiful music to Francis Scott Key's poem. He too would be very proud to know that his music became our National Anthem.

The words to the Star-Spangled Banner are beautiful, and have a great meaning. I don't see why anyone would want to change it. As for me, I don't want it to be changed.

Sincerely yours,

PAM BRADY.

FIRST PRIZE—BOYS

REYNOLDSVILLE, PA.,
March 25, 1969.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: I think we should not change the National Anthem.

It has been our heritage since September 1814. The sight of the American flag still flying over Fort McHenry after a fierce battle lasting several days and nights inspired Francis Scott Key to write the song.

With the trouble in our land today the anthem serves as an inspiration to our fighting men stationed all over the world. So I think we should not change the National Anthem.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS LYLE.

SECOND PRIZE—BOYS

PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA.,
March 25, 1969.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: I don't think we should change our National Anthem because it has been our official anthem for 38 years. Its stirring words were written by Francis Scott Key while he was watching the bombardment of Fort McHenry. Some of the words in it are taken from our Bible. If they change the words of the anthem it will not be ours, as it tells the story of our flag.

It is what Key saw and felt in his heart and it is not up to the people to change it. We should all ask ourselves if we want it changed or not.

Yours truly,

TOM KURTZ.

THIRD PRIZE—BOYS

DE LANCEY, PA.,
March 26, 1969.

DEAR MRS. NELSON: Some people want to change the National Anthem and some don't. I think we shouldn't change this song because we have had it for many years. It was written by Francis Scott Key and was adopted as our National Anthem in 1931. It is now part of our history.

All Americans know this song as our National Anthem. If we change this song it would cause much confusion. Some of the famous singers say it is a good anthem. This is why I think we should keep the National Anthem.

Yours truly,

KEVIN BARANOSKI.

KENNEDY, TUNNEY JOIN CALIFORNIA GRAPE BOYCOTT

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the State of California has recently become the center of a nationwide controversy which has led to the boycotting of stores which sell our table grapes.

Legislation is now before the Senate which attempts to settle this controversy and provide necessary guidelines to protect the interests of all concerned—farmers, workers, and the housewife or consumer.

The bill—S. 2203—authored by Senator GEORGE MURPHY is aimed at assuring the uninterrupted flow of an adequate supply of food products from our farms to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for the RECORD a column from the Long Beach, Calif., Press-Telegram, by L. A. Collins, Sr., which I believe discusses this situation very informatively and shows how it is being made a nationwide issue:

KENNEDY, TUNNEY JOIN GRAPE BOYCOTT

(By L. A. Collins, Sr.)

When Sen. Edward Kennedy and Congressman Tunney flew to Calexico to join the farm workers committee seeking to organize grape workers in California they, in effect, endorsed the movement to picket and boycott stores that sell table grapes. The leader of the force is Cesar Chavez from the Delano area where he has been trying to organize the farm workers for several years. Aided by unions in other areas, stores have been picketed in a secondary boycott to put pressure on the growers to accept union control of their farms. If the movement is successful we may expect the same illegal boycott of other California farm products in the organizing effort. Statements by Kennedy and Tunney support this effort which affects not only the workers but also retail stores and consumers.

Their statements on the issue would make it appear the vineyard workers are terribly underpaid and deserve to be organized to bargain with the growers. This is not borne out by the official Crop Reporting Board of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. That report shows California farm workers are the highest paid in the whole United States. The report shows the average for the U.S. is $1.20 an hour. The California rate is shown as $1.60 an hour. A report by the growers shows that grape workers are paid a basic wage of $1.50 an hour. But they are also paid 15 to 25 cents a box they pick. The average on that basis amounts to about $2.50 an hour.

Sen. Kennedy indicates he is trying to help the army of workers who are migrants without homes who are left helpless after the harvest season. Actually about 90 per cent of the grape workers in the Delano district—where the union is concentrating its efforts to organize the workers—are permanent residents of that area. About 5,000 of them work in the vineyards during crop picking seasons. About half that number are employed the year around.

Many of these workers are not heads of families. Many are housewives, students and casuals working the crop season—September through December—to supplement their family income. Most of the family heads are employed the year around irrigating, pruning, stripping, fertilizing and other work in growing the crop. The higher-than-most-farm-worker-incomes have been existent in the Delano area for many years.

It is this better-than-average pay that has given the union so much trouble in signing up workers. The present strike has been going on several months. If the union could sign up a majority of the workers it would have reason to ask the government to enforce negotiations between the union and the growers. The union has failed to get the workers to sign up—so it has taken the road to illegal boycotts hoping to hurt the industry in selling the crops. They have been successful in a few cases where chain stores have discontinued buying the table grapes. But these chains are small in number and the competing stores have more than made up for the lost outlets.

This writer would support NLRB action to assume power over labor-management problems if a majority of the workers signified they wished to be represented by the union. But where this is lacking he supports the growers who are fighting against the higher costs that would be incurred by union domination. The cost of such increases would have to be passed on to consumers.

A DIRECT POPULAR VOTE METHOD

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Connecticut State Chamber of Commerce unanimously adopted a resolution urging the adoption of a direct popular vote method of election for our President and Vice President. Carl N. Hansen, president of the Connecticut State Chamber of Commerce, Inc., wrote to me on May 23, pointing out that both on the national level and within the State of Connecticut there is strong support for electoral reform. His letter provides strong statistical evidence of these sentiments, including the results of several polls, and therefore I would like to bring it to your attention:

MAY 23, 1969.

Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DADDARIO: The following resolution was proposed and unanimously adopted at our Board meeting Wednesday, May 7, 1969:

"The Connecticut State Chamber of Commerce supports abolition of the Electoral College and urges Congress to adopt a direct popular vote method to elect our President and Vice President.

"A direct vote for the President would sweep away possible abuses of the current method, including those that could arise from the right of state legislatures to direct methods of choosing electors, the right of electors to disobey instructions, and the advantages of big states over small states. It would also eliminate the possibility that the popular vote winner would not be elected President."

Popular support for reform is strong both throughout the nation and in Connecticut. A 1966 membership referendum, conducted by the National Chamber of Commerce, revealed that 90% of the respondents favored reform. A nation-wide Gallup Poll, conducted in late 1968, indicated that 80% of those polled support immediate reform of the system. And, a recent survey of over 4,000 employees of the Travelers Insurance Company has revealed that over 80% favor the direct election of the President.

I trust you will give this matter serious consideration.

Sincerely,

CARL N. HANSEN,
President.

TRIBUTE TO HOWARD N. WAYMIRE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Howard N. Waymire, retiring principal of Leuzinger High School in Lawndale, Calif., for his 29 years of outstanding service in the field of secondary education.

Mr. Waymire began his career at Leuzinger High School in 1940 as a teacher of industrial arts. He was appointed chairman of the industrial arts department in 1942 and named boys' vice principal in 1947. In 1950 Mr. Waymire was promoted to director of guidance and curriculum. Ten years later, the Centinela Valley Union High School District board of trustees named Mr. Waymire principal of Leuzinger High. He has served in this capacity for nearly 10 years, providing guidance and leadership to a high school of 2,200 students and 100 faculty members.

Howard Waymire was born in Norwalk, Calif., on April 12, 1908, the son of a successful building contractor. A short time later the Waymire family moved to Overton, Nev., where Howard attended the public schools. In 1926 he graduated from Maopa Valley High School.

Mr. Waymire attended the College of Engineering at the University of Reno, married his wife Vern, and moved to Los Angeles where he received his AB degree in 1939 with a major in English from Occidental College. Later he received a master's degree in education and an administrative credential from the University of Southern California.

It was, however, his abilities in woodworking, machine shop, and welding that got him his first teaching job, and began nearly a three-decade career at Leuzinger.

Mr. Waymire's service to Leuzinger has been closely paralleled with service to the community. He is a member of the Hawthorne Kiwanis Club, the YMCA board, and a founding member of the Fine Arts Association of the Centinela Valley. He was also affiliated with the Hawthorne Symphony Association and the school district's Citizens Advisory Committee.

Mr. Waymire won the respect of faculty members at Leuzinger for his dedicated support of projects in classroom teaching which stress innovative approaches to learning. As one of the strong supporters of fine arts in the school and community, his tenure as principal saw Leuzinger recognized for its outstanding theatrical productions.

On June 11, 1969, Howard Waymire will be honored by a testimonial dinner for his unselfish devotion and dedication to education and the community. It is my privilege to join in saluting Howard N. Waymire for the outstanding job he has done as principal of Leuzinger High School.

OIL PATCH PATRIOTS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the spring issue of Petroleum Today contains an article on the vital national security role of the Emergency Petroleum and Gas Administration and the volunteer executives who man it.

The article features the leadership of Emmett Vaughey, administrator of region 3 of EPGA. A noted and respected independent oil producer of Jackson, Miss. Mr. Vaughey is a worthy example of business executives, who give freely of their time and talents when called to Government service. Because of their love and faith in America, these men perform important missions that have no glamour and little publicity.

I commend the following article to my colleagues:

OIL PATCH PATRIOTS

"Gentlemen, the United States has been attacked by an enemy using nuclear weapons."

The oil executives in the large meeting room stirred uneasily. The government official on the platform glanced at his papers and continued: "The information we now have shows that untold numbers of people have been killed and the oil industry throughout the South has been badly hit.

"The refinery at Pascagoula, Mississippi, is 60 percent destroyed and still burning. Most of the other refineries in the region have been knocked out. A few are still working at full capacity, but they mainly produce fuel oil—not gasoline. Hospitals, civil defense, and the military are clamoring for gasoline, and our surviving storage tanks are only half full.

"All right, gentlemen. What are you going to do about this?"

For Emmett Vaughey, a dapper, white-haired Mississippi oilman sitting in the front row of this Atlanta motel meeting room in December 1968, the words were familiar. He'd heard them before at other similar meetings Government officials had talked dispassionately about nuclear attacks or limited wars like Vietnam, of refineries wrecked or hurriedly converted to wartime fuel production.

The words were also familiar because they were part of a script, a script which had been outlined several years earlier by Vaughey and other oilmen.

Vaughey, a quiet-spoken petroleum executive in his 60's, heads his own independent production company in Jackson, Mississippi. He is also the administrator of Region 3 of the Emergency Petroleum and Gas Administration (EPGA). Region 3 extends from North Carolina to Florida and then west to Mississippi. Vaughey is responsible for mobilizing the petroleum industry in this area during wartime or periods of international unrest. The 75 other men in the Atlanta meeting room were also mostly petroleum industry volunteers.

That morning last winter, Vaughey had looked about the meeting room. Many of the men were ones he himself had recruited. "These are all good men," he remarked. "There's plenty of work piling up back on their office desks while they participate in these test exercises. But they've decided this is a job worth doing. And their companies agree with them about this and let them do it."

The purpose of the Region 3 test exercise was to simulate the problems the men would encounter if their section *were* hit by nuclear bombs. If it happened, these are the men who would apply federal direction to the petroleum industry in their area.

On the podium, John Ricca, deputy director of the Office of Oil and Gas and a full-time "exercise director" with EPGA, was describing other exercises that had been held across the country.

Vaughey nodded at Ricca. "John has a specially tough job. I've just got my 40 volunteers to keep tabs on. But he's got his work with Oil and Gas, and then he's in charge of EPGA. That's eight regions with over 600 men. He's got to run these exercises, evaluate them, plan for new ones. It's a grueling job."

When Ricca finished speaking, exercise kits were handed out and the volunteer reservists quickly walked off to their rooms to work on their particular problems. Though this was only a game exercise, the problem had been carefully prepared by the Office of Oil and Gas staff so as to seem *absolutely* realistic.

Amid a haze of cigarette and cigar smoke, the reservists in the various state groups hung up their jackets and began to hammer out the steps they would take once telephone communications resumed.

"You have to treat the exercise like the genuine thing," one of the reservists later explained. "People are dead, the industry is wrecked, and there you are in a room with a telephone and a pack of cigarettes, and you've got to get the oil and gas moving again. So what do you do?"

Buzz. The first step is simple, the reservists agree. Pick up the phone and get to the governor or the people at the state resource agency. Let them know you are on top of the problem. Now the job becomes more complicated. Get in touch with the refineries and terminal operators. How much fuel do they have? Get to the state resource people who have already pooled tank trucks and barges. What transportation is available? No oil moves without your say-so.

Now—who gets oil first and how do you get it to them? Are there enough operating personnel in the refineries or will you have to bring them in?

Is there enough electricity, water, and gas to run the industry?

One man on a phone in a room arguing, shouting, pleading, with the weight of a mangled industry on his shoulders.

This is the way it would be; and this is what the reservists attempted to describe in a written report during the first day of the EPGA exercises.

As the men worked, Emmett Vaughey circulated about the motel, stopping in at various rooms.

"Our biggest problems are procedural questions. The men wonder about things like, 'Do I have the authority to freeze deliveries?' 'How do I do it?' Fortunately, we have a lot of state resource officials sitting in on the exercise. These are the people we'd be talking to in a real crisis, and they are working out the procedures right here with us."

By the end of the day, most of the now exhausted reservists were finishing up their written reports. The next morning, they convened in the meeting room. It was now assumed, for the purposes of the exercise, that the time was 20 days after the initial nuclear attack. Telephone wires had been repaired and the states in the region could now communicate with regional headquarters and with one another.

"This is where I get busy," says Vaughey. "We divide the room up into regional divisions for transportation, marketing, and refining, and put the various men in each division together. Reports are exchanged. The marketing people work out their major problems and then present them to the refinery people. The refinery people get together with the transportation group to find out how they can get their products moving around the region."

Through the afternoon, Vaughey wandered from group to group. Officially, the exercise was over at 5 p.m., but Vaughey continued to move about the room talking to his volunteers. He missed a flight that was to take him to New Orleans for a business meeting. Finally, almost reluctantly, Vaughey packed and dashed for the airport.

Several days later, sitting in the deep shade behind the porch columns of his Colonial-style home in Jackson, Mississippi, Emmett Vaughey talks about the problems of keeping oil flowing. "You begin with the premise that without petroleum, the nation would come to a standstill. You can't name an industry that doesn't need oil or gas. But there are times, like World War II, when the demands are so great that you have to start balancing priorities. This was why the government created the Petroleum Administration for War, or PAW, back in 1941. It had the incredibly complex job of balancing civilian and industrial oil needs against the requirement for keeping the oil moving to armies all over the world."

Vaughey is no newcomer to the business of moving oil. He got his start in the petroleum industry digging ditches in the Oklahoma oil fields back in the 1920's and according to his own estimate, has done "just about every job you can find in the oil business." During the Korean War, he moved to Washington with his wife and daughter and went to work for the Petroleum Administration for Defense (PAD), which was a successor to PAW.

"But the trouble with both PAW and PAD was that we had to wait till we got into a shooting war before we established them. Then in 1962, the National Petroleum Council, which advises the Secretary of the Interior about oil matters, was asked to correct the situation. In the event of another war, the country couldn't afford to wait months while a new organization was set up. We needed a standby organization that could be activated at a moment's notice. So EPGA was founded in 1963."

Actually, it took two years to work out the basic framework of the new organization, and Emmett Vaughey was one of a group of oilmen who flew up to Washington every month to help hammer out the shape of EPGA. Then Emmett and the others spent another two years developing the training techniques.

Vaughey had nothing but praise for his volunteer reservists. "Most of these men give many days to studying manuals and participating in these exercises. They are doing all this to prepare themselves for something they hope will never happen. It takes character and dedication to work on a job which you hope will never be needed."

EUROPEANS SMILE OVER SST LEAD

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following article from the San Diego Union regarding French and British advances in the development of a supersonic transport. As a nation that has had the unquestioned lead in air transportation, it is inconceivable that we would let Russia, France, and Britain pass us by. We must build the SST and maintain our position in front with the fastest and best aircraft in the world's airlanes.

The article follows:

EUROPEANS SMILE OVER SST LEAD

(By Thomas Nuzum)

PARIS.—France and Britain's flying needle, the Concorde, has given Europe a shot in the arm.

Europe finally has taken the lead over the United States in the key industrial sector of civil aviation, French newspapers chortle as a result of the first flight of the Concorde prototype on March 2 from Toulouse.

The British press has been more reserved about the Anglo-French supersonic transport. Some papers call it a joint triumph in technology. But others note that the plane's 10 years of development was a $2 billion gamble that has yet to pay off commercially.

"It flies but so did the pterodactyl," commented the Manchester Guardian. The pterodactyl was the awkward flying lizard that became extinct.

FRENCH PROUD

The prestige-conscious French are proud that Concorde will use as much power as the Queen Mary. Commercially conscious Britons note that all that power will only fly an average of 130 passengers across the Atlantic.

It will be eight months before test pilot Andre Turcat tries the prototype out at its top speed of 2.05 times the speed of sound. Many more months will pass before it is certain if operating costs will stay within the extremely narrow profit margin of Mach 2 planes.

Profitability will determine whether the two countries can sell 250 Concordes at $20 million each in order to break even.

Military planes only hit supersonic speeds for a few minutes at a time. Concorde must keep it up for two hours straight in order to span the Atlantic in around three hours.

THREE COOLING SYSTEMS

To keep passengers from being fried if the air-conditioning system breaks down, the plane has two other cooling systems in reserve. Although the air temperature is 68 degrees below zero at Concorde's cruising altitude of 65,000 feet, no cool air will be available.

Air will be taken into the air-conditioning system hurling along with the rest of the plane at 1,380 miles an hour. Wing edges, the plane's nose and air intakes will suddenly compress the air so greatly that it will heat up to 261 degrees.

This hot air flowing along the plane's surfaces would bake those inside without unique air-conditioning systems. Air taken into the conditioners will be further compressed by jet turbines until its temperature rises to 1,110 degrees.

This highly compressed air will pass through two heat exchangers in the wings. It will be cooled by the relatively "cool" air outside and by fuel in wing tanks to a mere 390 degrees.

THIRTEEN BELOW ZERO

Then this air will be allowed to decompress as it spurts into pipes along the skin of the fuselage. Decompression will cool the air instantly to 13 degrees below zero.

It is supposed to keep the passengers' cabin at 70 degrees. Air-conditioning problems of America's supersonic transport will be still tougher. At the top speed of 1,800 miles an hour, outside air will be compressed until its temperature is 570 degrees compared with a mere 260 around Concorde.

To penetrate the atmosphere with the least possible air friction, Concorde's fuselage was designated nearly as slender as a needle. It is only 9½ feet wide although 194 feet long. There will only be room for four passengers to sit abreast. The wing span of the production models will be only 33 feet, 10 inches.

Concorde is scheduled to be certified for commercial service in 1973 or 1974.

THE DISGRACE OF INDIFFERENCE TO DISHONOR

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it must be a shock to columnists like Marquis Childs to encounter face to face the nihilistic cynicism of some modern young people. Mr. Childs' description of such an encounter appeared recently in the Washington Star and is as disturbing in retrospect as it must have been in person. For the utter lack of patriotism and loyalty it indicates must result from a failure on the part of parents and teachers. It could not just happen, and it is disturbingly prevalent among the hippie sect—each of whom is somebody's child.

It is as basic a truth as the fact that day follows night that the freedom and material prosperity we now enjoy in America was earned or preserved for us by courageous Americans, many of whom gave their lives in the process.

Each generation must be prepared to risk lives if it is to remain free. Representatives of a society that has possessions or a way of life that other people want must be ready to fight in order to protect and preserve it so that it may be passed on to its children to enjoy.

As for the putrefying characters described by Mr. Childs, they have nothing, for their souls are apparently lost.

We used to reflect on the profound lines of the poem:

> Breathes there a man with soul so dead
> Who never to himself hath said:
> "This is my own, my native land!"

It is tragic that there should be such driftwood in human form in this beautiful land of ours—that is still the land of opportunity if you are willing to apply yourself.

FEARS OF NEW VIOLENCE DARKEN A BRIGHT SPRING DAY AT HARVARD

(By Marquis Childs)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—An obliging legislature having changed three holidays during the year to fall officially on Monday, this state alone among the 50 observed Memorial Day on May 26, thereby making a long weekend. It turned out one of those perfect spring days when in full sun the great elms on Boston Common, in their new green, look as though they had been washed with a brilliant dye.

For Harvard the weekend was a respite, a truce of sorts after the shattering storm—the "bust" as it is called locally—that left the University divided into hostile factions. The 4 a.m. police action to end a sit-in at University Hall stirred passions such as Fair Harvard had never known before.

The fear is that the storm will break again on commencement day, June 12. Whether Harvard will ever be the same is being asked—hopefully by the student left determined to break up the old power structure, and despairingly by many who see the precedent of disruption and violence setting a pattern that will make it impossible to return to the tranquility of the past, when Harvard stood, as all Harvard men believed with no undue humility, in the forefront of scholarship and research.

On this last long weekend before the end of school, Harvard Yard was quiet. For many, exams are still to come and, what with the excitement of rallies, protests, and demonstrations, a lot of extra cramming was going on to make up for lost time.

Liberated spirits among the young sprawled on the banks of the Charles River, Harvard and Radcliffe in happy amity soaking up the sun. Beads, bells, costumes of every weird variety, the Indian predominating—this was Harvard that even 10 years ago would have been unrecognizable.

But the weekend was not all cramming mixed with la dolce vita. Students for a Democratic Society were out on the street corners pushing their radical biweekly, the Old Mole. The name is taken from the quotation from Karl Marx on the masthead, "We recognize our friend, our old mole, who knows so well how to work underground, suddenly to appear: the revolution." Mole is shrewdly, even brilliantly, edited to exploit all the discontents of the young. The first page of the current issue is splashed with red and headlined: "Outcry From Occupied Berkeley." Heavy stress is put on disruption in the high schools as the next front being opened up.

Cliche though it is, "generation gap" says more about what is happening in universities and colleges across the country than anything else. The alienation at times seems to be total. The young have little to say to their elders.

This reporter came on an incident on Cambridge Common that dramatized the alienation with the theatricality that would give a professional dramatist pause. A tall man wearing the uniform of the Disabled American Veterans stood arguing in a closely packed knot of the young. On his overseas cap was the legend Sr. Vice Commander Disabled American Veterans of Massachusetts.

The young were mostly hippie types, bearded, long hair. Cambridge is attracting hippies from all over the country as San Francisco once did. Three men and one young woman had faces painted dead white with symbols around the eyes and mouth, part of a street theatre. They were not hostile to the tall veteran so much as contemptuous.

"I suppose you call yourself a hero, do you?" one of the young men, more conventionally dressed than the others, said.

"No, I don't call myself a hero," the veteran replied. "I was in the Korean War, I was shot up a bit."

"Why did you go?"

"I went because it was my duty."

"Would you say what Stephen Decatur said?" This from one of the painted faces. "'My country, may she always be right, but my country, right or wrong.'"

"Yes, I would say that."

"So even if your country wasn't right, like in Vietnam, you'd go out and shoot 400 gooks."

This brought derisive laughter. A bit later the veteran called it off and shrugged his way out of the crowd. No, he wouldn't give his name? He didn't want publicity. He just wanted to see if you could talk to these people.

The incident took place against the backdrop of a Civil War monument, a standing figure of Lincoln, topped by a uniformed soldier of the Northern army, the sides defaced by swastikas, names, smears daubed on. I stood copying the inscription when a young woman detached herself from another group to say, "What are you copying down there, you big four-letter word. We'll make you pay for copying that."

The inscription was:

"The soldiers and sailors of Cambridge whose names are inscribed here died in the service of their country in the war for the maintenance of the Union. In perpetual memory of their valor and patriotism . . ."

SALUTE TO GENERAL KOSTER

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of West Liberty recently paid tribute to one of their outstanding citizens, Maj. Gen. Samuel W. Koster. General Koster is presently serving as Superintendent of the Military Academy at West Point. I join wholeheartedly in the tribute paid to General Koster by the citizens of West Liberty and by a recent editorial in the Muscatine Journal:

WEST LIBERTY'S SALUTE

West Liberty paid tribute yesterday to one of its sons who has gained distinction in the service of this nation.

Major General Samuel W. Koster, superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point, came back to the hometown Tuesday to be the commencement speaker for the West Liberty High school senior class of 1969.

General Koster was the guest of honor at a luncheon sponsored Tuesday noon by the West Liberty Chamber of Commerce. It was a chance for him to greet many of the friends he knew as a boy in West Liberty and his schoolmates from the Class of '37.

Willard Salemink, West Liberty Chamber of Commerce president, summarized the situation accurately when he said "We often have commencement speakers who tell the graduates to set their objectives, work hard and attain their goals. Today, we honor a man who has done exactly this."

Dr. John Carey, a lifelong friend who introduced General Koster at the luncheon, recalled that "Sam" was a perfectionist and a good student. He was also a school athlete, "the center on two of the better basketball teams this high school ever produced."

General Koster graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1942. He is a veteran of World War II and the Korean conflict. He was commander of the 23rd Infantry Division in Vietnam until he was named in June, 1968, as superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

West Liberty has a right to be proud of General Samuel W. Koster. He has served this country faithfully in war and peacetime, and continues to serve in the important job of educating the young men who will be the backbone of the Army officer corps in the future.

PROBLEM OF PERSISTENT PESTICIDES

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to counter the serious threat to the environment, fish and wildlife, and man posed by the indiscriminate use of persistent pesticides. To meet this danger, I am proposing two bills: The first would ban the use of DDT in the United States; and the second would establish a National Commission on Pesticides to improve the effectiveness of pesticides and to eliminate their hazards to the world we live in.

Well documented research has indicated that pesticides are a basic cause of serious disruption of the ecological balance, of permanent injury and death to fish and wildlife, and a potential threat to the health and welfare of the general public. The persistent pesticides do not disintegrate rapidly—for example, DDT remains about 50-percent toxic for 10 years—and thus accumulate in sufficient concentration to kill wildlife and fish through the poisoning of foodstuffs they eat or by interfering with reproduction.

Scientists have discovered decreasing reproduction rates in both birds and fish. In many birds, DDT and other persistent pesticides have caused a thinness of the eggshell, thereby increasing egg breakage and decreasing overall reproductive success. This phenomenon has brought the penguin of the Antarctic, the petrel of Bermuda, and the bald eagle and peregrine falcon of the United States to the point of extinction.

At the same time, many fish face reproduction problems because these pesticides penetrate the yolk sac and poison the main source of young fish. This phenomenon caused the death of a million coho salmon fry last spring. Only recently, the Food and Drug Administration impounded 28,150 pounds of Lake Michigan coho salmon. The FDA found that the salmon contained 19 parts per million of DDT and three-tenths of a part per million of Dieldrin—both levels considered hazardous by both the FDA and the World Health Organization.

Many scientists are concerned that the reproduction capabilities of other fish may be harmed. This is especially so in the case of lake trout, which spend 6 or 7 years in the water before sexual maturity as compared with only about 2 years for the salmon. The New York Health Commission has, in fact, reported that high concentrations of DDT are being found in the lake trout of New York's central and northern lakes.

What is especially frightening about the ever-increasing number of cases of affected wildlife and fish is that the pesticides have managed to travel so far to reach the animal in question. Thus, in order to infect the coho salmon, DDT and Dieldrin probably traveled hundreds of miles through air, water, and soil, and were consumed through the normal food chain of up to half dozen organisms. Moreover, the Bermuda petrel never go to the mainland and there certainly is no DDT spraying in the Antarctic where penguins are becoming extinct.

The effect of the wide use of these pesticides on man are just beginning to become apparent. At the 1968 Lake Michigan Water Pollution Conference, spokesmen for the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries testified that the concentration of pesticides could reach a level lethal to man and aquatic life if the heavy use of pesticides is continued. During a recent conference on pesticides in Stockholm, evidence was presented that DDT, even in very small quantities, could affect human metabolism. One of the studies cited was Russian research that indicated that Russian workers whose jobs bring them in contact with DDT and other organochlorine pesticides were found to suffer from changes in the liver which slowed down the elimination of wastes from the body.

Dr. Robert Risebrough, an environmental scientist at the University of California at Berkeley, stated that the effect on man may be serious. He has found enough accumulation in man to stimulate enzyme production, which acts as catalysts for bodily processes, such as digestion. And more recently, a Swedish scientist found that breast-fed infants are ingesting twice the amount of DDT compounds recommended as a maximum daily intake by the World Health Organization. What is perhaps most frightening is the likelihood that these findings represent merely the top of an iceberg.

In the United States, two committees have pointed out the dangers of environmental pollution caused by pesticides. The Wiesner Committee in 1963 urged cutbacks in the use of such persistent pesticides as DDT:

The accretion of residues in the environment (should) be controlled by orderly reduction in the use of persistent pesticides. As a first step, the various agencies of the Federal government might restrict wide-scale use of persistent insecticides, except for necessary control of disease vectors. The Federal agencies should exert their leadership to induce the States to take similar actions. *Elimination* of the use of persistent toxic insecticides should be the goal. (Emphasis added).

The report of the environmental pollution panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee in 1965 also dealt with this subject. It recommended:

Research should be encouraged toward the development of pesticides with greater specificity, additional modes of action, and more rapid degradability than many of those in current use.

Pesticide effectiveness should be increased and total environmental contamination decreased by further research leading to the more efficient application of pesticides to the target organisms.

Reaction around the world is only beginning to take form. Sweden has just banned the use of DDT for a period of at least 2 years. According to the London Observer, this is the first time any nation has instituted such a sanction on a pesticide.

Several States in the United States have recently started to meet the problem. Arizona, concerned with increased residues of DDT in milk and other food products, has banned DDT for 1 year. The Pennsylvania State Senate Committee has recommended banning DDT from use in the fields and forests.

Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin have already issued recommendations against the use of DDT for the Dutch elm disease, one of the primary targets of DDT use in the United States today.

It is time that we, too, recognize the dangers of pesticides. I think the case for banning DDT is clear, particularly since other less persistent pesticides are now recommended for the areas where DDT was previously used. Moreover, a permanent National Commission on Pesticides would provide a significant step toward better and safer control of our environment. We must act today, Mr. Speaker, before any permanent damage is done to man and his environment.

PACKAGING AND LABELING ASPECTS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO THE CONSUMER

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Melleng, a very active senior citizen who lives in Kearny, N.J., was kind enough to send me an article from Consumer Bulletin, which is worthy of the attention of all Members of this House and all persons who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article deals with deceptive methods of packaging and points out the need for stricter regulation to prevent consumer frauds.

Mr. Speaker, I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

PACKAGING AND LABELING ASPECTS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO THE CONSUMER

It is said that the public and Congressional concern about deceptive packaging rumpus started because Senator Hart discovered that the boxes of shredded wheat consumed by him, Mrs. Hart, and their children were becoming higher and narrower, with a decline of the net weight from 12 to 10¼ ounces, without any reduction in price. There were still twelve biscuits, but they had been reduced in size. Later, the Senator rightly complained of a store-bought pie in a handsomely illustrated box that pictured, in a single slice, almost as many cherries as there were in the whole pie.

The manufacturer who increases the unit price of his product by changing his package size to lower the quantity delivered can, without undue hardship, put his product into boxes, bags, and tins that will contain even 4-ounce, 8-ounce, one-pound, two-pound quantities of breakfast foods, cake mixes, detergents. A study of drug store and supermarket shelves will convince any observer that all possible sizes and shapes of boxes, jars, bottles, and tins are in use at the same time, and, as the packaging journals show, week by week, there is never any hesitation in introducing a new size and shape of carton or bottle when it aids in product *differentiation*. The producers of packaged products argue stoutly against changing sizes of packages to contain even weights and volumes, but no one in the trade comments unfavorably on the huge costs incured by endless changes of package sizes, materials, shapes, art work, and net weights that are used *for improving a product's market position*.

When a packaging expert explained that he was able to multiply the price of hard candies by 2½, from $1 to $2.50 by changing to a fancy jar, or that he had made a 5-ounce bottle look as though it held 8 ounces, he was in effect telling the public that packaging can be a very expensive luxury. It evidently does come high, when an average family pays about $200 a year for bottles, cans, boxes, jars and other containers, most of which can't be used for anything but stuffing the refuse can or the trash burner.

An article in Supermarket Merchandising noted that wrapped in Avisco cellophane "plebeian mixtures of ground ham and pork" go at $1.39 a pound, all because "of the garnish of a pineapple ring and a red cherry"—"Not a bad way of handling ham and pork scraps that were formerly discarded."

"Six rosettes" of ground chuck were "quality priced" at "6 cents more per pound to cover additional handling and packaging materials." Mr. X's "smart tricks have yielded smart profits," the article concludes.

THE CONSUMER'S RIGHT TO COMPARE

Packagers resent the idea of having commodities compared on cost-per-ounce basis; this, they hold, degrades the brand concept and disregards quality differences. Yet they may as well get used to this idea of price comparison, for government agencies intend to aid consumers in comparing unit prices; the point is strongly made and emphasized in the law itself, in its very first paragraph.

Packages and their labels should enable consumers to obtain accurate information as to the quantity of the contents, and should facilitate value comparisons. That's what the law says. In that respect, it's not a bad law. We doubt that the principle will be soundly implemented.

THE NEW LAW

The new Fair Packaging and Labeling Law has major defects, among which are: *1*) the fact that its administration is divided among three government agencies, with very different outlooks and approaches to problems of industry and consumers; *2*) the door is opened wide to an endless, unmanageable series of hearings and regulations (Regulations already total about 40,000 words and their language is so intricate and involved and in so many cases related to clauses in prior legislation affecting the scope and details of the work of the Food and Drug

Administration and the Federal Trade Commission that only big business concerns can afford the staff and legal counsel which will make the rules understandable); *3*) it allows slack filling if it is "functional," which means that slack fill is permitted if it "helps to protect the contents," or if the manufacturer chooses to fill by an inherently inaccurate method because it is fast, the law will not stop him. (It has not stopped him in the past, under previous legislation, because the trial court held that the manufacturer's convenience was more important than a design of package that would not deceive the consumer); *4*) as to the vital matter of naming the ingredients, a major loophole is provided in that no "trade secret" need be divulged; *5*) many products are excluded from the operation of the new law; meats and meat products, poultry and poultry products, tobacco and its products, seeds, insecticides and fungicides, certain drugs, liquors, certain containers; *6*) postponements of enforcement are freely permitted—as they were under the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act—when the bureau chief considers this to be "in the public interest."

Hereafter, competition on the basis of small differences of weight or volume may not be the unquestioned right of the manufacturers; we may be coming to a stage where standardized weights and volumes of packages of cereals and cake mixes are to be expected, such as we now have with flour, bread, beans, sugar, and many other commodities. Figures in even ounces, pints, and half pints, without the familiar 0.1 and ⅞ ounce appendages, are surely coming, as the government gets deeper into the problem of control of packaging.

INCOMPLETE ADDRESSES PERMITTED

The new packaging law requires, as did the Food and Drug Act, that the package shall give the address of the producer or distributor, but the Federal Trade Commission has "interpreted" the law, paralleling a long-established similar ruling by the Food and Drug Administration, to mean that the address *need not be* one that will enable the Post Office Department to deliver a letter to the firm in question.

We hold that the address provided on the label on the package should be one that is sufficiently complete and detailed that the consumer can use it to make contact with the manufacturer or distributor on any product which he happens to have bought and about which he may wish to enter a complaint for replacement of or redress for an unsatisfactory article.

The reasoning of the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission as to why the full address is not necessary is too long to give here. It will suffice to say that on this the governmental reasoning is entirely unconvincing.

The consumer should not be required to locate a city directory or telephone directory of a distant city to find out how he can reach by letter or telegram the maker of Boffo corn flakes or Pinko brand bug spray. In case of poisoning of a child, as happens often with household articles, it may be a matter of the utmost importance that the physician be able to make *immediate* contact with a manufacturer of an insecticide or oven cleaner to identify some ingredients of the product. The manufacturer should, as a plain duty to the public, go beyond the government requirement and furnish his full name and address on the package label and in all accompanying wrappings, boxes, or booklets.

We believe that consumers may expect a long period of ineffective and unsatisfactory enforcement of the new law. This will come in part from the inherently involved nature of governmental procedures, the complication that the law is enforced by three different bureaus, and in part from the fact that the law as passed is obscure in meaning and the regulations under it as set up by the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission are exceedingly involved and capable of being understood only by highly-paid professionals.

The law can do some good with its labeling provisions and its expected reduction of diversity, but there are some who doubt whether the results will be worth the cost to industry and the taxpayer. It would be far better if the industry were to set its own house in order, without government compulsion, by voluntary standardization of package sizes and weights, elimination of slack fill and deceptive package shapes, use of large, clear, contrasting lettering showing weights and ingredients, lettering meant to be located and read quickly, and last, by bringing the light of reason to package designers who tend to work too close to the edge of legality and sound business ethics.

Industrial leaders should bear in mind that to avoid serious and costly trouble with the anti-trust laws, groups of business firms setting up standardization committees to establish package sizes, weights, and labeling principles, *must* include fair representation of consumers and those government departments that are properly concerned with a particular commodity.

LIFE ON THE FARM IS GREAT BUT IT SHOULD PAY BETTER

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, Laurel Hannegrefs, a student at Minot State College, Minot, N. Dak., presented to me in a recent letter some views on the current farm situation which I would like to share with my colleagues. I believe they will be especially interested in the discussion of the values of rural living and the fact that low farm prices are destroying this cherished way of life. The text of the letter follows:

LIFE ON THE FARM IS GREAT BUT IT SHOULD PAY BETTER

This letter is a response to the questionnaire my parents received in the mail recently. The issue about which I wish to comment is federal legislation to help increase grain prices for the farmers. The price of everything else in this country seems to be skyrocketing but that of grain. Farmers must buy high-priced equipment but they do not get enough income from their crops to pay for the machinery. Therefore, most farmers find themselves so far in debt that they have to worry and work the rest of their lives to get out.

Maybe I'm prejudiced because I grew up on a farm, but I feel that if something were done to increase farm prices, a few other problems would be taken care of, too. For one thing, if grain prices were increased, there would very likely be a reduction in the migration from rural to urban areas. Farmers are forced to give up and look for work in the cities if they don't receive enough money for their grain to support their families. Therefore, if grain prices were increased so that farmers could support families, it follows that they would be less anxious to look for work in the cities and more content to stay on the farm.

Another problem which might be affected by a price increase in grain is the youth problem—the unrest and dissatisfaction in youth today. I grew up on a farm and I will never regret it. I feel farm children discover a world that city children never get the real opportunity to see. It is a difficult world to describe, but it involves freedom, beauty, appreciation of animals and nature. It is living with nature and God and appreciating them both. A young person who grows up on a farm seems to be less restless and dissatisfied because he can find so many things to do on a farm. City children, however, have such a limited play area and limited activities that they often resort to pranks and trouble to occupy their time. As they grow older, they need cars and beverages to create excitement.

Farm youth often resort to such things, too, but there may be less chance of it because they have duties to attend to on the farm. Farm children find a freedom from all the people, cars, and other city problems. They find security within their own families whose members often work closely together to keep the farm going. City youth are often so unfamiliar with this freedom and security due to their city problems that they turn to rebellion and demonstrations. But if more children are to be given the opportunity to grow up on a farm, the grain prices must be increased so that their parents can afford to live on a farm and raise their children on it.

Yes, the small farmers are becoming the victims of many problems including income and competition from big farmers. One of the main solutions may be an increase in grain prices so that farmers can continue to enjoy the freedom and security of their homes and land.

WHEN JOHNNY COMES MARCHING HOME

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, in these times of tension and turmoil, it would seem appropriate to remind America and our friends that the U.S. Government is not sitting still.

Steps are being taken; progress being made. We know of the various social programs designed to make life more livable for black Americans and those burdened with ghetto birth.

But little is known of the work in this field which is being done by the Department of Defense, to many minds an improbable agency for social betterment. Among the Department's programs is project transition, which is of particular interest to me since I am able to observe it at first hand. There is a project transition at Fort Lewis, Wash., which is located in the district I represent in Congress.

From July 1, 1968, through March 31, 1969, more than 1,900 soldiers received training in skills in the Fort Lewis program, and another 3,500 received vocational counseling. Business, industry, schools, and the Federal Government participate in this excellent cooperative program to prepare servicemen to make the transition from service life to civilian life. More important in most cases, it enables them to make the vital transition from a disadvantaged past to a promising future.

One of the most distinguished of foreign correspondents in Washington, D.C., has done the people of America and Great Britain a real service in bringing such efforts to their attention. He is Donald Ludlow, Washington correspondent for the Daily Mirror, one of the most widely circulated newspapers in the world.

Mr. Ludlow has had a most distinguished career gathering news in many parts of the world, including many years in the United States. His perceptive story in the May 16 editions of the Daily Mirror outlines the background of "Black Johnny" in the armed services, and what happens when our black servicemen come home.

I commend his story to the attention of my colleagues.

I insert the story as follows:

In a death cell at the State penitentiary in Columbus, Ohio, sits bearded Fred "Ahmed" Evans, Black militant and former sergeant in the American Rangers, a Commando outfit.

His crime: leading a shooting spree that killed three police officers and a Negro passerby, an incident that sparked off three days of race riots in Cleveland, Ohio, with arson and looting and cost seven more lives. Three of Evans's followers have yet to be tried for murder.

Evans, 37, won his stripes in Korea, re-enlisted, lost his stripes, hit a White officer, served eighteen months' hard labor in an Army prison and was given a dishonorable discharge.

He has been described as "a nonviolent man who preached Black pride." But blood is on his hands. Unless he is reprieved, Evans will be the first man to go to the electric chair in America in two years and the first in Ohio in six years.

His fate is not so important as the fears that men of his calibre, trained in the arts of killing and guerrilla war, have aroused in the hearts of White and moderate Black America.

The middle class of both races, angry with each other but prepared to talk rather than fight it out, are asking: What happens when Black Johnny comes marching home from Vietnam?

The average age of the returning Negro serviceman will be about twenty-two-and-a-half; he will be restless, "battle-prone," highly skilled in the use of all kinds of weapons and explosives—and himself explosive material for the racial tensions to which he will be returning.

The risks of battle aside, he will have lived well in the Forces with good food, good clothing, money in his pocket. He will not be prepared to live less well, much less see his family in the squalor of the ghettos.

Just how dangerous an element in American society, already torn with unrest, is Black Johnny likely to be?

First some figures: currently there are some 66,000 Black Americans in the Vietnam Forces, 45,000 in the Army, 8,700 in the Marines, 9,300 in the Air Force and 2,800 in the Navy.

Negroes make up 10.7 per cent of the total of American servicemen in Vietnam—little short of the 11 per cent which his people represent in America's total population.

Black Johnny is certainly doing his share in Vietnam by anybody's standards and he will want his share when he comes back.

Will he turn from war abroad to civil war at home?

Views vary widely. With crime rampant in the streets of every American city—ninety killings in Washington this year—fear will obviously mount at the return of the young Black lions.

The White House, the Pentagon and Congress are well aware of this fear and are trying to "cool" it. A questioner is answered by a question: Why should a Black Vietnam veteran be any more dangerous than a White Vietnam veteran?

The questioner is reminded that after every war the civilians have been frightened of the returning soldier: "They have given him a gun and taught him how to use it."

Just the same, this time greater efforts than ever before are being made to see that the Vietnam veteran—Black and White—should be helped to readjust to civilian life.

The Pentagon is running a multimillion dollar scheme called "Operation Transition" which, during the last six months of a young veteran's service, is designed to better his lot in life. He can get a high school diploma and if he has not acquired a skill in the services he will be taught one.

Private industry is co-operating, notably the giant motor car makers of Detroit, always looking for good mechanics. The American branch of Volkswagen has joined in the scheme.

Operation Transition has been going less than two years but the results seem rewarding. And Black Johnny is taking more advantage of it than White Johnny—twenty per cent of the trainees are black, double their percentage in the Forces.

By the end of June, one thousand men will have been trained as law officers—and a fifth of them will be Black.

The Veterans Administration, a branch of the Pentagon, with a budget of 7,000 million dollars a year, is offering bigger and better benefits such as: cheap medical care, educational care, support through college, even, if a man is married, cheap insurance, guaranteed housing loans, widows' pensions and child support. And Black Johnny is taking advantage of these benefits to get ahead.

Black veterans are also re-enlisting in the Services at much higher rates than their White comrades. Here are the figures:

Army: Whites 12.8 *per cent, Blacks* 31.7 *per cent.*

Navy: Whites 16.7 *per cent, Blacks* 22.5 *per cent.*

Marines: Whites 9.7 *per cent, Blacks* 15.9 *per cent.*

Air Force: Whites 17.5 *per cent, Blacks* 26.9 *per cent.*

A top official of the House Armed Services Committee told the other day about a young Negro veteran who came to ask his Congressman to help him get back into the Army after Black militants had been pressuring him to join them.

The young Negro said: "Man, I've seen enough of war. None of the leaders have seen a real battle and know what it means. We Black men can fight for our rights, but if we fight with guns we're sure going to lose."

War is an ugly thing, but it does have a maturing quality.

INFLATION COSTS MULTIPLY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, redundant as it may sound, inflation is our most serious national problem. The fire from this destructive force caused by feeding champagne appetites on beer incomes, has so rotted and destroyed our socioeconomic bases that we must face the possibility of our Nation crumbling.

Certainly we live in a fools' world to continue our spend-happy ways and to be completely oblivious to the deepening smoke and heat arising from the fire below us.

The editor of one of the great daily newspapers in Minnesota, the St. Cloud Daily Times gives us an on-the-spot analysis of the great damage that reckless spending has already done. In order to share Mr. Harold Schoelkopf's views, I am reproducing his editorial:

INFLATION COSTS MULTIPLY

(By Harold Schoelkopf)

One of the gravest domestic problems that face the American people is inflation, and there seems to be no sure or certain remedy for it.

The American dollar, once worth 100 cents, has declined in value, at latest calculations, to something like 42 cents in buying power.

Of course, almost all residents of this country suffer from inflation, but those who are hardest hit are those who live on fixed incomes—the pensioners, the retired persons on pensions, the folks whose incomes have not kept pace with the inflationary spirals, and those whose incomes have not increased. There are even wage earners who still live on incomes set 10 to 20 years ago, and who now are forced to dip into frugal savings to meet current bills.

Meanwhile the costs of almost everything are going up and up. Our tax bills zoom upward to heights unimagined even a few years ago. The social security deductions from pay checks move higher and higher. Even our little items like fishing licenses cost more these days, and there is no apparent end in sight.

While these costs increase, those on fixed incomes are more and more moved to seek relief on public welfare payrolls, and these in turn have reached levels undreamed of. A lot of independent people who thought they had laid aside an adequate "nest egg" for their declining years, are forced to turn to the counties for enough money to give them their daily bread.

There are other folks, who have reached and passed the normal retirement ages, who cannot quit their jobs simply because the costs of their simple living cannot be met by whatever retirement incomes they may have, or the supplemental social security checks.

Retirement incomes or pensions, in some instances available only to a favored few, fall far short of providing the incomes needed for a modest livelihood, and so more and more elderly folks, who have worked most of their lives to make a living, are forced to turn to the relief rolls, or if they are still able, to try to secure some other "moonlight" jobs to make ends meet.

There used to be a time, and not so many years ago, either, as time is measured, when prudent, hard-working wage earners could set aside a few dollars a week or a month in a savings account to provide for the sunset years of life, but those times have long since passed. Now the government, federal and state, dips into those savings, and takes its lion's share of an accumulated interest, and in many cases, requires that the principal sums be included to meet tax demands.

Those of us who are now figuring our state and federal income taxes are well aware of this situation, and there is little if any relief in sight.

Taxes on homesteads, that some families have taken years to acquire, are growing so high that the householders are not any longer able to meet their tax bills, and must give up their lifetime homes to seek much more modest domiciles. The number of families forced to sell their homesteads at bargain prices is growing year by year, and the elderly folks pay the ultimate penalty of parting with their homes or having them taken from them.

These things happen in an America that prides itself on its great prosperity, the growth of its national product, the affluence of so many of its people, but what is overlooked is the fate of so many millions of the little folks who have no relief, no redress, no forum in which to express their hardships.

Yes, indeed, this is a rich (although perilously close to a bankrupt nation) but the riches of the domain do not filter down to the people most deserving of help and consideration. Many of those elder citizens who held their heads high in past years as home owners and prompt taxpayers, are finding it next to impossible to meet their ever increasing costs of mere survival.

This is a prosperous thriving America? There are millions of persons who like to have that statement spelled out in plain language.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON SUPPORTS AMENDMENT TO EQUALIZE DISTRIBUTION FORMULA OF FUNDS IN THE MEDICAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION AND MODERNIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1969

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, my colleague from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) is offering an amendment to the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1969 to eliminate the inequitable distribution of funds in the bill which favors predominately rural States.

As a Congressman whose district and State are severely affected by this inequity, and is in dire need for additional medical facilities, I fully support Mr. OTTINGER's proposal.

The Hill-Burton distribution formula was fine in 1946—it was intended to stimulate the growth of much needed hospitals in underdeveloped States. That need has been largely met. It is now an out-dated formula because of the needs of larger numbers of people in the more populous States.

Mr. OTTINGER's proposal will not increase the total amount authorized in this bill. It will merely allocate funds more fairly based solely on population, per capita income, and need for facilities. It will assure that the people of all States are treated fairly.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

CHARLES J. EIB—ONE OF THE "GOOD PEOPLE"

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, each and every one of us serving in Congress must stand up to the buffetings of daily controversies. We attempt to reflect by our actions the wishes of our constituents so that our work will give meaning to the phrases "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." We try our best, but we do make mistakes.

Yet, when we face an uncertain outlook, when we are beset by doubts, when the choices to be made are all without promise, we do what we must because each of us is sustained by the confidence and trust of certain individuals whom we know to be "good people" back home.

They are the Americans who form the solid moral base on which all of our national power has been built. They work. They build. They hold organizations together. They set the tone of life in their communities. They take satisfaction from every good fortune met by every neighbor. Each and every one of them is irreplaceable.

Today it is my melancholy duty to take note of the passing of one such man, Charles Johnson Eib, owner and editor of the weekly Nicholas Chronicle published at Summersville, W. Va., in my congressional district. For 55 years he was connected in one way or another with weekly newspapers. During those years he was a vital and constructive force among the people of the area he served. Like many other persons who knew him, I shall miss his calm and rational counsel and his energetic good cheer. He came, he was with us for a span of years, he helped whoever he could however he was able, and now he is gone and we are the poorer for his passing.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to your attention the obituary of the late Charles Johnson Eib, along with a tribute to him by the Reverend L. Bruce Cooper and an excerpt from Publisher's Auxiliary which reported the start of his career 20 years ago:

CHARLES J. EIB

Charles Johnson Eib, 67 years of age of Summersville, Nicholas County, died Saturday morning, May 24, 1969, in the Charleston Memorial Hospital following a long illness. He was the son of the late Charles Burton and Maude Johnson Eib and was born at Peel Tree in Barbour County on the 21st day of May, 1902.

He was a member of: the First United Methodist Church of Summersville, the Board of Stewards, the Summersville Lodge A.F. & A.M. No. 76, the B.P.O.E., the Summerville Lions Club, the Summersville Chamber of Commerce, and a former official in the West Virginia press association.

Mr. Eib was Editor of the Buckhannon Record at the time of his graduation from Wesleyan College. He acquired a Journalism Degree from West Virginia University and was once selected by the Publishers Auxiliary as Editor of the Week, a national recognition, while he was owner and publisher of the Barbour Democrat at Philippi. He had been owner and publisher of the Nicholas Chronicle at Summersville, for the past eight years.

He is survived by his wife, Kathryn Jane Kincaid Eib, of Summersville, two sisters, Miss Irene Eib and Mrs. Blair Simons, both of Elkins. One niece, Mrs. Carl J. Johnson, Jr., and one great niece, Miss Kristen Johnson, both of Upper Mont Clair, N.J.

Funeral services were conducted Monday afternoon at 2 p.m., at the First United Methodist Church at Summersville with the Rev. Virgil Ware officiating, assisted by the Rev. L. Bruce Cooper and burial followed in the Walker Memorial Park at Summersville.

[From the Summerville (W. Va.) Nicholas Chronicle, May 29, 1969]

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES J. EIB

(By Rev. L. Bruce Cooper)

Some seven or eight years ago, Charles and Jane Eib came to our town, to become neighbors and citizens with us. Being a Pastor of long service, I have watched the Town develop and grow. I soon discovered that we have received valuable citizens with the coming of Charles and his good wife to be with us. I found Charles to be a Christian gentleman in every respect. He soon became one of the leaders in helping to make this a better town and place to live.

He was for every good program both for the expansion and development of the Town, as well as one who tried always to keep a spirit of warmth and good will among all our citizens. He was never on guard to keep anything out that would divide and bring anything mean or ugly within our mids't. Charles was a Methodist and was educated in the Methodist School. Yet, he seemed that in some way he too, belonged to me. It must have been because he was interested in all Ministers and Churches, while he was loyal to his own. He was a member of our Team, the team that is ever working for the betterment of Summersville, and the happiness and pleasure of our people. God must be especially pleased with those who do justly and love mercy and walk humbly with their Lord year after year. Of their reward, the half has never yet been told. John Bunyan, in his immortal "Pilgrim's Progress" describes the Christian pilgrims when they reached the gates of the Celestial City. According to his description several of the King's Messengers came out to meet them. These were clothed in white and shining rainment, and their melodious voices echoed throughout heaven. They greeted the pilgrims at the gate. Over the gate was written. "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they have the right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." The bells ring for Christian and his companion, and the Messengers said "Enter ye into the joy of our Lord." Good bye Charles, for a little while, we'll see you in the morning.

[From Publisher's Auxiliary]

EDITOR-OF-THE-WEEK: EIB WAS INDUSTRIOUSLY WEEDING POTATO PATCH WHEN PUBLISHER SAW HIM AND OFFERED A JOB

This is Charles Eib's birthday. The editor of the Barbour Democrat and the Philippi (W. Va.) Republican was born 47 years ago today, May 21, in Barbour county, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Eib. He attended Belington high school and West Virginia Wesleyan college.

He started his 35-year newspaper career when he was but 12 years of age. He was working in the garden of his home, cutting out the weeds in the rows between the potatoes.

"Being in a hurry," he explained. "I was making the weeds fly, so that I could take part in a ball game which was in progress on a neighboring lot.

"Fred E. Thompson, then publisher of the Belington Progressive, a weekly in our home town, happened to pass along the street and seeing that I appeared to be industrious, stopped and offered me a job in his printing plant," Eib continues.

So began a career that included at the outset, sweeping out the shop, running errands and setting type and, years later, editing such West Virginia papers as the Buckhannon Record, Grafton Press, Follansbee Review and the Preston Republican in Terra Alta and operating jobs on other dailies and weeklies in West Virginia and Ohio.

"When Mr. Thompson purchased a typesetting machine, his sister became the regular operator," Eib recalled, "But a few months later she was offered another job, and I became the operator.

"I didn't particularly care for the printing office at first, but the $3 a week . . . came in mighty handy, so I stayed with the Progressive until I completed high school. Of course, I received several raises from my starting salary. I stayed in the business because it offered steady employment at good wages. This work often meant long hours, but as long as one had the will to work, there was always an opportunity to make a good livelihood."

Then there was the time an auto dealer asked him to buy a new car.

"I explained I had just taken over the paper (in his home town) and was not able to make the purchase at that time," Eib said. "He insisted that I buy, and told me that he would take care of the financial end. I bought the car, and in a few weeks I received a large advertising order from a national gasoline company, for which the auto man was distributor, which amounted to within a few dollars of the price of the car.

"Neighboring publishers could not understand how I got such a large advertising order."

In Eib's opinion, the newspaper business may not be the best profession in the world, and perhaps not the most profitable, but it is one which continually offers a challenge—"to produce a better paper, to turn out a better printing job, to put over a community project."

"Then, too, there are always obstacles to be overcome," he adds. "Such as a balky machine, a new process, or new ideas to work out; one never needs to worry about what will happen next."

Eib says he has found it difficult to accumulate anything, either in equipment or money, when working on a fixed salary. It's easier, he claims, "to accumulate a little more of this world's goods as one goes along than it would be working on a fixed salary."

Eib's first venture into politics didn't prove as successful as his expertness at hoeing potatoes. He was a candidate for delegate to Democratic national convention, but ran fourth in a four-man race—"and so became cured." Formerly, he was Democratic chairman of Barbour county. He also is a former secretary of the West Virginia Journalism conference and his local Rotary club. At present, he is active in the Kiwanis club, Masons, Elks and Moose.

As to hobbies, Eib notes:

"For the past three years, I have found little time to indulge in them. Heretofore, I have been a wide reader; I like movies, too. Also, bridge, good plays, golf. Used to like tinkering with radios, and was interested in an amateur station, but have given this up. Like sports of all kinds, because sports, like life, often offer the unexpected at the most unexpected times."

AMERICA'S TURMOIL

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing need for our citizens to clearly understand and be genuinely concerned about the turmoil abroad in our land. The following speech which appeared in the June 9, 1969, issue of the U.S. News & World Report by James L. Robertson, Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, is one of the best I have read on this subject.

A "CONCERNED CITIZEN" SPEAKS ABOUT AMERICA'S TURMOIL

(A most unusual speech was made on May 22 in Omaha, Nebr., by James L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. It was not reported generally in the press because it was delivered by a banker talking to bankers, and he would normally be expected to discuss financial matters. But he didn't. Instead, he addressed himself in a most penetrating way to the problem of the hour in America—the disturbances and disorders and threats of revolution, particularly among the nation's youth.

(Mr. Robertson has had a wide experience in government, first as a clerk in the U.S. Senate Post Office and later as a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. After graduate work at Harvard Law School, he joined the legal staff of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and rose to the post of First Deputy Comptroller. He has been a member of the Federal Reserve Board for 17 years, three of these as Vice Chairman. The full text of his speech is printed below.—DAVID LAWRENCE, Editor.)

(By James L. Robertson, Vice Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System)

A truck driver was sitting all by himself at the counter of the Neverclose Restaurant down by the depot in my hometown, Broken Bow, Nebraska. The waitress had just served him when three swaggering, leather-jacketed motorcyclists—of the Hell's Angels type—rushed in, apparently spoiling for a fight. One grabbed the hamburger off his plate; another took a handful of his French fries; and the third picked up his coffee and began to drink it.

The trucker did not respond as one might expect of a Nebraskan. Instead, he calmly rose, picked up his check, walked to the front of the room, put the check and his half-dollar on the cash register, and went out the door. The waitress followed him to put the money in the till and stood watching out the window as he drove off. When she returned, one of the cyclists said to her: "Well, he's not much of a man, is he?" She replied: "Nope. He's not much of a truck driver either—he just ran over three motorcycles."

Like the trucker's response, mine will be different, too—hopefully though without running over any motorcycles. As a central banker, I might be expected to talk about the awesome domestic and international financial problems which are the subject of my official concern. I am concerned about those problems and especially the need to combat inflation hard enough and fast enough to keep it from getting out of hand.

I will be glad to discuss those matters later, in response to questions, if first you will let me speak briefly—not as a central banker, but as a concerned citizen—about a matter which is or should be of deep concern to each and every citizen of this great land. I refer to the crisis that is manifest in the chaotic conditions that have developed in many of our institutions of higher learning, and even in some of our high schools.

I find myself increasingly troubled by these developments. It might be inaccurate to say that people are apathetic about it, but too many of us are seemingly content to be hand-wringer, head-shakers, and condemners. This is not the way Americans typically respond to difficulties. We tend to be activists and problem solvers. Our motto when confronted with a difficulty is: "Don't just stand there; *do* something!"

Today, we appear to have too many people, mostly young ones, who think of themselves as problem solvers and activists but who want to *undo* something. They want to undo and destroy what it has taken men centuries to build. They have an almost ferocious conviction of their own righteousness and wisdom. They see themselves as the only real devotees in the world of the true, the good, and the beautiful. But to those of us who have lived a little longer and acquired a little more knowledge, and a little more experience, what they seek is neither true, nor good, nor beautiful.

One of the advantages that age has over youth is that we have been in their position, but they have never been in ours. We know those fiery passions, that hot idealism, that unshakable certainly that one has within his grasp the solutions to all the world's problems. But experience has taught us that reason is a better guide to action than passion, that beautiful dreams of the young idealists sometimes end up as bitter nightmares, and that those men who had the greatest certainty that they had the final solution to all problems have ended up portrayed in the history books as tyrants and enemies of mankind.

This is not to say that we should discourage the dreams of the idealists and the aspirations of our youth. Quite the opposite, we should encourage those dreams and aspirations and pay heed to the expressions of dissent which flow therefrom, for there is the source of orderly change and progress. But we must teach them what we taught their older brothers, what we ourselves were taught, and what our fathers were taught—that our wants and aspirations must be tempered to accommodate the legitimate wants and aspirations of others who live with us on this planet; that other people have rights and that these rights are embodied in laws that have been worked out over hundreds of years to make it possible for men to live together in some degree of harmony and to work for common ends; that these laws are our protection against others trampling on our rights; that if we ignore or destroy the law, we jeopardize our own liberty as well as the liberty of others.

We have recently seen a distinguished Harvard professor and Nobel Prize winner explain and justify the behavior of those who would destroy the law by saying, in effect, that these young people want something very badly and they have not been able to get it in any other way. This is very much like explaining and justifying the behavior of a child who throws a tantrum in a department store by saying that the youngster wanted a toy fire engine very badly and had no other way of getting it. Sensible parents know that children must be taught at an early age that throwing temper tantrums is not an acceptable way of getting what they want. This is done by punishing—not rewarding—those who engage in unacceptable conduct.

Society must do the same. The good parent is not the permissive one who tolerates and encourages temper tantrums in children. The overwhelming majority of parents realize this and hence it is possible to walk through our department stores without having to step over the bodies of screaming children lying in the aisles pounding their fists upon the floor.

Unfortunately, this is not true of our colleges, where mass teen-age temper tantrums have become a regular part of the campus scene.

The other day the Chief of Police of Los Angeles retired after a quarter century of service and stated that he was about ready to write off a whole generation of young Americans because of their attitude toward authority. Now, we cannot afford to write off a whole generation of young Americans—not even its small minority about whom I am talking. Every generation plays a vital role in the process of keeping civilization alive. We cannot write off a generation if we hope to transmit to the generations to come the values that man has laboriously nurtured and protected over the centuries.

Our country has survived and prospered because of the ideas on which it was founded. People from all parts of the globe came here to live. They spoke a variety of languages and had widely disparate economic, social, and cultural backgrounds. Yet they succeeded in building a great nation.

A nation is more than a collection of human beings who live in the same geographical area. To constitute a viable nation, these human beings must sense a community of interest, must share a common set of operational values.

America's glory lies in the fact that it won voluntary acceptance of its values from men and women of widely different backgrounds. This was perhaps largely because so many were attracted to this wild country in its early days precisely because they were impressed by what we stood for. Many had fled from authoritarianism and tyranny, to live in a land that offered them both liberty and justice.

This has always been the kind of country that allowed wide latitude to its citizens in both speech and action. However, it was expected in return that the citizens would respect and support the institutions, laws, and customs that were essential to the survival of a society of this kind.

It was expected, for example, that the citizens would accept the principle of majority rule, and obey the laws approved by the majority.

It was expected that the majority would respect the constitutional safeguards erected to curb its power and safeguard the rights of minorities.

It was expected that when the majority decided that the national interest led the country into conflict with a foreign enemy, all citizens, regardless of their personal views or national origin, would support and defend the United States. Thus it was that Nebraska's great statesman, Senator George W. Norris, after having vigorously opposed America's entry into the first World War, declared his unstinting support for the Commander-in-Chief once war was declared.

Underlying these operational principles were some commonly accepted moral values that helped bind the American people together. We shared a belief in the Judeo-Christian religious and ethical values—respect for truth, respect for human dignity, consideration of the rights of others, and a common conviction that man had a higher purpose in life than animalistic gratification of his sensual desires.

It is true that we have made many mistakes and that our practices have not always matched our beliefs, but we have generally recognized the value of aspiring for more than we could hope to achieve. And we were generally understanding and tolerant of our human and social imperfections, knowing that it was vain to expect to build Utopia here on earth.

The ideas that made this nation what it has become—a beacon in a dark world—did not spring up overnight. They were not the product of any single individual. They grew and developed over centuries before they reached their present development here.

These ideas will not die overnight, but what is transpiring at this moment in our country is a concerted effort to bring about their demise. The turmoil on the college campuses is but a symptom of it. A minority, but an articulate and activist minority of young people—young people who may be future teachers, writers, and political leaders—apparently have been persuaded that the cementing ideas that made this a great nation are false. Indeed, some of them deny that this nation has achieved anything praiseworthy. These young people have a different set of ideas and ideals.

They believe that freedom of expression for those with whom they disagree should not be tolerated.

They believe that laws which are not to their liking should be ignored and flouted.

They believe that their country is generally wrong in its disputes with foreign countries and hence they have no obligation to give it any support or to rise to its defense.

They proclaim their respect for truth, but they show little interest in undertaking the kind of arduous and dispassionate search for facts that is essential if truth is to be found.

They profess profound respect for the rights of all men, but they physically assault those whose opinions differ from their own, invade the privacy of their offices, rifle their files, and boastfully publish private correspondence of others to achieve some political advantage.

John W. Gardner, in his recent Godkin Lectures at Harvard, put it well when he said:

"Sad to say, it's fun to hate. . . . That is today's fashion. Rage and hate in a good cause! Be vicious for virtue, self-indulgent for higher purposes, dishonest in the service of a higher honesty."

But as he and many others have pointed out, it takes little imagination to visualize the kind of state these youthful revolutionaries would create if they had the power. Constitutional safeguards for the rights of even those who arrogate power unto themselves—let alone everyone else—would cease to exist. There would be no freedom of expression. Truth would be what the rulers believed, not what objective investigation might show. Personal privacy would disappear.

The age of Orwell's Big Brother would be upon us, for the historic pattern of continuing *violent* protest is clear. First comes revolution, with the overthrow of the good along with the bad, followed by chaos, and finally by dictatorial control. Only then could the long, agonizing struggle to obtain the four freedoms begin anew.

Perhaps because of the obvious risk of losing so much for so little, some of us are tempted to say: "It can't happen here!" But it happened, in our lifetime—in Russia, Italy, Germany, all of Eastern Europe, China, and Cuba.

It could not happen here if we took greater pains to preserve and protect the operational values of our society.

It will happen here if through carelessness we permit these values to be lost to that generation that some people are already prepared to write off.

We must appreciate that changes in basic ideas take place slowly, almost imperceptibly. What has happened on our college campuses is merely a reflection of an attack on our basic ideas that has been going on for many years. When the competing ideas begin to produce the kind of overt behavior we now observe, they have already secured a strong and dangerous foothold.

The question is, are we prepared to battle for the preservation of the ideas that made this country great? Do we believe in them enough to insist that they be transmitted to succeeding generations? Or will we—beset by doubts and uncertainty—decide that it is too much trouble to stave off the onslaught of the totalitarians?

Our survival as a free nation may well depend on our answer to this question: Is it too much to ask that our youth be taught—at school as well as at home—to value and respect the ideas that have given this country unexampled freedom as well as material abundance?

I, for one, do not think we price liberty too high when we ask that those who wish to enjoy it give their allegiance to the institutions and ideas that make it possible, even while seeking to change them through nonviolent dissent.

Edmund Burke once said, "The people never give up their liberty but under some delusion."

What is the source of the delusion that has led so many of our brightest youth to place liberty in jeopardy? If we are to be more than hand-wringers and head-shakers, we must probe for the answer to that question.

For me, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the finger points at those of us who have neglected the education of our youth, and especially at those who condone, forgive, and even justify violations of law and outrageous assaults upon the rights of others.

Would that every parent and teacher take upon himself the responsibility of conveying to the young the wisdom contained in Burke's words:

"Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put chains upon their own appetites; in proportion as their love of justice is above their rapacity; in proportion as their soundness and sobriety of understanding is above their vanity and presumption; in proportion as they are more disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and the good, in preference to the flattery of knaves."

PRELUDE TO INDEPENDENCE

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, each year the restored Colonial Capitol of Virginia at Williamsburg is the scene of the "Prelude to Independence." The occasion commemorates the activities of Virginians which paved the way for the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

This year we were honored to be addressed by former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. I am pleased to include his remarks today in the Extensions of Remarks:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

I am grateful for the invitation to join in celebrating the memory of the Great Virginians whose decisions made here almost two centuries ago led the way to American independence.

A celebration such as this has a direct bearing on our mental health as a nation. For in a very real sense, a nation like an individual, can be a victim of amnesia. If it loses the memory of its own past, it can be at a loss to know what it is in the present, and what it wants to be in the future.

Today, I want to dwell on the relationship between living Americans and a sense of the American past. I am convinced that this matter is of central importance to all other topics now at the focus of American attention.

Every generation looks at the world through the prism of its own experiences. My own generation was no exception.

We came to maturity at a time of great trouble in the world. All units of economic value had collapsed Totalitarian dictatorship and democratic appeasement destroyed the hope for peace.

All of us knew that something was profoundly wrong in many aspects of American life. Yet, with few exceptions, my generation did not feel hostile to the whole of the American past, we did not reject the entire web of legal and political institutions we inherited from other generations. Nor did we call for their overthrow in a thrust of violence and force.

Our thoughts and actions were governed by a political equation between the idea of progress and the idea of order, on the side of progress, we insisted that laws and institutions can no more resist the need for change than a grown man can wear the clothes which fit him as a boy.

We are convinced that if the need for change was denied while life moved on, the predictable result would be a violent explosion that could shatter existing institutions.

On the side of order, we insisted that if existing institutions were simply destroyed in the name of progress, the people would find their hope for liberty and progress destroyed in an unlimited war of all against all. There would be no standard of conduct to which all alike could appeal.

By striking a balance between the two sides of the equation, we came to a definition of our own task, namely: To cleanse and purify the body of existing laws and institutions and to retain what was best in them. That which was conserved became the foundation on which we could raise a bridge binding the American past to its unfolding future.

It would be an abuse of language to say that everything my generation hoped to do was done. Nor did everything that was done, gain the objects in view. At some points, there was a short fall between intentions and achievements.

What my generation achieved, however, was no small thing. We laid the basis for a tremendous advance in the material and intellectual conditions of American life, and for a world security system that has thus far spared us the carnage of a nuclear war.

How do things stand today?

Serious minded and vocal members of the rising generation of young people have framed a troubled indictment which demands our attention regardless of whether or not we agree with what it said. The indictment, stripped to its essentials, goes like this:

The whole order of American politics, inherited from the past, has lost its relevance in the face of rapid, accelerated and pervasive changes. These changes, differing in quantity and quality from any experiences in the past, have broken the link between public talk and the possibility of being heard, between urgent needs and the capacity of our established institutions to respond to them. In fact, the structure of the institutions, and the people who control the levers of effective power in them, makes it impossible to effect changes in society in an orderly and coherent way.

And the indictment continues:

Only a person who denies the evidence of his own senses can deny the shameful reality of two Americas in our midst—the one affluent and often indifferent, the other miserable and seething with frustration.

It is a reality made all the more offensive when placed alongside the fact that affluent America is in a position to enjoy the benefits of an economy, an educational system, and a communications network, all more highly developed in America than any other nation known in human history. Yet it chooses wilfully not to see or care very much about how the other America, the deprived America, lives.

And the indictment concludes:

There is a clinching proof that the structure of American politics inherited from the past has lost its relevance to present needs. It can be seen in the order of values which governs the mechanism of American politics when it comes to the allocation of national resources. It is a mechanism geared almost automatically to pour out limitless billions of dollars in support of armament systems beyond the limits of rational and justifiable needs.

Yet the same system strains at a gnat when asked to support programs designed to deal with dangerous conditions in our internal security—the crisis conditions in our cities, in our impoverished rural areas, the crisis conditions of inequality opportunity, the crisis conditions of hunger, unemployment, educational deprivations among the submerged one-fourth of our population, white and black alike.

It is a system geared to pour out untold billions of dollars in order to put two men on the moon, but is sullen and canker-hearted when asked to help put a dispirited man back on his feet right here on earth.

Most of the young people who have framed this anguished indictment stop with the indictment itself. They do not go on to say that existing institutions must be destroyed or overturned, or that the necessary changes of modernization should be entrusted to disorderly or even violent means.

They retain a residue of respect for the political and legal system inherited from the past.

But they demand repair and remedy—they seek above all to humanize our institutions—to broaden the base of participation and to open the avenues of opportunity. This young generation of responsible radicals is filled with anger and indignation over our failures to do what it knows can be done. Yes, impatient, angry, but not irresponsible—such are their characteristics.

They deserve our thanks, not our rebuke, to them we must listen and act. They remind us that freedom's work is never done—that the American revolution is a continuing one, unfinished and ever changing.

If we fail, the shape of our future is already visible to us in a miniature prototype. I refer to the activities and motivations of a still small group of young people—white and black alike—who have been pressing an "age-war" more virulent than any previously known in American history.

The members of this small group, whether in the colleges or the ghettos, despise the kind of social changes that are made in small steps. Change—for this new breed of rebels—must be total, beginning with an assault on all existing institutions and social relationships.

In one breath, the young rebels insist on absolute truth. "Tell it like it is." In a second breath, they are suspicious of any truth, saying that it is only a lie concocted in the interest of what they call "the establishment."

In one breath, they insist on the right for full participation in self-government. In a second breath, they say that the more a man is involved in the life of organized society, the more he is likely to be corrupted by it.

In one breath, they insist on a neat and rational order for society. In a second breath, they say that orderly thought and action imprison a man and corrupt the honesty of his responses. Orderly thought must therefore be displaced by a stress on spontaneity, by a direct response to immediate circumstances, by a purifying, discontinuous happening.

The young rebels of whom I speak are not troubled by the fact that they have no coherent program for action, or that their impulses—generous in some respects, dangerous and absurd in others—discharge themselves in almost any direction and in almost any form.

Since they view themselves as an elite—an embodiment of the total good—they feel morally armed with the right to make only their own voice heard and to gag all others.

They feel morally armed to prevent any other people from meeting, to invade any assembly or classroom, to break up any proceedings where people of divergent views seem to be engaged in a rational, groping search for a common understanding. They, the destroyers—the nihilists—to them and their tactics, we must not yield.

If there is any ground for comfort in all this, it is that we have been forced anew to consider the meaning of dissent and civil disobedience in American politics—or more particularly, the tradition of dissent and civil disobedience stemming in good part from the great Virginia dissenters whose work we honor today.

The great Virginians who labored here were not schoolboys. They were mature men, leaders in their respective communities, heads of substantial enterprises, with much to lose if they erred, they were not given to rash adventures, nor given to raising hell just for the hell of it.

Before they embarked on their great act of dissent and civil disobedience which led to a revolt and then a revolution, they carefully debated among themselves the most difficult of all political questions.

At what point does the need for "order" in the state and society take precedence over the need for "justice" in the state and society—or the other way around?

How much injustice is tolerable for the sake or order?

How shall the modes of protest be expressed? Against what objects? Decided by whom?

Who shall say if the avenues of legal relief for the redress of grievances exist in point of fact? Who shall say if these avenues exist only on paper, but not in the world of real things?

The great Virginians recognized that unless they asked and at least struggled with possible answers to these old questions, they could become useless to themselves and to the cause they intended to promote by their dissent.

They could become useless if they were to bring to their act of dissent the wrong kind of behavior, the wrong kind of strategy, the wrong sense of their own moral autonomy.

They could become useless, if the act of civil disobedience were permitted to degenerate into a breaking of all laws, good or bad, simply because they are laws.

They could become useless, even if their initial cause was just if by lack of moral and intellectual discipline they were to open the gate to indiscriminate dissent and to indiscriminate civil disobednience as a way of life.

Their act of civil disobedience was not a private act. It was not a conspiracy in a corner. It was a public act made in the open by a regularly constituted representative body of the community, a public act agreed to only after a full debate and an approving vote.

Instead of coupling their civil disobedience with a clamor for amnesty if they failed to carry their object, they made it clear that they were prepared to suffer the loss of their fortunes and even their lives if their revolt should fail.

They ventured to prove that they had resorted to civil disobedience only because they exhausted every available constitutional means for a redress of their grievances, or only because the constitutional means as they existed on paper were in fact inoperative in practice.

They made it abundantly clear that they were not protesting in the abstract, but that in breaking the law binding them to the British Empire, their object was to bring to birth the terms of a new policy under which they could live more happily.

They clearly distinguished, in the words of George Washington "between oppression and the necessary exercise of lawful authority . . ." and between the "spirit of liberty and that of licentiousness." That is why, once they had unanimously instructed the Virginia representatives at the Continental Congress to propose independence for the American colonies, they allowed no gap to develop in the legal structure of Virginia itself.

They promptly went to work on a new constitution for the independent state of Virginia—a constitution which by law, enlarged the market place for public freedom, enlarged the political space in which more Virginians than ever before would have the right of access to the public realm, to their share in public power, to participate in the conduct of public affairs with its discussions, deliberations and decisions.

In short, the whole object and achievement of the Great Virginia dissenters was to uphold the concept of law by establishing it on a broader basis of consent than had been possible when Virginia was held in tutelage by the English monarchy and parliament.

For all these reasons, the great Virginia dissenters led the way to a durable and positive achievement in independence—as against the trail of wreckage left in the wake of some of our present-day advocates of violence.

Does politics have any answer to give to the case of America's young rebels of today who seek to manipulate other people by coercive means—by gun-play, fire-bombs, intimidation, physical assaults, kidnappings?

I hesitate to say. If, as some medical men believe, the pattern of behavior has all the earmarks of paranoia, then politics may have to be guided by the psychiatric profession in dealing with the sickness.

It is my view, however, that politics can at least keep their numbers small instead of gaining them new recruits from among young people who still retain a residue of respect for the legal and political forms inherited from the past.

Before I come to the ways and means, let me note two sets of realities that are often overlooked and that lie at the heart of our present predicament.

First, there was the oversight of the comfortable people in the United States who on the one hand applauded the actions of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which gave currency to the strategy of non-violence, but who on the other hand, turned away when it came time to remedy the injustices and discriminations which prompted Dr. King into the streets.

These comfortable people saw the non-violent strategy simply as an instrument for restraining restive Negro Americans.

This oversight was the father to other things that were overlooked. For example, the very success of the non-violent methods used in getting long-needed civil rights legislation on the statute books created the illusion that the battle for civil rights was over. In fact, it had only begun.

The laws, all indispensable in themselves, had only established the conditions for legal equality between the constitutional rights of whites and blacks alike.

They did not, of themselves, achieve a condition of equity measurable in terms of concrete rights—the right to a job of decent pay, the right to adequate income if one cannot work, the right to an education which spurs rather than hobbles human creativity, the right to decent housing in safe neighborhoods, the right to a decent diet, and the right to access to the benefits of modern medical science.

Those of us who battled year in and year out to reconstruct an edifice of legal equality between the two races were not under any illusion about what had been accomplished even when the year 1964 brought the legislative effort to the peak of success.

We knew this was only a down payment on the larger and more difficult task of translating legal language into improved material conditions in the day to day life of Americans who were black.

We also knew that if there was a default or failure of nerve with respect to this larger, more difficult task, two things would happen:

First, there would be a tendency on the part of people whose hopes for a better life had been aroused, to lose faith in the normal operations of the law as the best instrument for the promotion and distribution of justice.

Secondly, and in a related degree, if the non-violent tactic which had helped get necessary civil rights law on the statute books did not lead directly to tangible social improvements, the predictable result would be an escalation of social tensions and a loss of capacity to solve the problems of social justice by peaceful means within the framework of law.

If these two melancholy predications were to be proven false, it was also clear from where the primary remedial initiative must come. It must come primarily from the privileged segment of our society. The main beneficiary of all the good things our society has to bestow.

It could not be expected to come from the segment of the American population that had been denied for so long full participation in America's economic, social and political life.

Unfortunately, the privileged segment of our society did not provide that initiative in a measure commensurate to the need. Unlike the signers of the declaration of independence they did not pledge their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor to secure these rights.

Everyone, of course, still talks about the urgent need for peace between the white and black races in America. But what kind of peace? On what terms? Achieved how? Where? By whom?

A peace which depends on walls and moats each race builds around itself, announces on its face that the spirit of war is in the air. A peace which comes after human rages have spent themselves in violence is of the kind covered by the cry of Isaiah: "In peace is my bitterest bitterness."

Peace has something to do with the habits of the heart in the encounters of daily life, and with perceptions that are a guide to actions which are beyond the reach of the law.

It has something to do with the truth that the white and black races in America are like two mountain climbers tied to the same rope. Their fate is indivisible. If they do not move in mutual support of each other, then as surely as the law of gravity exists, they will fall together into a deadly abyss where violence will be the rival of violence.

Above all, peace has something to do with justice, with equity, and with measures in the public realm that promote justice and equity in the private realm of daily experience.

The specific things that have to be done should no longer be a subject of mystery. They were clearly stated in the report of the Kerner Commission. They were restated again a year later—this year—in the study released by Urban America and the Urban Coalition.

Through these and similar sources, we have again been told—and it is true—that poverty remains a pervasive fact of American life, and that the continued disparity between this poverty and general affluence was and remains a source of alienation and discontent.

We have again been told—and it is true—that ghetto schools continue to fail, and the small amount of progress made in improving the quality of these schools has been counterbalanced by a growing atmosphere of hostility and conflict in many cities.

We have again been told—and it is true—that there are no programs that seriously attack the continued existence of the slums.

Each of these failures states the need for remedial measures. The question is not whether we have the power of mind required to devise the social inventions that can give effective form and force to the remedial measures. We have that inventive power. And, we have the means and the resources. The question is, do we have the will—the determination. Will we make the commitment?

That inventive power and that commitment will not be brought into full play unless all of us are keenly aware of the stakes at issue. They are the same stakes which confronted the great Virginians of the American Revolution after the American War had been won—to establish a government under a new constitution for a more perfect union.

As in their case, so now in our own, we are confronted with the need to prove anew that men can establish good government through reflection and choice, rather than entrust their future to the play of accident and force.

Here I come to the second reality that is often overlooked. It is that the traditional dividing line between domestic and foreign affairs has become in all our cardinal questions as indistinct as a line drawn through water.

What we do in the world arena has a direct bearing on what we can do at home. What we must do at home, has a direct bearing on what we can and must do in the world arena. And precisely on this account—we must be clear about our national priorities. The paramount priority requiring persevering patience and yet a sense of urgency, is the attainment of peace in Vietnam, and I know that the President is as interested in achieving peace, as was the former President, and I pledge myself to support the President in his quest for peace.

The growing debate focused on the anti-ballistic missile system is only symptomatic of the more fundamental decisions that must be reached over the size and nature of military spending.

Unless we are successful now in slowing down the nuclear arms building, it can be predicted without qualification that we will be caught up in a new spiraling arms race that will cost hundreds of billions of dollars, and be meaningless in securing either side any military advantage. The level of danger will be raised—the balance of terror more precarious.

It can be predicated, further, that as this military spending accelerates, our urgent domestic needs will be neglected and our efforts to mobilize the country in getting at the running sores in our internal life will fall woefully short of need.

We may then find ourselves in the peculiar position of a people devoured from within by bitter and embittering social conflicts, while our outer face is that of a superpower bristling with weapons systems, but all amounting to a hard shell encasing an empty center.

We must come to see that our security is threatened more immediately and more directly by the missiles of hate and bigotry and injustice and violence that are loose within our own borders, rather than the nuclear missiles of the Soviet Union that are checked by the policy of mutual deterrence. And we must set our priorities accordingly.

Surely high on the list of priorities is to promptly initiate discussions with the Soviet Union directed toward halting the expansion of both offensive and defensive nuclear weapons. Already precious time has been lost.

To complicate this urgent task by injecting issues of trade and political disputes of many years standing is both dangerous and unrealistic.

To wait for Congress to act on the issue of the ABM before initiating negotiations is neither necessary nor desirable. The time to negotiate is now.

If the negotiations are successful, then we will be spared the cost of the weapons. If the negotiations should fail, we will know, at least, that we tried to save mankind from an experience of dangerous escalation in armament. The world looks to us for moral leadership. We dare not default.

Let me speak candidly: In this time of rapidly rising tension and festering alienation, to delay in coming to grips with the issue of arms control and our social and economic problems is to only intensify the danger. It is like trying to cap a volcano only to find that in the end it explodes with even greater force and destructive power.

We paid dearly in the 1960's for our failure in the 1950's to come to grips with the problems of race, urban decay, education, and poverty.

The price will be higher and the level of danger will be greater if, in the next two to four years, we fail again to set our national priorities wisely and make the national investments that the American society so desperately needs.

This cannot be a time of relaxation, of taking it easy, of again turning our faces from the unmet human needs around us.

Yes, now, as in the time of this Nation's birth, we must resort to the terribly difficult ways of civilized and rational men—fearlessly striking down that which hobbles our national growth but always with a decent respect for the opinions of others, always with a firm grasp on democratic principles and liberties, and always with an unclouded view of where we are ultimately headed. This is the spirit of the American Revolution.

I recall the words of Adlai Stevenson—"Democracy is not self executing. We have to make it work, we have to understand it . . . not only external vigilance but unending self-examination must be the perennial price of liberty, because the work of self government never ceases."

With a sense of urgency and destiny as if creating a new nation, we must ventilate the clogged stale channels of political participation and social opportunity. The refreshing winds of change must be directed to constructive purposes through debate and dissent—through dialogue and discussion—until decision and direction are achieved.

This is the meaning of government by the consent of the governed—the social contract of equals. To do less would be disrespectful of our heritage and unworthy or our priceless legacy of freedom and independence.

ABM DESERVES "YES" VOTE

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a great newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, editorially endorsed the "Safeguard" ABM system on June 1.

The Sunday editorial on the ABM issue stated:

The Times, after careful weighing of the arguments on both sides, urges Congress to vote "yes."

It further states—

This recommendation is based on the conviction that such action offers the best hope of preserving the credibility of our strategic deterrent without jeopardizing prospects for an arms limitation agreement with Moscow.

For review by my colleagues, the Los Angeles Times editorial is inserted in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 1, 1969]

ABM DESERVES "YES" VOTE

(ISSUE.—President Nixon's ABM proposal has been debated for weeks. Has anyone come up with a workable alternative?)

For weeks a national debate has raged over whether Congress should vote "yes" or "no" on President Nixon's proposal to go ahead with the prototype phase of the so-called "Safeguard" system of antiballistic missile defense.

The Times, after careful weighing of the arguments on both sides, urges Congress to vote "yes."

This recommendation is based on the conviction that such action offers the best hope of preserving the credibility of our strategic deterrent without jeopardizing prospects for an arms limitation agreement with Moscow.

Although the fact has tended to get lost in the confusion and acrimony of debate, Mr. Nixon is in full agreement with the ABM critics on the fundamental importance of a Soviet-American accord on arms limitation.

Such an agreement, negotiations for which are expected to begin in July or August, would enable us to channel more money into education, housing, urban transportation, job training, etc., without any impairment of our national security.

If past experience means anything, however, the talks are likely to drag on for years. Meanwhile, we cannot rationally ignore the potential peril represented by the continuing Soviet buildup in offensive missiles and missile-firing submarines.

The great attraction of the Administration's Safeguard proposal is that it offers the President a relatively inexpensive means of keeping his options open in a period when nobody knows whether the Russians will opt for arms control or an intimidating nuclear capability.

No one, least of all President Nixon, questions that as of now we could absorb a surprise Soviet missile attack and still have enough missiles and bombers left to destroy the Soviet Union in retaliation.

But, as the President has observed, the Russians may be "substantially ahead of us in overall nuclear capability" by 1972 or 1973—if we stabilize our forces at present levels while they continue building ICBMs and Polaris-type submarines at the recent rate.

At best, U.S. acceptance of an inferior power position would leave the world vulnerable to nuclear blackmail on the part of the Soviets.

At worst, it could tempt the Soviet Union into believing that it could make a surprise nuclear attack on the United States without suffering devastation in return. Obviously, the problem is to keep them convinced otherwise—but by means which will not endanger an arms control agreement.

President Nixon's answer is Safeguard—a limited ABM system which admittedly could not protect U.S. cities from a Soviet saturation attack, but which is designed to insure the survivability of enough Minuteman ICBMs to deter the Russians from making the gamble.

Safeguard's total cost is estimated at $8 billion, including warheads, if it proves necessary to build the whole system. But President Nixon has made it amply clear that he hopes it will not be necessary.

In essence, the President is asking congressional approval to go forward on two prototype installations for completion by 1973. Cost of the prototypes is estimated at $2.1 billion—or an average of $400 million annually for five years, which is just about one-half of 1% of our total defense budget.

Whether the rest of the system ever would be built depends upon the progress of arms control talks. Construction even of the prototypes could be halted anytime a workable system of arms limitation is agreed upon.

A number of prominent scientists have expressed skepticism that Safeguard will actually work. But equally prominent scientists are convinced that it will.

The Russians are unlikely to gamble on who is right. As one eminent scientist put it, "They will be deterred by the very fact that it might work"—and deterrence, after all, is the name of the game.

Another charge by the critics is that Safeguard will endanger the arms control talks. But the Kremlin, which already has an ABM of sorts around Moscow, has given no such indication.

Several alternatives to Safeguard have been proposed, but none appear to offer the same combination of protection for our deterrent and consistency with the goal of arms control.

We could, for example, step up deployment of offensive missiles to offset the Russian buildup, but this might indeed look provocative to the Kremlin and impair chances of ending the arms race.

Another alternative, previously favored by The Times, would be to hold off on approval of Safeguard pending a reading on the progress of the arms control talks.

But the negotiations may go on a long time. And the Administration argues persuasively that if Safeguard does not go forward now, costs would go up and it could not be built in time for the potential period of peril beginning in 1973.

In the absence of a "compromise" that will satisfy this objection, Congress should vote "yes" on Safeguard.

IDAHO BUSINESSWOMAN FOILS CRIME

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the Idaho Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs brought to my attention some time ago the heroic act of one of their members, Mrs. Langdon, of Twin Falls, Idaho. This week, that organization will honor their former State president for the brave action which probably prevented serious harm to a small child.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, a copy of the article which describes the incident. I am sure you will all be heartened to learn that there still are those fine American citizens who are willing to become involved in the events surrounding them.

The article referred to follows:

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMAN ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN CRIME PREVENTION

Under a heading "Twin Falls Citizens Praised for Getting Involved" in the Times News of Twin Falls, Monday, August 5, 1968, is the following news item:

"Action by a Twin Falls businesswoman and several other concerned citizens drew praise Monday from Twin Falls Police Judge Harry Turner.

"Judge Turner said that in the present day, when everyone is more concerned with not getting involved than helping a fellow man, it is encouraging to find citizens who will get involved in the interest of justice.

"A Twin Falls city police report Monday showed that Mrs. Marion Langdon probably prevented a serious crime Sunday when she bothered to go to the assistance of a crying child.

"Mrs. Langdon witnessed a man take the youngest, a little girl, and lead her toward a house. They first entered the house, then immediately left going to a shed at the back of the property. At this point the little girl began crying.

"When Mrs. Langdon when to the child's assistance and questioned the man as to whether or not he was the child's father, he ran. She called to a passing automobile and others in the area to follow the man while she called the police department.

"Officers reported the man was in custody of four other interested citizens when they arrived.

"The suspect was in custody Monday charged with disorderly conduct and being drunk in a public place.

"Others who assisted Mrs. Langdon were identified on the police report as Jim and Rick Lockhard, Kimberly; Jim Ledbetter, 436 Jefferson Street and Charles McNiel, a serviceman home on leave from the U.S. Navy.

"The three children told officers a man gave the older youngsters money to go to the store and gave the little girl two quarters to go with him."

(NOTE.—Mrs. Langdon, who owns and operates a business in Twin Falls, is a past state president of the Idaho Federation of Business and Professional Women, and is a member of the Mountain Home BPW club. She is certainly living according to our Collect, and is "out in front" in preventing crime. Congratulations, Marion). (Marion also was selected Idaho Mother of the Year several years ago.)

A PEOPLE TO PEOPLE IDEA—A PARTNERS PLANE FOR PEACE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago today, 351 delegates from 17 nations of the hemisphere rose to their feet and cheered the approval of a resolution which asked President Nixon to make available one aircraft to serve the cause of peace and understanding in the hemisphere.

These Partners of the Alliance delegates were from 37 States and from 38 areas of Latin America. They were meeting in Salt Lake City in search of new ways to carry the Alliance for Progress to the people through self-involvement.

In 1968, citizens in the Partners of the Alliance in the United States sent more than 660 tons of agricultural, educational, and hospital equipment to their Partners in Latin America. All packing and shipping arrangements were made by those private citizens, but the tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is that countless tons of additional equipment and large numbers of technical assistance volunteers could have been added to the development resources had transportation been available.

It is my understanding that the Partners have not been able to accept many contributions of excellent equipment because their warehouses already are bulging with an estimated 800 tons of equipment that despite their best efforts they are unable to transport.

In 1968, 350 volunteer technicians were involved in Partners development projects with transportation assistance from AID. During that same period, however, 1,250 additional volunteers from the United States and 560 program volunteers from Latin American nations traveled on Partners project missions under private funding. Though this is an outstanding record of private response to the challenge of the Alliance for Progress, it is again a tragedy that countless other professional and technical volunteers who were ready to give of their time and talents were unable to do so because of a lack of transportation assistance.

While the ship *Hope* plows the seas in its great humanitarian undertaking to teach and to heal, the time has arrived for another bold effort—a Partners' Plane for Peace—which can bring the citizens of the hemisphere together in an even closer working relationship.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution adopted at the Fourth Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance pointed to the thousands of aircraft assigned to military and defense purposes throughout the world. The resolution petitioned the President to assign one plane to serve the cause of peace and understanding in the hemisphere. I join with the citizens of the 75 Partners committees throughout the hemisphere in asking that a Partners Plane for Peace be made available to match people and equipment with needs and opportunities.

CHAUTAUQUA INSTITUTION

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention of the House to an article in the Washington Post concerning one of the most notable centers in the world for education, entertainment, culture, and recreation.

The article deals with Chautauqua Institution, an expansive, tree-shaded summer colony on the shores of Lake Chautauqua in southwestern New York State. There is not anything like it in the Nation today which typifies more the essence of America.

Under the leadership of its president, Dr. Curtis W. Haug, Chautauqua Institution today is a worldwide showcase for all that is superlative in the arts, music, and literature as well as serving as a forum for figures of national and international prominence in all fields of endeavor.

Presidents have made some of their most important pronouncements from the platform of the amphitheater. President Franklin Roosevelt made his famous "I hate war" speech there and Theodore Roosevelt called it the "most American spot in America" and truly it is.

The above-mentioned article follows:

CHAUTAUQUA

(By Matilda D. Mascioli)

"It's an institution," claims its president. "It's a crazy house!" counters a wag. "It's where you find your thing," adds a teenager.

It's all of this and more. For snuggled on the shores of a lake in the southwestern corner of New York State is a spot for a family vacation. It's Chautauqua—the place Teddy Roosevelt called the "most American spot in America."

Though Chautauqua was founded in 1874 by the Rev. John Heyl Vincent, a religious editor, as a retreat for Methodist Sunday school teachers, today it is a bubbling, booming cultural mecca. No less than the beat of Count Basie thumps out over the waters of Lake Chautauqua.

"Don't confuse us with those traveling tent shows, orators and revivals you've heard about," bristled an old-timer in a rocking chair on the veranda of the Athenaem Hotel as she watched the day's arrivals and departures. "They took our name but had no ties with us. Those circuses folded up in the '20s and we're still here!"

At Chautauqua you can write—or read—a poem or a novel; play the violin, oboe, flute, or horn; take ballet lessons, birdwatch, weave, paint; see a movie, opera or play; attend concerts or lectures on world crises; get expert tips on the stock market. You can even learn to tune a piano. Or you can just loll by the lake, swim, cruise, water ski, go fishing, hike in the woods and play shuffleboard.

You name it; Chautauqua has it. Everyone is encouraged to be himself, improve himself, and to have fun doing it.

Last year over 50,000 persons spent at least a day or all of an eight-week season pusuing the program of fun and fact-finding that the Chautauqua Institution offers every July and August. The town swarmed with people of all ages, from babies in perambulators to senior citizens with canes. A large proportion were young people.

A gatehouse and a high fence around the grounds mark Chautauqua on New York State Highway 17J, 16 miles north of Jamestown. Entrance is by paid admission. Daily, weekly, or season tickets range from $1 for a 12-hour weekday stay to $60 for the entire eight-week season. The gate fee entitles admission to practically all events except operas, plays, classroom courses and a few special programs.

A gateway parking lot takes care of your car for the duration of your stay. Cars are permitted on the grounds only for deliveries and unloading or loading of baggage. "In Chautauqua you walk," commented our rocking-chair informant. "Even people with chauffeurs have to walk for we've left many of our fine old trees standing right in the middle of the streets."

Rooms and apartments are also available in private homes and church houses. Pleasant eating places are everywhere, all with extremely modest prices. A note to the Publicity Department, Chautauqua Institution Chautauqua, New York 14722, will bring you a packet of pamphlets.

The biggest bargain is the ten-cent, round-trip scenic bus ride of the 700-acre enclave. The route starts and ends at Bestor Plaza, the town's hub. Radiating off Bestor Plaza are quiet, narrow streets shaded by enormous trees. Small, square houses with verandas, curlicued cornices and handkerchief lawns line both sides. Round globes, nostalgic of a past era, light Whyte street, the main intersection.

As the bus jogs along you become aware of bird warbles mingling with violin arpeggios, piano cadences and flute tones—the "cacophony of Chautauqua." What appears to be a scattering of shacks in the woods turns out to be "Piano Village," a series of studios for piano practice. George Gershwin wrote his "Concerto in F" in one of them.

An eight-sided white building stands at one intersection. Over the door a sign reads "The Octagon Poets." There recognized and fledgling poets meet to read, discuss and write poetry. On the lakefront is the ballet studio. Around the bend are the Boys' and Girls' Clubs.

At the other end of town is the Recreation and Education Center. Classes start with 3-year-old toddlers who learn to use toys, books, playground slides, seesaws and sand piles. For high school youngsters there are courses in English, history, mathematics, the sciences and typewriting. For college students and adults the program offers not only usual studies with particular emphasis on the arts, but also such topics as fund-raising techniques, study of the Chinese language, and—as a sign of the times—a seminar on narcotics education.

Everyone is bound sooner or later to meet in the amphitheater, a 7000-seat open-sided structure where lectures, religious services, movies and jam sessions take place.

But the temptation to relax lures many away from all this intellectual stimulation. A cruise on the "Gadfly," which tours the lake, shouldn't be missed. The lake is famous for muskie, which the New York State Conservation Department breeds in hatcheries just above Chautauqua. Water skiing, canoeing and sailing regattas are all part of the program.

ROMULUS TOWNSHIP BEGINS HOME CONSTRUCTION

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a successful program now underway in the township of Romulus, in my congressional district, to provide low-rent housing for families who will be relocated because of an urban renewal project.

Utilizing the Department of Housing and Urban Development's turnkey program, Romulus Township has begun construction of 101 homes on scattered sites in the community. This project is an excellent example of how local communities are making effective use of the many and varied programs that have been authorized and funded by Congress.

Romulus Township officials made their first application for this program in September 1966. Working closely with my office and with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, they obtained $15,000 in planning funds early in 1967.

On January 10 of this year, the Department approved a $1,906,334 loan to enable the community to proceed with its plans. The homes will include 52 duplexes and 49 single-family units. They will be built by the Urban American Land Development Company, and then purchased by the township's Housing Commission for rental. Annual contributions by the Federal Government will enable the Commission to keep the rents within the means of low-income families.

The Housing Commission will sell long term bonds to repay the HUD loan, and then retire the bonds with the rental income.

I am very proud of the farsighted community planning on the part of Romulus officials which has made this program possible. I am also proud to be serving in a Congress which has enabled local communities to solve their problems through cooperation with Federal agencies.

Romulus Township is a community of nearly 20,000 persons, with an area of 36 square miles, making it one of the largest municipalities in my district. The township has already made some moves toward becoming a city, and all recent estimates show Romulus to be on the verge of a great population boom.

The low-rent housing program was conceived and brought into being by a dedicated group of officials, which includes Roderick Smith, supervisor; Alfred J. Perry, clerk; Joseph Wallis, treasurer; and Trustees Ellis Pennington, Jimmie C. Raspberry, and James Stewart.

Others who have served as township officials during the past 3 years include Edmund Bizek, supervisor, and Norbert Wegienka, trustee.

Current members of the township's Housing Commission are Eugene Wilson, president, and John Guerst, Felix Rogalle, Ernie Davis, Sadie Ward and Donald Harris. Former members are Vira Petraska, Bernard J. McGrane, Alfrida Melvin and David Layne.

To this outstanding group of public servants, I offer my sincere congratulations for an excellent example of how enlightened cooperation between Federal and local agencies can help progressive communities plan for the future, and put Federal tax dollars to work on local projects to benefit local residents.

WHAT EISENHOWER REALLY SAID

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, reams of paper have been devoted to speculation and comment on former President Eisenhower's parting words regarding the military-industrial complex. A great deal of distortion has crept into the original meaning of his words. The following editorial from Navy magazine put the General's words regarding defense industries and the necessity of maintaining a strong defense posture into a more balanced perspective and I include this editorial in the RECORD:

WHAT EISENHOWER REALLY SAID

When the tough old soldier finally succumbed at 79 after an unprecedented number of heart attacks and other illnesses, the nation lost one of the greatest and certainly the best loved leaders of our age. We still leave to history a detailed appraisal of Dwight D. Eisenhower's record as Allied Commander in Europe in World War II and as President of the United States. He had his critics during both periods, particularly as President. But if he failed to do some things some people feel he should have done, Ike unquestionably was victorious in war and successful in keeping the United States prosperous, strong and at peace during his years in the White House.

His breadth of view was well known. He coined the term "parochial" for those military leaders and others who judge things only by partisan or preconceived concepts. Although a West Pointer, General Eisenhower immediately saw the tremendous advantages of the Polaris submarine and a nuclear power surface Navy and pushed such developments more than any other President. He backed aircraft carriers and strategic air and missile power, often to the dismay of the Army. We say no more about the late former Commander-in-Chief for two reasons. NAVY published a full length article about him in March. And we feel the urgent need to comment on a current movement which uses another term he coined.

We refer to the powerful current of anti-militarism that is sweeping the country which blames "the military-industrial complex" for most of our current ills. In his farewell address as President, Ike warned against the *potential* danger of large armed forces and a huge arms industry gaining "unwarranted influence" in our nation, while at the same time stressing that both were "vital" to our survival.

The phrase, quoted completely out of context, has become the catch-word, the spearhead of an attack against anything concerned with maintaining an adequate U.S. national defense and almost everything America has stood for. Not only the militant radicals, but respected liberal Senators, editors, columnists, commentators, scientists and professors have used the phrase as "proof" that not only should defense spending be drastically cut to add billions immediately to solve the real problems of poverty and the cities, but also in support of anything they personally oppose concerning the military. They lose sight of the totally important factors of military strength needed to preserve the Republic.

These sophisticated leaders of American thought—who are quick to accuse others of the crime of lifting statements out of context—use the bare phrase or a sentence or two of Eisenhower's comment in a way that undoubtedly would distress him if he were here. The alleged "military-industrial complex" is cited constantly as a reason to vote down the ABM, new warships, planes, and other proposed weapons systems. The term appears in every argument for abandoning the ROTC, military research at universities, barring military or defense industry recruiters from campuses, ending the draft and in favor of any number of unilateral disarmament proposals, pulling out of Viet Nam without honor and turning the other cheek at whatever North Viet Nam does to us.

Eisenhower's oft-quoted warning about the dangers of a combination of large armed forces and a big defense industry did indeed warn of the "potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power" which could endanger American liberties and democratic processes.

But this was only a small part of what he said in a speech primarily concerned with his great desire to maintain peace. He warned against the danger of global Communism, and then said:

"A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction."

He noted that the U.S. military organization and American industry had greatly changed since pre-World War II days, when we had no armaments industry and when "American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well."

"But now," he added, "we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions" and a 3.5 million man military establishment. His warning against the "potential" of a "military-industrial complex" gaining "unwarranted influence" and endangering "our liberties or democratic processes" followed.

What Life magazine called the current "highly emotional general attack on the U.S. military establishment" has stimulated new Congressional investigations into Pentagon "waste" and charges that the "military" has dominated U.S. foreign policy, overcommitting the nation around the world. There has indeed been "waste" in that a number of weapons systems have been cancelled either because they failed to measure up to standards, were outmoded before they were ready, or were late and costs ran up and performance improvement proved marginal. But war is waste, and this is the nature of the game. Pentagon decision-makers must agonize between chancing mistakes on risky new weapons with great promise or catastrophe if they wait until the other side achieves some technological breakthrough that would leave the United States open to attack. Russia has been building a new prototype fighter plane almost every year and scrapping it in favor of a new model. All nations always have done the same thing with the same results and the same charges of "waste." Some of it could have been avoided, and top military officers must bear a share of the blame.

But it is important to note that civilian leaders, not only in the Pentagon but also in the White House and State Department, for the past eight years, have made the major decisions on weapons systems and strategy—not the uniformed leaders who now are getting the most criticism. They did not make the decisions on major strategy in the Viet Nam War, on the Bay of Pigs, in the Cuban Crisis, or in leaving the Northwestern Pacific so unguarded as to make the *Pueblo* and EC-121 incidents possible.

Military officers, unhappy at being the targets of recent attacks, resent even more the fact that General David M. Shoup, retired Commandant of the Marine Corps, and long a military maverick, joined the assailers with a vitriolic attack on the officers corps as the leaders of the "military-industry complex" in an article in Atlantic magazine. He accused many of them, in effect, of being "war lovers." Another retired Marine officer, Colonel Robert Heinl, now military analyst of the Detroit News, accuses Shoup of "going sour" on his profession and country because of frustrated "political ambitions" and a "desire for publicity."

The origins of the present attack on the military are clear. General Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, blames it on "frustration" against the Viet Nam War, which "has gone on so long," with no clearcut outcome, along with a rejection by many Americans of our involvement in "other nations' security affairs" in unpopular wars like Korea and Viet Nam, as well as the huge cost of new weapons.

There is no question but that U.S. military policy and force levels are in for a thorough reexamination. But this can have its good side. In reviewing overseas commitments including the maintenance of many divisions and air units in Europe, which Mr. Eisenhower criticized, Congress can take a good look at alternate and more economical strategies, such as the seabased one. But, looking back on history, we are concerned lest the new wave of antimilitarism gets out of hand. We recall the fervent belief in the '20s of the Kellogg Treaty solemnly outlawing war. And how Senator Gerald Nye, and his Subcommittee Counsel, Alger Hiss, almost convinced the American people, in a highly publicized Congressional investigation, that the "merchants of death" (munitions makers) were largely responsible for wars, causing many Americans to ignore Hitler and other aggressors. Somehow, the current attack on the "military-industrial complex" smacks of the Nye-Hiss "merchants of death" campaign of the '30s which almost left America unguarded when World War II came.

FARM GRAB

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, last week this body imposed a limitation of $20,000 on the Federal aid to any one farm. Since then, there have been a number of editorials from newspapers in my home district in West Virginia, and not one of them has opposed that restriction.

Representative of the feelings of these newspapers in the State of West Virginia, the Intelligencer of Wheeling. This newspaper has long served West Virginians by being a watchdog of Government spending and Government programs. The following editorial is another effort to save money for the taxpayer by that newspaper:

[From the Intelligencer, May 31, 1969]

FARM GRAB: CORPORATE WINDFALLS ONLY CASUALTIES OF CEILING ON BENEFITS

The $20,000 farm aid limit voted by the House of Representatives strikes this newspaper as the soundest piece of agricultural legislation advanced in a long time.

Yet the proposal already is under fire, and from no less a person than the new Secretary of Agriculture, who has expressed the hope that "The Senators will reverse this action."

Mr. Hardin's reasons, as reported in Washington press dispatches, seem a bit obscure. He is not, he told reporters at a press conference called to explain his viewpoint, judging the "morality or ethics" of big benefit payments to large corporate farmers. But he doesn't feel that this is the appropriate vehicle for dealing with the subject. The House tacked on the $20,000 ceiling as an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill. Hardin says the time to consider the subject of benefit limits is when Congress takes up revision of general farm programs next year.

The time to slap on a limit, if it is to be done at all, is now when the business at hand is the appropriation of money. If, as the Secretary of Agriculture seems to feel, there is danger in the limitation of reactivating an old cotton program under which big growers would continue to get unlimited support, Congress assuredly can take care of that in separate legislation. By next year the political situation may be unfavorable.

The big stated purpose of agricultural aid as it has evolved during the past quarter of a century or so was rescue of the family farmer. It hasn't worked out that way. Farm families by the millions have been deserting the land, more and more of their acreage falling into the hands of big operators who took advantage of the federal subsidy to expand their holdings.

It was inevitable, perhaps, even desirable, that agriculture, especially where big crops like grain and cotton are concerned, would become big business in the mass production sense. But there is no more economic reason or social justice in subsidizing a big mechanized farm than in helping a steel mill or a coal mine.

The House has taken a first step in a good direction by putting a ceiling on the amount any individual operation can collect. Unlike Mr. Hardin, this newspaper hopes the Senate supports rather than reverses the House action.

A BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today President Nixon departs for Midway Island for a round of talks with President Thieu of South Vietnam. From these meetings could come new and innovative alternatives toward ending the war in Vietnam, and securing a viable and lasting peace throughout Southeast Asia.

Yesterday, I was privileged to communicate to the President some of the views of us in the Congress and throughout the Nation share regarding our over-involvement in Vietnam and the search for peace there that we all so diligently hope and pray will soon come to pass.

Today, I should like to share with my colleagues some of the thoughts and recommendations I have conveyed to the President on the eve of his departure for Midway.

One of the real agonies of Vietnam, which explains in part, not only our involvement in the war but much of the dissention, confusion, and misunderstanding that prevails over this question, has been the failure of the past to explain to the American people the historical background that led up to the deployment of U.S. fighting men in the Vietnam conflict.

The plain truth is, that the people in this country have never been told the full story or the complete truth about the virtual collapse of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—and its inability or refusal to respond and provide security for free people when aggression first "raised its head" in South Vietnam. Regrettably, SEATO, the regional security organization, established under the U.N. Charter for the purpose of defending free people and free nations against aggression has flatly failed to effectively respond or "handle" the threat to these countries' internal security.

Another failure, with regard to informing the American people, has been to neglect "telling it like it is"—that this conflict in Vietnam is a "new kind of war" commonly known as "guerrilla warfare"—completely unlike the conventional wars of the past. In a conflict wherein unconventional strategy and tactics are employed by the enemy, many people are still trying to evaluate and make judgments on the conduct of the war using conventional terms.

Back in August of 1968, Candidate Nixon had this to say before the platform committee in Miami:

The (Johnson) Administration has either not recognized that this is a new and more complex kind of war, or has not seen its significance. The result is that the old style, conventional military aspects have been over-emphasized, and its other dimensions—psychological, political, economic, even diplomatic—have gotten too little attention. . . . We need far greater and more urgent attention to training the South Vietnamese themselves, and equipping them with the best of modern weapons. As they are phased-in, American troops can and should be phased-out. This phasing-out will save American lives and cut American costs. Further, it is essential if South Vietnam is to develop both the military strength and the strength of spirit to survive now and in the future. It is a cruel irony that the American effort to safeguard the independence of South Vietnam has produced an ever-increasing dependency in our ally. *If South Vietnam's future is to be secure, this process must now be reversed.*

This is precisely why I have, since 1965, advanced the so-called phase-in/phase-out concept through the creation of a free Asian security force which would, on a carefully conceived, realistic, and methodical timetable, phase-in motivated, trained, and properly equipped South Vietnamese and other Southeast Asian manpower as U.S. troops are phased out or phased back to the initially acceptable advisory and supporting role previously agreed upon as the U.S. commitment to those SEATO countries threatened with Communist subversion or aggression.

Such a security organization, in my

judgment, is the only way in which free nations in Asia will be able to fill the security vacuum that was created around the free nations of Asia following the withdrawal of the French security forces from that part of the world and the subsequent reluctance on the part of SEATO to fulfill its defense obligation to the participating nations.

That the United States had to respond at all to the conflict in Vietnam is totally unrealistic when you stop to think of the 1 billion people in Southeast Asia who are perfectly capable of defending themselves.

This is why I firmly believe and strongly recommend that, if we are to prevent future Vietnams, SEATO must either be updated and revitalized—or replaced by a mutual and more viable security organization in Southeast Asia that would require a pro rata sharing of the manpower needed from each participating nation to provide the security that is now totally lacking in the Pacific Basin communities.

Since January of this year, a concerted effort has been underway to provide the training and modern equipment needed by South Vietnam's armed forces to permit them to assume their rightful burden and increased responsibilities for the actual conduct of the war until such time as a reasonable and honorable settlement of the conflict can be negotiated in Paris.

Thus, as I see it, the "phasing-in" stage is, in fact, well underway and this is the direction we must take.

In an editorial appearing in the Hearst newspaper in March 1968, Editor in Chief William Randolph Hearst, Jr., had this to say:

> Now here is the crux of my thinking. The U.S. has some 500,000 men over there fighting their war. This is about one man for every 400 of our total population. If the Asian countries only equalled this effort—and they should do more with the enemy at their borders—they could, and should, field an army of around a million. Besides this great numerical advantage, it would have a tremendous psychological effect. Right now, Ho Chi Minh has the advantage of being able to say he is fighting what he calls white imperialists. With a million or more Asians facing him on the battlefield, the picture would be put in proper perspective, to say the least.

Mr. Hearst and I have consistently agreed on this approach. Unbeknown to each other, Bill Hearst and I were publicly expressing similar points of disagreement and disenchantment with the conduct of the Vietnam war. He wrote an editorial, "Plugging the Dike in Vietnam," while I developed a "blueprint for peace"—the "phase-in, phase-out" concept through the creation of a free Asian security force."

Our suggestions were similar then, and if you read President Nixon's platform statement of 1968, you will note the same ring of similarity in his announced objectives and recommendations for a satisfactory solution to the Vietnam problem. I am pleased to see him following through on his previous position.

I am also pleased to see President Thieu traveling to and communicating with other Southeast Asian leaders. This is absolutely essential if we are ever going to develop the firmed-up SEATO or free Asian security organization required to help solve the Vietnam problem and prevent further Communist encroachment and/or subversion of the other free Asian countries of South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Laos, Burma, Cambodia, Australia, and New Zealand.

We, in the States, have 200 million people. There are 1 billion people in Southeast Asia. Is it not fair to expect that the prime source of manpower required for the "antiguerrilla" and "counterinsurgency" ground forces come from these countries that have the primary threat to their security?

I say absolutely, and it is this message I have asked President Nixon to convey to President Thieu and all the free Asian leaders:

As I said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, 1968:

> My own judgment is that such a program is feasible—that the manpower is available, that the idea is practical, logical, and fair, and that the free Asian nations can be convinced of this diplomatically . . . It suggests a broad but positive and orderly plan for reducing U.S. involvement in Vietnam without any sacrifice to our basic security requirements. Further, it would place the conduct of the war in the hands of the Asians themselves, who must now take a new look at the ground rules.
>
> With security as the key, I can forsee the Free Asian Security Force providing the type of security that SEATO and the U.N. were expected to provide.
>
> Eventually, however, there must emerge the kind of regional cooperation among the nations of the Pacific Basin that will promote economic growth through a type of Asian-Pacific Common Market. How can this be accomplished? Here we can export our free enterprise system in the same way we helped Japan recover from the ashes of World War II to become the strongest economic power in the Far East in less than 15 years.

As President Nixon has said:

> Vietnam does not exist in isolation. Around the world, we should mobilize our diplomatic forces for peace . . . We need such an effort not only to speed an end to the war in Vietnam, but also to lay the groundwork for the organization of a lasting and larger peace. Certainly one of the lessons from the agony of Vietnam is that we need a new diplomacy to prevent future Vietnams.

The potential for future Vietnams is all around us—in Laos, Thailand, Burma, South Korea, the Mideast, Eastern Europe, in Africa, and South and Central America.

If we are, in fact, going to avoid future entanglements such as Vietnam, then, certainly, a "new diplomacy" must now be forged out of the jungles and the graveyards of Vietnam. A diplomacy, I submit, that places far greater emphasis on political, diplomatic, and economic initiatives—rather than on military crusades. As there is, as President Nixon has said, no military solution to the conflict in Vietnam, neither is there a military solution to present or future foreign problems.

The world has grown weary of war and in our quest for peace, we have become embroiled in such national controversy as whether or not Saigon should have a so-called "coalition government." In the first place, President Nixon has not suggested or proposed a U.S.-imposed "coalition government" on the people of South Vietnam. Instead, he talked of "free and open elections" by all the people of Vietnam and their right "to self-determination." Quite frankly, this is not a proper or fitting matter for the United States to determine and I believe the President has made this absolutely clear.

In this regard, I believe we should stop kidding ourselves. In Communist terminology, "coalition government" is a tool whereby the Communists are handed a tool for the complete domination and imposition of their will on the people concerned. We have seen this pattern develop not only in Eastern Europe after World War II, but more recently in Laos where the Communists are "using" Laos as part of the Ho Chi Minh Trail to ferret men and supplies to South Vietnam.

The key point I want to make is this:

Can you imagine the impact a strong free Asian security organization would have on the negotiators from Hanoi, the Soviet Union and Red China—North Vietnam's principle military equipment suppliers?

As Mr. Hearst stated:

> If the Asian countries equalled our effort, they could field an army of a million men.

If Hanoi and the Communist negotiators in Paris fully realized that they would have to face the manpower supplied from 1 billion Asians backed by our military and technical training programs, I think they would change their attitude and their "tune" at the negotiating table in Paris.

Simultaneous to this, however, we must demonstrate by deeds, not just words, our strong desire and intention to cooperate economically and diplomatically to help accelerate free nation building in their part of the world, with all of the associated benefits—the most important of which is a vastly improved standard of living.

OCEAN RESOURCES AND MARINE BIOMEDICINE

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bruce W. Halstead, director of the International Biotoxicological Center of the World Life Research Institute in Colton, Calif., today presented testimony before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries which I would like to call to the attention of the entire House. He explains the need for a national marine biomedical program of worldwide scope and outlines procedures necessary to getting such a program underway. He lists areas of study vital to determination of information we must have if we ever hope to properly and safely develop the full potential offered by the sea.

Dr. Halstead's full testimony follows:

> The term "marine biomedicine" as used in this presentation is concerned with such disciplinary areas as marine biochemistry, pharmacology, pharmacognosy, toxicology, nutrition, micobiology, physiology, epidemiology, taxonomy, ecology, pathology, ethnobiology, medicine, marine biomedical litera-

ture documentation and retrieval, bionics, technology and instrumentation that have a bearing on national and international marine-derived solutions to health problems. Although the aforementioned areas appear to be of greatest concern, marine biomedicine is not necessarily limited to these subjects. In brief, marine biomedicine is concerned with those aspects of the total marine biotope that have both a direct and indirect bearing on man's health and welfare.

INTERNATIONAL SCOPE OF MARINE BIOMEDICINE

International cooperation in the scientific study and use of the sea and its biomedical resources is imperative for the following reasons: The world ocean covers 71 percent of the earth's surface. Most countries have sea coasts and make some use of the sea, although national jurisdiction extends over only a small fraction of the ocean's area; the remainder is common property. The waters of the world ocean and their contents intermingle without serious restraint. Many oceanic processes are of large scale and are driven by forces of planetary dimension. The organisms inhabiting the sea are influenced by these processes and forces, and their distribution, abundance, and behavior are often influenced by events occurring far beyond the territorial limits recognized by man (FAO Fisheries Rept. No. 41, Suppl. 3, October 1967).

In this regard, it is recommended that a national marine biomedical program should be global in scope and integrated with the international cooperative efforts of such organizations as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, World Health Organization, Scientific Committee on Oceanic Research, International Biological Program, International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, and other international agencies. A more detailed report of the recommendations of these organizations appears in a booklet entitled "International Ocean Affairs; a Special Report of the Joint ACMRR/SCOR/WHO (AC) working group on the Implementation of the United Nations Resolution on the Resources of the Sea" published in FAO Fisheries Reports No. 41, Suppl. 3, FRM/R41 Suppl. 3(En), Rome, October 1967.

In order to fulfill the the need for protein for the world's burgeoning populations, many countries including the USA will have to augment drastically both agricultural and marine resources. If it is decided to increase the harvesting and to start the herding of marine animals, then it is essential to study not only the health safety of potential food species but also the organisms in their food chain which are potential contributors to biotoxicity and pathogenicity in man.

RECOMMENDATION FOR A SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT APPROACH

It is recommended that a systems management approach be used in order to avoid useless duplication of effort and funding. The systems approach has been used with much success in the development of the space program, and it is believed that it would contribute materially to the successful operation of the projected marine biomedical program. It is believed that present grant-in-aid methods are inadequate to meet our future national oceanographic requirements.

Industrial management techniques, engineering "know-how," economic data evaluation methods, etc., can be of value in developing procedures for the utilization of marine biomedical resources. There is need for further exploration of the manner in which industry, government, and academic institutions can work together in areas of mutual interest.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL MARINE BIOMEDICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

If our national goals are to be achieved, leadership from our national Government must be forthcoming. It is most urgent that marine biomedicine be recognized by our leaders in Government as a specific disciplinary entity, that our existing deficiencies in this field be clearly understood, and that adequate governmental organization be provided to deal properly with the subject. It is apparent that some facets of marine biomedicine merit greater attention and fiscal priority than others.

Since the subject matter is multifaceted and international in scope and comes within the purpose of several Federal agencies, a coordinated approach is highly desirable. It is therefore recommended that a standing Marine Biomedical Coordinating Committee (MBCC) be established and that this committee operate under the National Council for Marine Resources and Engineering Development (or its successor—if the present Council should be disbanded).

It is further suggested that the membership of this committee include representatives of the following groups: President's Scientific Advisory Committee, National Council for Marine Resources and Engineering Development (or its successor), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health), Department of Interior (Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and Federal Water Pollution Control Administration), National Science Foundation, Environmental Science Service Administration, Department of Commerce, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of State, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Department of Defense (ONR), and a select number of consultant specialists from universities, research institutes, industry, and biological and medical professional societies.

The purpose of the MBCC would be to establish national goals and to coordinate programs of interagency, national, and international importance in the area of marine biomedicine. The MBCC could serve a useful function as a scientific advisory body to the U.S. Congress. The activities of MBCC should be assisted by means of a full-time executive secretary and a clerical staff.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MARINE MEDICINE AND PHARMACOLOGY

The Congress of the United States should be encouraged to establish a National Institute of Marine Medicine and Pharmacology (NIMMP) within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The institute should be established for the purpose of conducting and supporting marine research with a view to advancing scientific knowledge in marine biochemistry, pharmacology, pharmacognosy, toxicology, nutrition, microbiology, epidemiology, physiology, taxonomy, ecology, pathology, to ethnobiology, bionics and technology as it may relate to the causes, diagnosis, prevention, treatment, and control of physical and mental diseases and other impairments of man. The NIMMP should have an advisory council to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters relating to marine medicine and pharmacology. The institute should be authorized to provide training and instruction, establish traineeships and fellowships, and provide research grants to public or other nonprofit institutions. An international exchange of graduate and post-doctoral students should be encouraged. Numerous landlocked schools and universities are desirous of obtaining access to marine field facilities. Every attempt should be made to provide access to adequate educational and research facilities for these inland institutions. Educational programs should also be provided for the training of skilled technicians. There is urgent need for more adequate support of educational programs in marine biomedicine.

THE NEED OF REGIONAL MARINE HEALTH LABORATORIES

The Public Health Service presently operates three marine health laboratories. These are situated in Washington, Rhode Island, and Alabama. These laboratories are concerned with the general areas of the health aspects of water pollution control, nutritional values and health hazards of sea resources, marine biotoxicology, infectious agents, hypersensitivity reactions to marine products, physiological effects of the marine environment on man, pharmaceuticals and drugs from the sea, and other general marine health problems. The present support level of these laboratories is inadequate. These laboratories should be upgraded, adequately funded, and their operations expanded. These regional laboratories should be adequately equipped for advanced sophisticated analytical research.

It is further recommended that additional sites be considered for the establishment of regional marine health laboratories in Alaska, Hawaii, Rhode Island, California, Florida, Texas, or the Virgin Islands. One or more of these laboratories should serve as technical documentation centers.

THE NEED OF REGIONAL MARINE BIO-MEDICAL FIELD LABORATORIES

There is urgent need for international field research facilities for investigators needing to work in specific geographical (continental or insular, temperate, subtropical, tropical, or polar) oceanic regions. Field research units would in most instances be minimal field facilities but with maximum accessibility to field resources. These laboratories would be used primarily for the procurement of living specimen materials, ecological, physiological, and other types of activities that could not be conducted to a greater advantage elsewhere. Each laboratory would be of a standard format and would have collecting gear, diving equipment, and small vessels (approx. 45 ft.) suitable for making local field studies.

The following field sites are recommended on the basis of their strategic environmental and geographical locations. These field units could be operated either under contract with a private nonprofit organization or directly by a governmental agency. Recommended sites are as follows:

Trust Territory (Palau,* Jaluit), Line Islands (Palmyra), Samoa, New Caledonia,* Society Islands,* Great Barrier Reef,* Korea,* Japan,* Ethopia, India,* Virgin Islands (St. Johns*), Cozumel, Honduras, Canal Zone,* Indonesia (Ambon*), Thailand,* Seychelles, East Africa,* Aegean-Adriatic areas, British Isles,* West Africa, Azores, Brazil,* Galapagos Islands,* Gulf of California*, Pt. Barrow, Alaska,* Palmer Station, Antarctica.*

Most of these localities are readily accessible by air transportation.

Particular attention is directed to the fact that the greatest assemblage of marine organisms possessing biodynamic substances is found within the Malay Archipelago (Sumatra, Java, Lesser Sunda, Moluccas, Timor, New Guinea, Borneo, Celebes and the Philippines). It is noted with deep regret that the United States has not used to advantage one of the richest biotic provinces in the world which is available to our country through Palau in the Trust Territory. Palau lies on the eastern border of the Malayan Archipelago and is about 400 to 600 miles northeast of Ambon in the Moluccas where the Soviets had almost completed building an enormous oceanographic facility for the Indonesian Government. It is highly recommended that a biomedical research laboratory be established in Palau at the earliest possible moment.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL RESEARCH VESSEL FACILITY

A single large research ship (5,000 ton class) should be made available and equipped as a national facility for marine biomedical

* Indicates that there is an existing facility, but most of these present facilities are in dire need of more adequate support.

investigations. In addition, it is recommended that smaller vessels (approx. 45 ft. in length) be assigned to regional field facilities for local operations. These vessels should be specially designed for biomedical ocean work and adequately equipped for survey, collecting, and diving operations. Special attention needs to be directed to the problem of refrigeration and low temperature requirements suitable for the preservation of venoms, enzymes, etc. Many scientists are desirous of investigating biomedical problems but are unable to obtain the necessary logistics support. Laboratory and research vessel facilities are urgently needed for biomedical studies.

INSTRUMENTATION NEEDS

It is imperative that the effectiveness of instrumentation to be used at sea be increased, since this is the major avenue by which the effectiveness of the research investigator can be improved. The design of instruments intended for use in the marine environment is at present left to the ingenuity and usually meager facilities of the individual who needs them. Although miracles are achieved by this route, it subverts time of biologically trained men, and their lack of training in engineering and some of the physical sciences is often evident in the result.

It is therefore recommended that funding for research and development of instrumentation, collecting devices, diving research vehicles, and data handling and processing equipment be specifically directed towards that segment of our economy which can best satisfy this need—industry. In order to guide the selection of projects to be funded, it is suggested that review panels be set up within the framework of the Marine Biomedical Coordinating Committee for this purpose. These review panels would have the specific task of making recommendations of areas of technology and instrumentation which need improvement. The means for effecting this improvement would be left to industry and engineers, working in close collaboration with scientists.

RECOMMENDED AREAS OF MARINE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

The following are some suggested areas of marine biomedical research which are urgently in need of attention. Undoubtedly there are other priority areas which have been overlooked, but these suggestions provide a rough guideline to the scope of marine biomedical research that is needed.

Taxonomy and ecology of medically important marine organisms, particularly dangerous marine animals of all types. Studies should include photographic documentation of their habits, habitat, identification, etc.

Screening of marine organisms for biological activity.

Investigation of the food web of marine orangisms.

Study of triggering mechanisms in the production of toxicity cycles in marine organisms.

Uses of marine organisms as biomedical research tools.

The investigation of industrial waste product contaminants involved in the food web of marine organisms.

The use of marine organisms as sources of new drugs.

Investigation of marine biochemical substances as models for the development of new synthetic chemicals.

Evaluation of health safety standards for new marine-derived foods.

Development of laboratory culture techniques of marine organisms that are likely to serve as sources of either new foods or useful biochemical agents.

Clinical aspects, diagnoses, treatment and prevention of marine biotoxications and other marine-induced diseases.

Study of disease processes in marine organisms.

Epidemiology of marine biotoxications.

Mass aquaculture techniques for the production of food and useful biochemical agents.

Study of the effects of aquaculture as it relates to environmental disease production and control mechanisms.

Origin of toxic and other biologically active substances in marine organisms.

Development of surveillance systems of commercial marine food and drug products.

The study of the use of marine organisms by primitive native groups.

Chemical and pharmacological properties of biologically active marine substances.

Marine bionics.

Chemotaxonomy of marine organisms.

Investigation of food detection and sensory mechanisms in marine animals.

A national file for the storage and retrieval of marine health information.

Investigation of the nutritional potential of plankton.

Investigation of marine pathogenic microorganisms.

The study of hypersensitivity reactions to marine organisms.

Physiological effects of the marine environment on man.

The relationship of marine organisms to the Man-in-the-Sea Program.

Health aspects of ocean pollution.

Anatomy of the venom organs of marine organisms.

Physiological hazards relating to diving, such as: effects of pressure, inert gases, increased oxygen tensions, etc.

PUBLICATION OF RESULTS

There is a dearth of useful marine information that is available to both the scientific and lay public. Greater attention needs to be directed to the quality, publication and public dissemination of scientific findings. Adequate funding should be provided for the publishing of investigative results in technical journals and well illustrated manuals, monographs, and books. Documentary educational films are needed for civilian and the Military. The production of these films should be encouraged and funded.

ECONOMIC RETURNS

Benefits to be derived from biomedical research are both immediate and long-term. Laboratory studies have shown that there is a vast spectrum of marine bioactive substances having antibiotic, antiviral, and fungicidal properties. There is evidence that many of these substances will have immediate commercial potential. There is also a great variety of systemic drugs affecting the nervous system, cardiovascular, urinary, gastrointestinal, and various other organ systems. Some of the greatest medical problems facing mankind today are concerned with the chronic degenerative diseases, cancer, heart disease, neurological disorders, mental health, arthritis, etc. Marine organisms provide an untapped wealth of plants and animals that either store or produce a fantastic array of complex chemical substances, many of which offer exciting possibilities as new therapeutic agents.

World fisheries are beginning to expand rapidly into tropical seas, and greater attention is being directed to shallow-water shore fisheries operations. There is urgent need for a more effective utilization of the so-called "trash species" in warm water areas. The utilization of a broader spectrum of tropical marine organisms as food products has brought about an unprecedented confrontation with an enormous array of poisonous marine organisms. Toxic marine organisms range throughout the phylogenetic series of plants and animals. The toxicity of some of these poisons are about 10,000 times that of sodium cyanide or about 3,000 times that of our better war gases. With the necessity of developing protein concentrates from an ever increasing variety of marine organisms, it is urgent and necessary that the edibility of all marine organisms be evaluated, particularly if they are likely to be used in the production of protein concentrates.

The prospects of using protein resources from the sea for human and animal consumption are becoming increasingly more difficult as toxic industrial wastes are being discharged into the marine environment. The devastating outbreaks of Minamata disease in Japan document the serious threat that industrial wastes contribute to the food economy of the sea. The Minamata situation points up the fact that in the future we must be prepared to cope with toxic products from both natural and industrial sources which become incorporated in the complex food web of the sea. In the preparation of FPC we may also encounter a concentration effect of trace elements and other industrial chemical compounds that could eventually result in serious disease problems. This is an area of research that is going to require carefully controlled long-term chronic toxicity studies. At the moment there is no evidence that any serious consideration is being given this subject.

Important economic by-products will also result from a national effort in biomedical oceanography in the area of education. New job opportunities will be developed and new educational programs will be required.

The untapped biochemical wealth of the sea offers some of our richest resources with the promise of immediate returns as nutrients and useful therapeutic agents which are likely to prove to be highly effective against some of mankind's most devastating ills. Marine biotoxins play a dual role of being able to preserve life as well as to destroy it. We must learn how to utilize these substances for the benefit of all mankind.

NEED FOR INDUSTRIAL-GOVERNMENT LIAISON

Provision should be made to establish an effective liaison between government and industry. If the biochemical wealth of the oceans is to be successfully utilized, there must be brought about a much closer working relationship between government and industry. Most pharmaceutical companies are not in a position to undertake the expensive logistics, procurement, and documentation program that is required before a marine organism can be assayed for its pharmacological properties. These initial studies will of necessity have to be funded by government. A great deal of fundamental research will be required in order to develop commercially feasible aquaculture techniques for the rearing of marine organisms having marine pharmaceutical potential. It is noteworthy that at least one commercial company (Aquarium Systems, Inc., Wickliffe, Ohio) is presently exploring the rearing of marine pharmaceutical organisms. It is important that some sort of a cooperative program be established with private enterprise so that compounds having commercial potential can be profitably marketed and thereby enhance our economy. This is a very critical area that must be carefully evaluated if these biochemical products are to be of economic value to our nation.

LACKAWANNA OPPOSES OIL DRILLING IN LAKE ERIE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the issue of underwater drilling for oil and gas has had prominent attention of late, particularly in view of the accident off the California coast.

There is now a proposal for oil and gas drilling in Lake Erie about which the people of the Niagara frontier are rightfully concerned.

Lake Erie already has a serious pollution problem with which local, State, and Federal officials are striving to deal as fast as possible.

Our people are worried that oil and gas drilling may add new complications to an already extremely difficult situation.

On May 20, I submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution from the legislature of Erie County, N.Y., in vehement opposition to the proposed lake drilling.

Now the City Council of Lackawanna, N.Y., has passed a resolution expressing its opposition "to any drilling for oil or gas in Lake Erie because of the imminent dangers of pollution."

The resolution urges Governor Rockefeller and our State and Federal legislators to "take any and all action to prevent such drilling."

The council approved the resolution by unanimous vote and a copy of the resolution, No. 30, signed by Council President Melvin D. Wodzinski, has been sent to all parties.

The anxiety of our people in the Buffalo area is very clear and I hope that there will be careful consideration of all of the aspects of the drilling proposal before final action is taken.

INCREASE MINORITY REPRESENTATION ON DRAFT BOARDS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, even though President Nixon shows interest in at least one aspect of selective service reform—a lottery draft concept—I doubt if any changes will be occurring in the near future.

For young men now subject to inequities and distortions contained in the current draft apparatus, the prospect of future reform does not mean very much. Too many present regulations and practices utilized by the Selective Service System seem to me to be flagrant repudiations of basic democratic concepts upon which our Nation was formed.

Already this session I have introduced a bill (H.R. 8428) calling for a 5-year transition to a full volunteer military, with a lottery draft employed during the interim. I still stand behind my position that even though a volunteer army may offer certain grave dangers, on balance it is a better system than the current draft-oriented military—with or without a lottery mechanism.

In addition to that bill, I have indicated my support of draft reforms proposed by other colleagues. In April I joined with my friend from New York (Mr. KOCH) in a bill (H.R. 10500) clarifying the definition of conscientious objectors; soon, I will be a cosponsor of a proposal by my friend from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) which seeks to give registrants the right of legal counsel before a draft board.

This week, I entered a new bill which asks for change in another facet of the Selective Service System—minority representation on draft boards.

Three years ago, I discovered that in the parts of Los Angeles County where there was a heavy concentration of Mexican-American citizens, the three draft boards serving those areas only had one Mexican-American member. Furthermore, he was the only person of Mexican-American descent in all Los Angeles County—and there are over 600,000 Mexican-Americans in the county—to be on a draft board.

Given the wide autonomous powers granted individual draft boards, composition of the boards may result in varying responses to similar situations. That is, there could be deferment or drafting of some men in some communities who would have been given a different status in a different community. Whether or not the racial and economic makeup of boards has contributed to the range of policies taken by different boards is hard to either say or prove, but I believe it certainly could have such implications and is a matter that should be corrected.

Since 1966, when I first brought up the underrepresentation of Mexican Americans on Los Angeles boards, there has been some improvement in getting better minority participation. Within a year—by July 1967—Mexican-American board members jumped from only that one to six. Now, nine Mexican Americans serve on boards throughout Los Angeles County.

Yet, still more needs to be done. If the proportion of Mexican Americans on Los Angeles County boards were to be "truly representative of the community they serve"—as President Johnson ordered in his 1967 draft reform address—instead of nine, there would be 20 Mexican Americans serving today.

Since President Johnson's speech, nationwide minority membership on boards has risen. According to a chart in the May issue of "Selective Service," the monthly publication of the national Selective Service System, between March 1967 and March 1969, the number of minority group members serving on local boards increased from 801 to 1,688.

Over that period, Negro membership zoomed about 230 percent—from about 300 to nearly 1,070—and from about 37 percent of all minority board members to around 63 percent. The percentage growth of Spanish-surnamed members rose the least of all minority groups, going up about 26 percent over the 2-year period.

The bill I introduced yesterday (H.R. 11799) aims at further increasing minority participation on local selective service boards. It says that the "President, in making such appointments, and the Governors or other officials, in making recommendations for such appointments, shall insure that the individuals forming the membership of a local board substantially reflect the ethnic and economic composition within the boundaries of the area which such board serves."

I believe additional minority representation would help, in part, to assure fair and equitable treatment for all registrants, and could also provide better community participation and acceptance with board actions.

JUDGE JOHN S. SIMMANG

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, central Texas has lost a great leader and all of us have lost a great friend. Hon. John S. Simmang, district judge of the 21st Judicial District of Texas, died recently of a heart attack.

Judge Simmang was widely known at all levels—he worked with Presidents and Governors, but he also sat at the table with the common man.

Judge Simmang began practicing law in his native Giddings in 1929. Although he was widely traveled, he never had any desire to leave Lee County. His father, the late E. T. Simmang, practiced law in Giddings beginning in the late 1800's. His brother was also an attorney.

The judge served as Lee County attorney from 1954 until 1969, when he resigned to accept the post as district judge. This career was never to be fulfilled. Judge Simmang died after having served only 5 months. This loss will be keenly felt.

His son, Michael, has continued the family law tradition. Mike is the district attorney, a job he took the first of this year.

From 1938 until 1952, Judge Simmang served as judge of his county. He was cocounsel for Bluebonnet Electric Co-op for 27 years. During his tenure, this co-op strung lines into the back country and generated power for thousands of people.

Not content with these credentials, Judge Simmang also served as president of the Texas Association of County Judges. During this tenure, he personally worked to make the dream of farm-to-market roads a reality.

John Simmang was a common man in philosophy, but not in action. He was without equal in getting things done. For example, he served on the Giddings Chamber of Commerce, the volunteer fire department, the industrial foundation, and the State school committee.

The list of his service organizations fills a telephone book.

Judge Simmang was an astute Democratic worker. Years ago, he joined hands in helping a young man in his bid for election to Congress. That young man later became President of the United States—Lyndon B. Johnson.

Judge Simmang was born in Giddings in 1906. He died in 1969. In those years between, John Simmang carved out a new central Texas. He carried his area to heights they never dreamed of. In a quiet but firm manner, this man asked all of us to deliver more than we thought we could—and then he would hold our hand until we did, helping over the rough spots.

The years of John Simmang's life were a gift to all of us. I will miss him sorely, as will all his many friends.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by including remarks written by a young man Judge Simmang encouraged. This tribute is written by Buddy Preuss, editor of the Giddings Times and News—one of the Judge's own:

LEE COUNTY HAS LOST A FRIEND

(By Buddy Preuss)

The people of Lee County have lost a friend with the passing of Judge John S. Simmang.

This man loved Lee County and its people like few others I have ever known.

Yet the prominence of becoming District Judge didn't change his attitude about the common people. He had dined with the highest dignitaries of this nation, including Presidents and Governors. But his heart always came back to his beloved Lee County, the place of his birth and childhood, where he followed in his father's footsteps as an attorney in the practice of law.

Although Judge Simmang had associated with the highest officials of the land, he was more often than not seen dressed in work clothes associating with people of all races in this area who truly earned their living by the sweat of their brow. He, too, spent as much time as possible at his farm with his cattle.

Judge Simmang loved the outdoors. Nothing probably hurt him more in this respect than the decision of the Corps of Engineers to drain Flag Pond when the Somerville Dam was built. Yet just last week, he made an all-out effort to help obtain lights for the Neils Creek Park on the Lee County side of the Somerville Lake. He realized the importance of these lights in protecting those Lee Countians and others who were using this park for recreation.

It was announced at all three Lee County Sheriff's Posse rodeos last week that Judge Simmang had donated lights above the bucking shoots so that his people could better enjoy the sport of rodeos.

These are just a few of the recent contributions Judge Simmang made to this community. Thousands of things he has done for untold numbers of individuals and families in Lee County will never be known. It didn't make any difference whether you were rich or poor, black or white. If it was help you needed, the Judge was there to give it.

Not only did he often give free legal advice to those who couldn't afford his services, but often reached down into his pocket to help those who needed it. And he made countless contributions to various churches and civic organizations.

The "little man" meant just as much to Judge Simmang as the fellow with lots of money and great honor. Thousands in this area will testify to this fact.

He had reached the height of his career with his election as District Judge last November. It is quite possible that he could have had appointments to even higher judicial offices had he wanted it. But Judge Simmang didn't want to leave Lee County. The good life among his friends meant more to him than a high political position. So his short 5 months as District Judge still allowed him to live in the place of his youth.

He was happy these past few months, probably happier than he had ever been. Yet he was the first to admit the shortness of life on this earth. He talked about it almost as if he expected not to be here much longer. Still he loved life and lived it.

Those living in Bastrop, Burleson and Washington counties were already beginning to realize the fairness of Judge Simmang on the bench. He received a very complimentary article just last month from the publisher of the Brenham newspaper. These are the kind of men we need more of on the benches of our courts. Fair, yet not so liberal to be too lenient to those found guilty of a serious crime.

It hurts me to thinks that the Judge could not have been spared long enough to fill at least one term as an example to the judicial branch of our government.

I will never forget how Judge Simmang about two years ago accepted a county court case, the first held in nearly 2 decades in this county. He knew it wouldn't make him any money in big fees, but he was fighting for a principle. And without principle a man's word or his character means nothing.

So Judge Simmang and his son Michael won a court case which allowed $500 for 3 "wolf dogs" which had been shot by a man because he claimed the dog was disturbing his cattle. The dog belonged to a colored gentleman who had been hunting wolves as sport for years, helping to cut down on the wolf population in this area.

Whatever Judge Simmang believed in, he would fight to the end for it. This is the way it was with his political beliefs. Back when Lyndon B. Johnson first campaigned for Congressman in this 10th District, it was Mr. John who headed his campaign in the Lee County area. And he backed Lyndon Johnson all the way to the Presidency.

Both LBJ and the Judge were instrumental in getting the LCREC, now Bluebonnet Electric Co-Op, for Giddings. It's meant a lot to the economy of this community and has helped to give electricity to the entire rural area.

The Judge also served at one time as President of the County Judges & Commissioners Association, helping to get roads for rural areas.

One of Judge Simmang's most recent contributions to this community came just last year when the Giddings State School Committee, of which he was a member, helped obtain the State School for Boys to be located at Giddings. Although the Judge did not live to see this become a reality, the School will be a monument to his untiring work for a better communtiy. And it will employ several hundred people, most of whom will be the "common people" he cared so much for.

Yes, Judge Simmang will be missed. But then he is finally getting to rest from his labors. It can be said of him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

He was a servant of the people.

THE ECONOMICS OF MANPOWER POLICY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the need for a more effective national manpower policy was eloquently expressed by Secretary of Labor Shultz in a speech he gave recently before the Associated Employers of Illinois. I am inserting the distinguished Secretary's speech in the RECORD because of my conviction that his wards clearly indicate that the time has now arrived to develop a more comprehensive approach in the manpower field. The speech follows:

THE ECONOMICS OF MANPOWER POLICY

(Remarks by Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz, Associated Employers of Illinois' luncheon, Chicago, Ill., May 23, 1969)

Manpower policy 50 years ago consisted of putting a "Help Wanted" sign in the window, or a classified ad in the local newspaper, or calling on a private employment agency.

These methods continue today and serve individual purposes but they are not adequate for a national Manpower Policy.

We know that an acute shortage of labor on the one hand and substantial idle manpower on the other add up to economic waste.

Those are the circumstances today. It is this waste that a national manpower policy seeks to overcome. These circumstances are further complicated by inflation, which we are dealing with as firmly as we can without throwing the economy into reverse.

Manpower training programs serve a twofold purpose:

1. The direct social benefits of giving the hard-core unemployed a sense of usefulness to themselves and society are well known.

2. The economic effects of an active manpower policy are not so well known.

The major promise of manpower programs as a tool of economic policy was stated quite articulately by Gosta Rehn and adopted by the Council of the 22-country OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperative Development) in 1964:

An active manpower policy has the special advantage of being expansionist with regard to employment and production but anti-inflationary with regard to costs and prices."

In terms of the current economic situation the challenge is to take the steam out of inflation while defeating the upcreep of unemployment. Manpower programs can increase the supply of useful labor and thereby increase the ability of the economy to match output and demand.

If manpower policies are to be fully effective in supporting both economic and social objectives, however, further strengthening and more flexibility is needed in three major areas—the public employment service, the unemployment insurance system, and manpower training programs.

In the first of these areas—the public employment service—we have seen some progress, including

The separation of unemployment insurance from placement functions, so that the emphasis can be shifted to placement, particularly for the hard-core, who are seldom part of the unemployment insurance system,

Steps toward computerizing labor market information,

The elimination of job discrimination, and

The coordination of employment service operations with training and other programs for the disadvantaged.

Yet, despite these improvements, problems remain. To date, there has been little training of employment service personnel. State salary levels have remained inadequate. And virtually no preparation has been made for possible large-scale lay-offs.

In the unemployment insurance system, immediate action is needed to correct such deficiencies as the inadequacy of unemployment insurance benefits which are typically low in relation to the past income of the unemployed, especially the male head of household; coverage for only 3 out of 4 workers; and the fact that half the States still refuse benefits to many trainees.

Our training programs also need improvement. We have not yet, for example, developed adequate measures of the number of people who need training. Even with the uncertainties concerning need, however, there are indications that only a limited number of those who require training are getting it.

In addition, we have not yet fully met the training needs of the nation's youth, even though youth have been one of the special target groups for manpower programs.

Steps needed to strengthen all these programs—the unemployment service, the unemployment insurance system, and training programs—can be taken under present authority, programs, and funding.

We are planning, for example, or have already begun:

Vacancy surveys to pinpoint training needs that exist side by side with unemployment.

To direct more training and placement to service jobs—insurance, banking, hospital work and other manpower shortage areas that are less vulnerable to economic downturn than are jobs in the goods producing areas.

To set up Job Banks in 36 cities, and computerize job-matching in the employment service systems of 3 or 4 States next year.

To shift out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps training opportunities to preparation that leads to jobs in the public or private sector.

To expand successful programs—like JOBS—to more cities, and non-profit and public sector organizations.

To streamline administration.

To give the States more freedom and flexibility to tailor job training to local and individual needs.

But these changes, though important, would not be enough to deal with a rise in unemployment. If that happened, resources to combat the rise must be available quickly. This means considering such ideas as whether or not training and work experience opportunities should increase automatically if unemployment rises, and whether Governors should be able to command additional manpower resources for spot unemployment problems.

In order to have resources for long-run economic purposes, we can also make substantial manpower investments that would provide economic strength, and greater production and productivity.

These investments would include:

Greatly expanded upgrading of the workforce.

Determined steps to avoid occupational accidents and diseases.

Prisoner training and placement.

More extensive training of welfare clients and steps to bridge the gap from school to work.

By taking steps in all these areas, the nation's manpower policies can become a permanent, flexible, and sizable means of attaining both full employment and economic stability.

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1969, the Civitan Club of Marietta, Ohio, awarded a scholarship to Bruce Dunn, 131 Oakwood Avenue, Marietta, Ohio. One of the requirements to apply for this scholarship was to write an essay on "What America Means to Me."

With the actions of many young people across this Nation, the rioting and boycotting of colleges, it is refreshing to find a young man of the caliber of Mr. Dunn. I believe that this essay shows what the majority of the young people in this country feel for America.

Mr. Dunn's ambition is to become a doctor of veterinary medicine and he will enter Ohio State University in the fall of 1969. He has been an outstanding citizen not only in the community but at his school. He was tapped for National Honor Society and has won several honors in speech contests. Also, he has spent many hours assisting teachers in the field of chemistry and agriculture.

I submit Mr. Dunn's essay for inclusion in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues and other concerned Americans may share the thoughts of this patriotic young American:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

In today's world of growing strife and discord, it is reassuring to know that there is still one nation which will defend to the death man's basic freedoms. These basic freedoms of speech, press, and religion, contained in a single document nearly two hundred years ago, are guaranteed to any person in these United States, regardless of race or creed. Even when the freedoms are used to reach out and strike down the same government which protects these rights, our American way of thinking feels it must defend these citizens all the more. Thus, America means to me the protection of certain basic rights given to man, often abused and often restricted in other nations.

One has only to look back at his heritage to find ancestors coming from many countries in Europe. People have come from Britain, Ireland, Germany, France, Poland, and many other nations from all over the world. They have immigrated to the great melting pot of the world, where the only true natives were the American Indians. What was the one thing that so many people of such widely different backgrounds found in a strange country so very far from their own homes? I believe that they were looking for freedom. And the only way that many could ever find freedom was to start to build it in a new and untamed land. Although these people were often separated by a language barrier, they were commonly united by one will and one desire. With this common goal in mind, these early pioneers tried to and did overcome any obstacle in their path, often paying the price with life itself.

Yet, today, many of us seem to have slammed the door on our proud heritage. We have forgotten the sacrifices made at Valley Forge, Bull Run, and Pearl Harbor, so that we may enjoy a more perfect way of life in this country. Instead, many are picking up the protest marchers' sign and picketing against the very rights which make America such a great country to live in. These very people who value freedom of speech and expression refuse to realize that it takes every citizen of a nation working together to protect these freedoms.

To me, America has not only proven herself first in freedom, but also first in many other fields. For example, my basic field of interest, agriculture, has progressed more in the past two hundred years in America than in the rest of man's known history. Only in this nation was land available to anyone who wished to settle and work it. Instead of returning all of their profits to the state, the early pioneers who were willing to work were able to pass on a meaningful existence to their children. American agriculture has progressed a long way from the time of the fork and mule to today's modern push-button farms. This was all done through hard work and Yankee ingenuity.

When he had nearly completed the settling and exploration of the wilderness on this earth, the American pioneer turned to a new and vast wilderness—outer space. Although another nation was the first to put a manned system into outer space, America was quick to see the importance of exploring a new frontier where man exists as a speck of dust. Brave new explorers, willing to risk their lives in much the same manner of our early pioneers, set forth into space with not even the promise that they would return alive. Yet while an astronaut is in space, each and every American seems to be with him and a part of his family. These men who are willing to risk their lives to explore new possibilities for the success of future generations are the real heroes of American history today. This is only one of the reasons why I can say with pride, "I'm proud that I'm an American."

America has meant the difference between success and failure to many of our modern inventions. Only in this nation have equal chances been given to anyone willing to search for and come up with a new idea. By our laws the rights and inventions of individuals are protected so that a government or another individual may not steal the rewards of another's work. Evidence of equal opportunity in this field is shown through the hundreds of inventions of such men as Thomas Edison. Often the right to investigate new ideas is taken away from the citizens of other nations. America has meant to me the opportunity to give birth to ideas of my own.

Education is the backbone of a nation. The welfare and economy of the nation stem from that education, no matter how poor or how good. We, who live in the United States, are fortunate to have the best education system in the world. It is no longer only the rich man who is educated. Ever since America's early public history there has been some form of free public education available to anyone willing to take advantage of it. Today, free public education is given to every male and female of this nation from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. But education does not stop here. College is available to anyone willing to meet the scholarship requirements. Federal aid or scholarship funds are available to almost one fifth of those who attend our colleges today. Therefore, it is not necessary for the education of any American today to stop after a few years in grade school.

Even though one does not have the aptitude for a college education, vocational training schools are available to develop the best talents of anyone willing to attend. People graduating from these vocational training courses are well prepared to enter into a useful place in society, instead of an unemployment line.

While proving herself first at home, America has often stepped out of her boundaries to help another nation, whenever in need. This has meant our men leaving our shores and fighting in behalf of another people. Any nation wishing our assistance for the sake of freedom and peace has never been turned away. Often this has brought rash criticism and ill feelings against the United States, but this we have withstood. The very survival of many small countries has been due to the fact that only the United States was willing to stand up for the underdog.

Along with revolution and war come the needs of many innocent individuals involved. These innocent ones are the children, the aged, the sick and the invalids or victims of circumstances. While being mighty in war, America has proven herself mighty in the time of need. We have moved to share our abundance with those who are less fortunate, even though those less fortunate may be our enemies of tomorrow. Thus, America has proven herself as an humanitarian nation. This has meant to me that an individual or a nation is truly great when he can bend to help his fellow man.

In summary, one can look at his heritage to see what America has meant to him. I am proud of my native land and proud to be an American because of some of the reasons I have discussed. Yet these are but a few examples of what makes America and her people great. The United States can function as a republic only when I, as a citizen of this country, am willing to take the responsibility of voicing my own opinion in the operation of its government. This nation will continue to be the greatest in the world so long as we are a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people!"

PRESIDENT FERDINAND E. MARCOS

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, as the Republic of the Philippines celebrates the 23d anniversary of its independence, it is increasingly evident that this vibrant young republic, under the dynamic leadership of President Marcos, is a major force in Asia in the struggle against communism. It is one of the main bastions of freedom in the Pacific.

For this reason, it is important for us to be adequately informed of the accomplishments of President Marcos' administration—a period that coincides with our involvement in the war in Vietnam.

I am most grateful to my good friend, Dr. Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of Bataan magazine and president of Capital Publishers, Inc., for the valuable information he has given me about the achievements of the Marcos administration. Dr. Yap has condensed the full text of President Marcos' fourth and last state-of-the-nation address delivered during the opening of the fourth session of the Sixth Congress of the Philippines.

In reviewing the accomplishments recorded by this administration during the last 3 years, Dr. Yap pointed out that President Marcos has recommended bold proposals for legislation this year to "sustain the significant gains we have in major areas." His third year in office, President Marcos stated, was the year when "we expanded our scope to include the public services, foreign relations, domestic and foreign commerce, and industry. This year as distinguished by the confirmation of our competence for progress."

President Marcos further stated that the material achievements during the era of his stewardship "represent, above all, a transformation of the Filipino spirit, from defeatism, sloth, and self-depreciation to a new level of energy, self-esteem and the will to achieve our goal." This spiritual and intellectual transformation is the "new Filipinism."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In summarizing the 114 printed pages assessing the current state of the nation, the following outstanding accomplishments, among others, must be enumerated:

First. Built more concrete roads than were ever built from the turn of the century to 1965.

Second. Reduced in 3 years by almost 50 percent the backlog of schoolrooms which had accumulated through the decades.

Third. Made spectacular breakthrough in rice production which enabled the Philippines to export this staple for the first time in history.

Fourth. Raised the land reform program to the level of serious action for the first time. At the end of 1965, a total of only 12 municipalities had been proclaimed land reform areas. From January 1966 to October 1968, the present administration declared 50 municipalities as land reform areas.

Fifth. Initiated bold and decisive support to the growth of private industry. The board of investment, created in 1968, has set up a system of priorities in our accelerated industrialization effort.

Sixth. Investment has increased. The private sector has regained faith in the government. In fiscal year 1965–66, the total paid-up capital investment by newly registered corporations, partnerships, and single proprietorships was P323.7 million. In fiscal year 1967–68, this amount rose to P478.4 million, an increase of 47 percent.

Seventh. The economy, in a state of ruin at the end of 1965, has gained new life. This is reflected in the growth rate achieved in 1968.

Eighth. The external stability of the currency has been maintained. In the last quarter of 1968, as a result of these measures, we had a $25 million surplus. Before that, we had successive deficits, ranging from $14 million to $38 million.

Ninth. Community development projects increased by 427 percent. This increment has benefited more than six million people.

Tenth. Obtained unprecedented benefits for labor.

Eleventh. Industrial peace was maintained. The incidence of strikes was reduced by 65 percent compared with the previous administration.

Twelfth. Gave the country its first workable manpower development program.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The President made the following proposals for immediate legislation:

First. Creation of a presidential commission to study the possibility of major changes in our Government system to eliminate obstacles to growth.

Second. Establishment of a trust fund from which can be drawn increases in teachers; salaries, cost-of-living allowances, and other fringe benefits.

Third. Opening up of adequate channels for public school teachers to communicate their grievances.

Fourth. Complete and immediate embargo on the importation of all luxury and nonessential goods.

Fifth. New resources of revenue to be provided to finance the legitimate requirements of our people for improved living conditions.

Sixth. A tax on foreign stocks, land, and buildings acquired abroad by residents of the Philippines.

Seventh. Present tariff rates should be assessed and revised to promote industrialization.

Eighth. Congress to define exactly the areas in which we are prepared to extend temporary national treatment to foreigners, and the areas in which we are willing to give only most-favored-nation treatment.

Ninth. Review of the present government schemes of financial assistance to private industry to favor Filipino capital and, at the same time, discourage importation of nonessentials.

Tenth. Appropriation of the Rice and Corn Administration be increased to 40 million a year.

Eleventh. Appropriation of a sum sufficient to liquidate long overdue obligations of the RCA.

Twelfth. Congress and the executive should adopt as a basic policy that investments in agriculture from now on be concentrated as much as possible below the typhoon belt.

Thirteenth. The creation of a special fund for peace and order.

Fourteenth. Integration of all police agencies of Manila and suburban areas under a Metropolitan Command patterned after Scotland Yard.

Fifteenth. Examination of the possibility of giving the national government more latitude to step into the peace and order problems on the local level.

Sixteenth. Setting up branches of the Court of Appeals and the Court of Agrarian Relations in various regions.

Seventeenth. Establishment of a research and advisory staff for every court of first instance.

Eighteenth. Judges of first instance with unreasonable number of undecided cases be denied the privilege of being reassigned to another jurisdiction until they have cleared their dockets.

Nineteenth. Enactment of a law defining the guidelines for the creation of private corporations for a public purpose.

Twentieth. Enactment of an export incentive bill.

Twenty-first. Enacting of a law authorizing the President to designate export processing zones.

Twenty-second. Establishment of more science high schools.

Twenty-third. Creation of a fund to support more barrio high schools.

Twenty-fourth. Creation of a special fund for the University of the Philippines.

Twenty-fifth. Revision of the UP Charter to guarantee academic freedom and self-determination.

Twenty-sixth. Revision of charters of government colleges and universities so as to provide for student membership in the boards of regent.

Twenty-seventh. Establishment of a P3 million permanent trust fund, the earnings of which will finance the expenses of student organizations.

Twenty-eight. Passage of a Magna Charta for students.

Twenty-ninth. Mustering of the will and the funds to declare Central Luzon as a land reform area by 1969.

Thirtieth. Grant of congressional authority to sell the lands now occupied by Fort Bonifacio, Camp Aguinaldo, Camp Crame, and other government properties in the four cities of the metropolitan area, the proceeds to constitute a huge fund to finance land reform and agriculture.

Thirty-first. Immediate enactment of the pending manpower development bill.

Thirty-second. Authorizing the Mindanao Development Authority to borrow money from foreign sources to finance major turn-key projects.

Thirty-third. Updating of existing laws on power distribution so that cheap power may be extended to all.

Thirty-fourth. Changing the entire orientation of our public housing policy to suit needs of the low wage-earners.

Thirty-fifth. Establishment of a workable unemployment insurance scheme.

Thirty-sixth. Creation of a workers' bank with GSIS and SSS providing seed.

Thirty-seventh. Immediate passage of pending medicare bill.

Thirty-eighth. Appropriation of sufficient funds to reactivate public defenders.

Thirty-ninth. Creation of a Textbooks Commission for Public Schools.

Fortieth. Establishment of trade and cultural relations with countries of Eastern Europe.

The biography of President Marcos follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF H. E. FERDINAND E. MARCOS, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Of all the present Asian leaders, President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Republic of the Philippines shows every sign of becoming the most persuasive and most deeply committed to the cause of democracy, both as a system opposed to communism and dedicated to peace with freedom.

It is not difficult to believe in this, for Ferdinand Marcos, born on Sept. 11, 1917, belongs to the generation that grew up in a time that was still stirred by World War I and in a country that was imbued with the democratic ideals learned from America, and passionately embraced by a people and their leaders who longed for freedom.

Ferdinand Marcos was a studious youth, as reflected in his high grades from elementary school through high school and college, and it was because of his serious mind that he soon became conscious of politics and the dynamics of government. Pursing a law course in the state university, the University of the Philippines in Manila, he became a student leader and participated in student demonstrations against certain national ills at the time and for the early attainment of independence.

His life suddenly took a dramatic turn, when even as he was finishing his law course, he was accused of the murder of a political enemy of his father, Mariano Marcos, a public school teacher turned politician, who served a term as representative in the Philippine Legislature and later was appointed governor of Davao province in Mindanao. The young Marcos was subsequently convicted by the local court in a highly controversial decision. He appealed his case while still in detention, at the same time continuing to review for the bar examinations.

He passed the bar in 1939, with one of the highest grades in bar history, and won his case, Philippines-Northern Luzon. This unit fought inside enemy lines in the rugged terrain of the Cordilleras range in the Mountain Province.

During the Liberation Campaign, President Marcos fought in one of the decisive battles of the war, the Battle of Bessang Pass, which led to the capture of General Yamashita, the commanding general of the Japanese Imperial Forces in the Philippines.

President Marcos emerged from the war with nearly every medal and decoration for courage and gallantry the Philippine and American governments could bestow on a soldier. He received, in all, 27 medals and decorations, making him the most decorated Filipino soldier in World War II. Four of his decorations were for five wounds sustained in battle.

His first taste of civil administration was his assignment to establish a government in the areas cleared of Japanese by his outfit, in Northern Luzon. He continued to do this, first as combat officer then as judge advocate general and civil affairs officer of the USAFIP-NL. From this experience, he went actively into public service.

He served as a technical assistant to President Manuel A. Roxas, the first President of the Republic of the Philippines, in 1946, then led a mission of Filipino officers in 1947 to Washington, D.C., to secure from the U.S. Congress arrears-in-pay and other benefits for Filipino World War II veterans.

In 1949, at 32 years, he ran for the Philippine Congress, and won a seat as representative of the second district of his home province, Ilocos Norte, in Northern Luzon. It was the same district once represented by his father. This lanuched his political career.

He served as Congressman for three consecutive terms—one term is four years—and after his third term, he ran for senator and won the highest number of votes among the senatorial candidates. That was in 1949. As with his career in the Lower House, he was a leading senator, occupying vital positions of leadership.

In the Senate, he was minority leader and then President. He also served as a member of the National Economic Council, the Council of Leaders and the Council of State.

A prolific lawmaker, he established a record during his terms in both Houses for the most number of important bills introduced, many of which were passed. He pioneered in land reform legislation, championed the Land Tenure Act in the House and steered the passage of the Land Reform Code in the Senate. He also worked to strengthen trade unionism, was cosponsor of the Magna Carta of Labor and the Anti-Scab Law.

President Marcos, had, indeed, a broad interest as legislator, which ranged from agriculture to civil liberties, economics to foreign relations. It was as though he was rehearsing for the Philippine presidency, for which he set his hat from the jump-off point of the senate presidency, which he held at the time he broke off with the then President Macapagal and the Liberal Party, and joined the Nacionalista Party.

In the Nacionalista Party national convention of 1965, he fought a hard but masterly battle, with the odds against him, being a neophyte member of the party while contesting the presidential nomination with veteran Nacionalista leaders. The resounding triumph of President Marcos, in a way, indicated what was to come in the presidential campaign that was to follow. As it turned out, it was an uphill battle all the way, but the votes ultimately gave President Marcos a clear-cut mandate from the people.

In his first six months in office, President Marcos spiritedly faced up to the crisis in government, which had to contend with low morale, depressed public funds, and an economic slump. Today, there is a new briskness in government operations, resumed economic activity, and fresh public confidence in the national leadership.

In foreign relations, President Marcos unequivocally reiterated Philippine support of the free way of life and the Philippines' staunch opposition to communism, as proven by his vigorous advocacy of Philippine assistance to South Vietnam in its struggle against communist aggression. He has also sparked the resumption of Philippine diplomatic ties with the Federation of Malaysia, the recognition of Singapore, and the rapproachment between Malaysia and Indonesia. He has enunciated a policy of support for any move to strengthen economic, cultural and mutual defense agreements among friendly Asian countries, in the interest of common development and stability.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN A TRILLION DOLLAR ECONOMY

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 I addressed the Career Academy annual convention in Milwaukee and discussed America's great need for a workable and effective program of vocational education in our schools to acquaint our young people with the world of work and what it means to be an adult.

Following is the text of my remarks:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN A TRILLION DOLLAR ECONOMY

In his book, "Making Education Relevant," Marvin Feldman of the Ford Foundation said:

"We can no longer tolerate an educational system which ignores the world of work; where occupational studies are considered inferior to general studies, and where youngsters in vocational courses do not receive the training necessary for entry into college and those in college preparatory courses are denied vocational experience which relates their learning to reality."

The United States is now in its 10th year of continuous, expanding prosperity—a standard of living unmatched in the history of the world. Within a very short time, our nation will be a trillion dollar economy.

In the midst of this abundance and this plenty, we are confronted with disorders in high schools and colleges, civil discontent, hunger and poverty. How can this be?

Sixty percent of America's high schools have experienced some form of disorder—to a lesser or greater degree—and I suspect the most prevelant cause is a disenchantment by young people with the type of schooling they get.

In the midst of our unequalled prosperity, more than 4,000,000 Americans are unemployed—the vast majority willing and anxious to work.

Within the next 2 weeks, approximately 1,000,000 high school graduates will enter the job market, to a great extent unprepared for anything but unskilled labor.

Some 26 million young people have entered the nation's job market for the first time in the last 10 years. Of this number, a minimum of 30% were under-educated for the specific jobs available.

Only 1 student in 10 who leaves school without a bachelor's degree has some preparation for a specific occupation.

Thirty percent of the able-bodied unemployed in America this very morning are between the ages of 16 and 19.

This pool of potential talent is going to waste because American education has consistently and brutally ignored the one common ingredient in all of our lives.

Our educational system has relied on and continued to stress rote memorization of history, language and the arts, while at the same time failing to incorporate these subjects into an equally important discipline—the world of work.

Only one student in 5 goes on to college after completing high school. The other 80% enter the labor market, most of them ill-prepared and poorly trained to confront technology head on. These young people have spent 10 to 12 years behind desks in classrooms, and most of them can count on the fingers of one hand the hours they have spent actually preparing for the real world.

I am not suggesting, nor would I, that we ignore the scholastic disciplines. And I do not propose to engage in a debate with those who favor the liberal arts to the exclusion of technical skills.

I do propose a massive restructuring of our system of education in America. Our present system—and I speak to you today with more than 10 years of solid work in looking into all aspects of American education—our present system is unrealistic. It fails to serve the young people it is supposed to be preparing for life.

Far too many students are bewildered and confounded by the sheer choices with which they are confronted when they leave school. And far too many of them are blocked from making any sort of meaningful choice because they have not been exposed to legitimate work experience.

It is for this reason that I strongly believe that this last third of our 20th century belongs to vocational educators.

For years vocational educators have been striving to interest their colleagues in the merits of correlating the skills, training, and information available in education to encourage students to explore the outside world and to prepare them to live in it as productive adults, not national liabilities.

For too long occupational education has floundered in the backwater of American life. All too often young people were being trained for outmoded jobs.

We need a major restructuring of our thinking in education today. We need a curriculum geared to the world as it is, in which students will earn their living and develop as adults. If there is a salvation for American education, I firmly believe it lies in a greater emphasis on developing occupational skills.

This is why I believe we need to enlist the help of proprietary schools such as your own Career Academy to train the massive labor force America needs as it passes a trillion dollar economy in the 70's and reaches for a 4 trillion dollar gross national product by the end of this century.

Our children are not stupid; neither are they interested in being preserved in cocoons of ignorance and shielded from learning what it is to be adult until that magical age of 21.

Occupational training can offer a workable, exciting solution to educating our children. It can offer them distinct choices. It can acquaint them with methodolgy and technology and give them a firm grounding in the skills they will need to find jobs that mean something, not only to them, but to their communities.

We need an entirely new sense of direction in job training too! One of the major faults in our massive job training programs instituted by the Federal Government in recent years is that we have tried to train people primarily for entry skills. We have trained them to do only that which will get them on a payroll—any payroll—as quickly and painlessly as possible.

But in our effort to help them earn their own way, we neglected Step 2, which is to provide them with the training necessary to progress in their jobs. As a result, too many of our Federal programs have been a tragic and costly failure; and too many thousands have abandoned these instant jobs feeling discouraged, disappointed, and enraged.

Most of them feel they've been conned. And many of them are right. The tragedy is that you can never get them to try again.

We have the means to reach these young people and to offset and eliminate their restlessness and dissatisfaction in our nation's private trade schools.

We don't need new programs, for the techniques and technology that already are available are more than adequate for this massive task.

There are in America today more than 7,000 private trade schools which could absorb with no delay—immediately; tomorrow—more than 1 million hard-core unemployed for meaningful training programs, and your own network of Career Academies scattered throughout the United States is the most effective of them all. Career Academy is the Cadillac of trade schools in America.

All of these schools have been approved for their academic standards by the Veterans Administration and are today training tens of thousands of young men benefitting from the G.I. Bill of Rights.

We have gone through a noble experiment in job training in this country only to see program after program fail to reach its goal.

The huge cost of the Job Corps; the millions of dollars spent on manpower retraining; the highly touted National Alliance of Businessmen which was to have spent $2 billion training the hard-core unemployed for meaningful employment—all of these have had—at best—only limited results.

That is why I so firmly believe the time has come when we ought to put this whole program of occupational education into proper perspective.

For the very young people still attending elementary and high school, we ought to fully fund the Vocational Education Act of 1968 which I sponsored, and which would bring meaning to American public education.

For those who are now out of school or who seek a faster orientation in a meaningful occupation, I propose the Federal government fully utilize this very impressive network of trade and career schools we have in America.

Your own Career Academy is today a national asset because it has the know-how, experience, and the capability of closing the gap between those unprepared for gainful employment and the employer who so desperately needs their services. We need only look at the weekend want-ad columns to see jobs begging to be filled.

Your Career Academy has developed an outstanding capability in recruiting, training, and above all, in placement after the training cycle, in meaningful employment.

America's trade schools offer the greatest hope for job training.

Contrast your orderly and systematic approach to job training with some of the government-sponsored programs, and you will see what I mean.

I submit that a hard-core unemployed American has three strikes on him when he tries to go the route of being trained by an employer. First of all, because he is considered hard-core unemployed, his fellow workers in his new job environment subliminally display an antagonism toward his presence; the foreman or other supervisor in the plant—already overburdened with his normal responsibilities—rebels against the extra responsibility of training the so-called hard-core unemployed recruit; and finally, the recruit himself—bewildered and inexperienced—becomes easily frustrated and drops out of the training program at the slightest provocation.

This is why the drop-out rate in the recruitment efforts of hard-core unemployed is so unnecessarily high and costly to the taxpayer.

In my judgment, it is a tragic mistake not to utilize the proprietary schools of this country with their excellent record of achievement in this great effort to deal with hard-core unemployment in America.

Your own experience as administrators of these schools teaches you that the orderly process of occupational training, which you can provide even to those totally unskilled, gives a student confidence, competence, and stability.

During the whole course of training, the student develops work habits which prove invaluable to himself and to his future employer.

It is for this reason that I have proposed to the Secretary of Labor that if we really want to have effective programs of training, we enlist your help. For you can provide that bridge between the world of unemployment for the hard-core unemployed and the meaningful world of work. All over this country employers are finding, in ever-increasing numbers, that this transition is not as easy as they thought.

In a growing number of situations, American industry which has invested in plants in the ghetto, is now finding that the absentee rate among the hard-core unemployed which employers try to train themselves, is making the venture so costly that in too many instances they have abandoned these projects.

Training or retraining of those who were unemployed or underemployed is a job for the experts. There is no short cut to produce "instant workers" and the sooner this nation learns this truism, the sooner we will start making meaningful progress toward fulfilling the needs of America's expanding industry.

In this room today we have men and women who hold the key to the future of America's economic progress.

Our nation cannot achieve a trillion dollar economy and train a force of 100 million workers to keep that economy going without your help.

More than a decade ago, Paul Goodman in his book *Growing Up Absurd* recommended that students be trained for eventual employment by allowing them to combine school with a job. He proposed that schools, with the cooperation of business and industry, offer work experience programs to students to help them develop skills and receive academic credit.

Such a work experience program would be for all youngsters in high school wishing to take advantage of the opportunity, and it would have the added advantage of assisting needy students to continue their education.

Mr. Goodman's idea was a brilliant one ten years ago and a brilliant one today. It is surely no secret to any parent or anyone who cares to read a newspaper that students drop out of school largely because they find it irrelevant and unrelated to what they are going to do for most of their lives.

About 95% of the young people who lose their first jobs lose them not because of any lack of potential ability or intellectual proficiency; they lose them because they just don't know what is required of them on the job.

Work experience helps the student to feel a sense of achievement and of growth and maturity. He learns to recognize the value of work and, hopefully, learns that regular attendance at school and work pays off.

That is why I maintain that this last third of our 20th century belongs to you as vocational educators. You have the skills and the ability to make productive adults out of unemployable adolescents.

Among the more than 7,000 vocational education schools in America, Career Academy here in Milwaukee surely ranks among the most distinguished of this group.

Last spring the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders reported that nearly 80% of the persons involved in disturbances were employed in intermittent, low-status, unskilled jobs.

Dr. Kenneth Clark and countless other experts in the field of social science have repeatedly stressed the importance of jobs that provide the worker with dignity, opportunity, and respect. Surely this is not asking too much of a nation that was founded on the premise that every man has value and integrity that should be nurtured in freedom.

It is imperative that we create courses of study so welded to employment that students are permitted the widest number of career choices. Unskilled labor is becoming obsolete and options for the poorly educated decline daily.

With a curriculum that involves the student in preparing for his own future, that develops his skills and self-knowledge, and that also gives him a broad view of the humanities and their application to his own world and his place in it—it is logical to expect that a great number of students will be motivated to remain in a school environment until they earn their diploma.

That diploma means a passport to income and a worthwhile career in a trillion dollar economy. Seeing to it that every able-bodied American youngster has that passport to opportunity is my responsibility as Congressman and yours as vocational educators.

LOS ANGELES ATTORNEY APPOINTED CHAIRMAN OF INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to offer my congratulations to a fellow Californian, Mr. Martin G. Castillo, of Los Angeles, on his appointment as Chairman of the Interagency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs.

Mr. Castillo brings with him an excellent background of education, personal knowledge, and professional experience to his new position on the Federal level, and I am confident he will be able to do an outstanding job of continuing and advancing the vital work already begun by the Interagency Committee.

A 37-year-old attorney, member of the Los Angeles law firm of Leis, Gershan & Castillo, and graduate of Loyola University Law School, Mr. Castillo is a former fighter pilot who currently holds the rank of captain in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

I am particularly happy about Mr. Castillo's appointment because knowing of his deep interest in improving opportunities available to America's Spanish-surnamed citizens, I believe that, as Chairman of the Interagency Committee, he will maintain the tradition of strong, active leadership in identifying and meeting the unique needs of the Nation's second largest minority group.

Because of his intimate knowledge of the problems, challenges, and potentialities of the Spanish-speaking community, Mr. Castillo is a strong advocate of the proposition that every American, regardless of race, color, creed, national origin, or ethnic background, should be offered a chance to enter into the mainstream of all aspects of our Nation's life—to obtain a full share of the tremendous economic, social, and educational benefits of our great land.

I know Mr. Castillo will make every effort to fulfill the Interagency Committee's Presidential mandate, both to assure that Federal programs are reaching the Spanish-speaking community and providing the assistance required, as well as to seek out new policies and programs that are relevant and meaningful to this significant segment of our country's population.

And, since the Committee is the only Cabinet-level voice within the executive branch designed specifically to represent Spanish-surnamed Americans in the highest Government councils, Mr. Castillo will now be in a position to make a major contribution toward achieving the Committee's goal of increased jobs, better housing, improved health care, and wider educational opportunities for members of the Spanish-speaking community.

THE DEFENSE DEBATE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there has been significant press, radio, and television coverage of the recent Congressional Conference on the Military Budget and National Priorities. The Conference report, issued June 1, inspired many newsstories and much editorial comment.

As an originator of the Conference, I have been pleased to see this reaction for it fulfills a basic purpose of the Conference: to inspire discussion among citizens on what our national priorities are and where defense spending finds its place among them.

The Long Island Press on Monday, June 2, 1969, contributed the following intelligent comment on this discussion:

THE DEFENSE DEBATE

A welcome sense of reason is emerging in the debate over the role of the "military-industrial complex" in national affairs. Too much of the debate has been animated by emotional tirades for and against the defense establishment.

Apologists for giving the Pentagon carte blanche too often cry "communist menace" to justify enormous expenditures with a minimum of constraint and questioning. The result has been the creation of a vast and powerful force within America that has taken on a life of its own, espousing policies and taking actions that often inhibit any genuine approach to peace.

On the other hand, too many, like the Nobel Prize winning biologist, George Wald, go to the simplistic extreme of just wishing away the realities that bother them. This is all one world, he said in a recent, widely hailed speech, and "the thought that we're in competition with Russians or with Chinese is all a mistake and trivial."

It may well be a mistake, but it won't be a trivial one until the Russians and Chinese agree with Prof. Wald that there is no competition.

As a panel of American and European analysts pointed out the other day in a study of Soviet naval policy, the Russians are embarked on a maritime strategy aimed at controlling the seas of the world. There is nothing trivial about this—or about the various communist pressures throughout the world, in the Middle East and Middle Europe, in Latin America and Asia. Does Prof. Wald or anyone else really believe that if we simply throw away our bombs and bombers the rest of this world will follow suit?

The ugly fact of life is that there is deadly competition, mutual distrust, feeding on each other. We must do all possible to end this, but until there are guarantees that all agree on arms controls, we dare not weaken our defense capability.

But it is one thing to acknowledge the need to maintain our military strength. It is another to let the military dominate our national existence, and draw on our resources far beyond any rational need. And it is here that voices of responsible criticism are raised with relevant urgency.

Last week, a House-Senate economic subcommittee blasted the Pentagon's wasteful procurement policies that artificially inflate the budget and line the pockets of defense contractors.

In a blistering report, the congressmen showed that "the evidence is convincing that procurement expenditures can be substantially reduced without diminishing national security. In the past, literally billions of dollars have been wasted on weapons systems that have had to be canceled because they did not work . . . The result of the absence of effective cost controls, has resulted in a vast subsidy for the defense industry . . ."

Pentagon officials quickly agreed with the report. They pointed out it dealt with practices occurring under the previous administration and they said the Nixon Administration is overhauling the purchasing procedures.

That's fine for a beginning. Executive initiative is essential. But so, too, is constant and vigorous congressional review. And this, among other things, was what has been proposed by 45 congressmen in a report, issued last night, on the proceedings of a conference on military budget and national priorities held in March.

The report was signed by nine senators and 36 representatives, including five Long Island Democrats: Benjamin Rosenthal, a sponsor of the conference, and Shirley Chisholm, Lester Wolff, Allard Lowenstein and Hugh Carey. It called for the creation of a Defense Review Office to analyze defense spending for Congress; a temporary national security committee to look into military-industry relationships, and a reduction of security classifications.

These are welcome signs that Congress is ready to take away the Pentagon's blank check that has allowed 80 per cent of our federal expenditures to go into defense costs, an amount greater than all federal, state and local outlays for social security, health, education, housing and agriculture.

Readjusting this gross imbalance need not in any way endanger the basic needs of national defense. Indeed, if we can divert the billions now being wasted into domestic channels crying out for assistance we shall be doing a great deal to strengthen the national security by building up our internal strength.

THE WAR MACHINE UNDER NIXON

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during its first 4 months in office, the Nixon administration has repeatedly pointed to rising inflation in the economy as the major problem confronting the Nation.

In order to reduce inflation, the administration has emphasized making substantial cuts in Federal expenditures. The bulk of the proposed budget cuts for fiscal year 1970 are in the domestic area. Although it has recommended some reduction in the military budget, the plain fact is that the President has taken $3 from civilian needs for every $1 from the military budget.

The substance of the reductions proposed for the military for the coming fiscal year are examined in the detail that is so often lacking in the Armed Services Committees of Congress in an article by I. F. Stone which appears in the June 5 issue of the New York Review of Books. In addition to examining how these so-called reductions actually conceal an increase of nearly $3 billion in non-Vietnam defense expenditures, the article, entitled "The War Machine Under Nixon," discusses the broader implications of putting the acquisition of weaponry and nuclear overkill above starved domestic programs.

If the allocation of resources proposed in the administration's budget for fiscal year 1970 is indeed an indication of where, as Mr. Stone puts it, "Washington's heart is," there is little doubt that the heart of this Government belongs to the Pentagon.

The waste and extravagance which have permeated defense spending for the past decade constitute one of the most scandalous episodes in our history, especially in light of the continued postponement of vital domestic needs in our society.

The reallocation of resources which is so urgently needed if we are to meet our numerous domestic problems, on the basis of the budget it has presented to Congress for fiscal year 1970, is not to be the policy of the Nixon administration. Given that fact—and I think we must recognize that it is a fact—it is up to Congress to assume the responsibility of halting the runaway spending of the Pentagon and rechannel the resources of the Federal Government into domestic programs that offer solutions to our multiple domestic needs.

The article by I. F. Stone on the defense budget follows:

[From the New York Review of Books, June 5, 1969]

THE WAR MACHINE UNDER NIXON

(By I. F. Stone)

In government the budget is the message. Washington's heart is where the tax dollar goes. When President Nixon finally, and very tardily, presented his first budget proposals in mid-April in a mini-State of the Union message, he said "Peace has been the first priority." But the figures showed that the first concern of the new Administration, as of the last, was still the care and feeding of the war machine.

Only Nixon's style had changed. "Sufficiency" rather than "superiority" in nuclear armaments remained the new watchword. But in practice it was difficult to tell them apart. Administrations change, but the Pentagon remains at the head of the table. Nixon's semantics recalled John F. Kennedy's eight years earlier. The Eisenhower Administration had waged battle for four years against the bomber gap and the missile gap with the slogan of "sufficiency." "Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt," was Kennedy's elegant riposte in his Inaugural, signaling a new spiral upward in the arms race, "can we be certain without doubt that they will never be employed." The rhetoric was fresh but the idea was no different from John Foster Dulles' "position of strength." This is the *plus ça change* of American government and diplomacy. It emerged intact after Nixon's first three months in office, too.

At a press conference four days after his budget message, Nixon said again that "sufficiency" in weaponry was "all that is necessary." But a moment later he was clearly equating it with nuclear superiority. He said he didn't want "the diplomatic credibility" of a future President in a crisis like that over Cuba's missiles "impaired because the United States was in a second-class or inferior position." A press corps obsessed with the latest plane incident off North Korea did not pause to consider the implications. Was "diplomatic creditbility" to be measured in megatons? Were we preparing again to play a thermonuclear game of "chicken," to see who would blink first at the prospect of instant incineration? Was this not the diplomacy of brinkmanship and the strategy of permanent arms race?

No correspondent asked these questions, and Nixon did not spell out the inferences. His tone was softer, his language more opaque, than that of the campaign, but the essential "security gap" theme had not changed. The main emphasis of Nixon's first months in office, the main idea he tried to sell the country, turned out to be that it was in mortal peril of a Soviet first-strike capacity. The new Administration sought to overcome a mounting wave of opposition to the ABM and to the military generally, by ringing the bells of panic.

True, the Secretary of State often seemed to deny the perils the Secretary of Defense painted. Which was the party line? It was indicative that when visiting editors were given a press kit on the ABM April 7, with a covering letter on White House stationery, signed by Herbert G. Klein as Nixon's "Director of Communications," the only thing new in that kit, the only news it contained, *and the one bit on which nobody commented*, was the "document" the Administration had chosen as the first item. It was a reproduction of a column in which Joseph Alsop three days earlier had exuberantly portrayed the "grim" (a favorite Alsop word) dangers of a first strike from Laird's new monster, the Soviet SS-9. The leading journalistic Pied Piper of the Bomber Gap and the Missile Gap had been enlisted by the new Administration to help it to propagate a new Gap. If the White House stationery and the Klein signature were not enough to make Alsop's nightmare official doctrine, the reproduction of the column carried at the bottom of the page this imprimatur, "Prepared under the direction of the Republican National Committee, 1625 Eye St. N.W., Washington, D.C." The candor was dazzling.

The Budget Bureau fact sheets which accompanied Nixon's spending proposals sought to create the impression that on the military budget, as on so much else, Nixon in power was reversing the course set by Nixon on campaign. "Military and military assistance programs account for $1.1 billion (27%) of the $4.0 billion outlay reduction [for fiscal 1970]," said one fact sheet, "and $3.0 billion (55%) of the cut in budget authority." But, as we shall see, while the cuts in domestic civilian programs proved all too real, those in the military budget were either dubious or deferrals.

There was in the Nixon budget one complete and dramatic about-face on the FB-111. Six months earlier, just before the election, at Fort Worth, where General Dynamics was building this new strategic bomber, Nixon had promised to make the F-111 "one of the foundations of our air supremacy." Now it was put permanently on the shelf. Procurement of the bomber was cut back sharply for fiscal 1969, which ends June 30, and abandoned altogether for fiscal 1970. Only the F-111D, the Air Force fighter version of this plane, was to stay in production a while longer.

Thus *finis* was soon to be written to the career of the multi-purpose, multi-service plane originally known as the TFX, one of McNamara's most costly misjudgments. But on this, as on almost every other item of apparent economy in the Nixon-Laird revisions of the Pentagon's budget, the few hundred millions saved in fiscal '69 and '70 were linked to commitments which would cost literally billions more in the decade ahead. Every short step back hid another leap forward in expenditures.

The TFX was McNamara's effort to stall off the drive of the bomber generals to commit the country to an entirely new manned bomber in the missile age. He gave them the FB-111, the bomber version of the TFX, instead. Laird reduced FB-111 procurement in fiscal '69 by $107 million and eliminated altogether the planned outlay of $321 million in fiscal '70. But he then added $23 million for fiscal '70 to speed "full scale engineering" of the new intercontinental bomber AMSA (Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft) for which the Air Force and the aviation industry have been lobbying for years. "The FB-111, Laird told the Senate Armed Services Committee March 15, in an echo of of the lobby's arguments, "will not meet the requirements of a true intercontinental bomber and the cost per unit has reached a point where an AMSA must be considered to fill the void."

It will be quite a void. The cost overruns, which had more than doubled the price of the FB-111, now, became the excuse for going ahead with a far more expensive bomber. The net saving of $405 million in fiscal '69 and '70 ($107 plus $321 minus $23 million) will commit the country to a new plane which Senator Proxmire told the Senate April 22 will cost at least $24 billion during the next decade. Such illusory economies place heavy first mortgages on the future in favor of the military and at the expense of social needs.

Even so, there was hidden in the F-111 cutback a $200 million consolation prize for General Dynamics. The formal budget document[1] carried an increase of $155.7 million for "Production of F-111D at minimum sustaining rate related to FB-111 cancellation." I was puzzled by this reference to a "sustaining rate." What was being "sustained"—military needs or General Dynamics?

I found a fuller explanation when *Aviation Week & Space Technology* arrived for May 5. It said the revised Nixon procurement plans for General Dynamics F-111D provided $599.8 million for aircraft "plus $56 million for advance procurement and $71.4 million to cover excess costs generated in fiscal 1968." It said the total of $727.2 million "represented a sharp increase over original fiscal 1970 plans of $518 million." Indeed this is an increase, though *Aviation Week* did not say so, of $209.2 million rather than the $155.7 specified in the budget message.

The increase had been approved by Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard—a director of General Dynamics until his Pentagon appointment—to counterbalance a cut of $320.9 million in the FB-111 program. It would "enable General Dynamics to retain its present production facilities." Not only did thirteen of these fighter planes crash in their twenty-six months of operations[2] but Senator Curtis of Kansas, in a comprehensive Senate speech last October 3, said they were not maneuverable enough as fighters. They are effective only as tactical bombers against enemy forces like those in Vietnam, which have no air cover of their own. Yet the government was not cutting back on its original plan to buy 331 of these F-111D's.

This in only one of many examples in the budget of how easily the Nixon Administration finds millions for such dubious military purposes but not for urgent social needs. The $200 million consolation for General Dynamics is the same amount—a very inade-

Footnotes at end of article.

quate amount—Nixon set aside in his budget message for riot-devastated cities. Nixon got a lot of publicity out of his order to give this urban program priority, but it didn't have enough priority to be a $200 million addition to the budget. It was just deducted from the meager amounts already available for other urban purposes.

II

Those who still look for the "shape" of the Nixon Administration are bound to remain bewildered. Shape is another word for policy, and policy requires the substitution of decision for drift. The campaign promised decision from one direction, the right. The situation requires decision from another direction, which might be called the left. Nixon turns out to take his stand—though that is too strong a word—in the middle of makeshift compromises. Whether on electoral reform or tax reform or poverty, feeble and inadequate half-measures are the rule. This shapelessness is the shape of the new Administration.

Hand-to-mouth decisions are standard in all governments, and inertia is basic in politics as in physics. But drift is only safe in quiet waters; to let inertia have its way in stormy seas is to risk disaster. Richard Nixon in the Sixties is beginning to resemble Calvin Coolidge in the Twenties, when the country kept cool with Cal, just before going over the brink with the stock market crash and the Great Depression.

To let inertia reign in the American government is also to let the military dominate. The sheer size of the military establishment, its vast propaganda resources and its powerful allies in every business, locality, and labor union affected by the billions it spends every year, gives it momentum sufficient to roll over every other department and branch of the government. In the absence of a strong hand and hard choices in the White House, the Pentagon inevitably makes the decisions. If nothing else, it makes them by default.

But there is more than default, and more than meets the eye, in the military budget. The readiest source of campaign funds and political support for nomination and election as President lies in the military-industrial complex. It is also the most skillfully hidden source. I suspect that the 1968 campaign, like the 1960, was preceded by deals which called for a buildup in military procurement. This would help to account for the steep increase in appropriations by the Kennedy Administration despite its discovery on taking office that the "missile gap" did not exist.[3]

The two plums the military-industrial complex most wanted on the eve of the 1968 campaign was the ABM and AMSA, a new advanced strategic bomber. In 1966 the Armed Services Committees of both houses recommended extra funds to speed both projects. A Congress still comatose on military matters dutifully voted the money. But McNamara refused to spend it. Johnson made two moves during the following year which cleared the way for both projects. In September 1967 he forced McNamara to swallow the bitter pill of advocating a "thin" ABM system in which the Secretary of Defense clearly disbelieved. Two months later Johnson made the surprise announcement—as much a surprise to McNamara as to the press—that he was shifting the redoubtable Pentagon chief to the World Bank. That cleared the way for AMSA, too, and with both projects it also cleared the way for the 1968 campaign.

As late as January 1968, in his last posture statement as Secretary of Defense, McNamara was still fighting a rear-guard action against AMSA. He argued that the principal problem lay in the growing sophistication of Soviet air defenses. "Repeated examination of this problem," he told Congress, "has convinced us that what is important here is not a new aircraft but rather new weapons and penetration devices."

AMSA began to inch forward when Clifford replaced McNamara. In Clifford's first posture statement last January, he struck a new note when he declared the FB-111 would be too small to carry the new weapons and penetration devices McNamara had in mind. One wishes one knew more about this, since it seems unlikely that McNamara would have overlooked so simple a point. While Clifford said "we are still uncertain whether a new intercontinental bomber will be needed in the 1970s," he more than doubled the research and development funds for AMSA, increasing them from $30 million in fiscal 1969 to $77 million in fiscal 1970, "to keep the program moving."

The Nixon-Laird revisions two months later went further. They not only added $23 million more for AMSA but authorized the Air Force to move into the engineering phase, the last stage in R and D before procurement. "Now, after a very careful review," Laird told the Senate Armed Services Committee March 27, "we have decided to cut off the FB-111 program . . . and concentrate our efforts on the development of a new strategic bomber, AMSA." General Dynamics, which lost out when Nixon phased out FB-111, will be one of the bidders on AMSA.

ABM and AMS together could spell $100 billions in electronic and aviation contracts in the years ahead. AMSA itself may prove a bigger gamble and a far more costly error than the TFX. *Space/Aeronautics* for January published a special issue plotting future trends in strategic warfare. It pointed out some of the pitfalls which may lie ahead for AMSA. About eight years elapse between concept definition and actual production in developing a new bomber. But Pentagon intelligence has never been able to come up with estimates of enemy threat valid for more than two or three years. "Thus," this Conover-Mast publication for the aerospace industry concluded, "there is no way of telling, the critics of AMSA claim, whether we would be committing ourselves to a system we really need or to what will end up as an immensely costly mistake."

The survey admitted that AMSA would be "less vulnerable than the B-52 and perform better," but added philosophically that "in a nuclear exchange time is too important an element for bombers to have any real effect." In other words even the fastest bomber may have no targets left after the far swifter missile exchange is over. One firm intelligence forecast emerged from the survey. "If AMSA is built," *Space/Aeronautics* said, "it will probably be our last strategic bomber. Once the present generation of Air Force commanders is gone, the top-level manpower will not be there to produce the sort of pressure that has kept AMSA alive for so long." Once the bomber admirals are dead, the clamor for a new bomber will die out, too. But the last fly-by will cost plenty.

III

AMSA is only one of many new military projects hidden in the new 1970 budget which will add billions to the future costs of government. "The present inflationary surge, already in its fourth year," Nixon said in his April 14 message, "represents a national self-indulgence we cannot afford any longer." But the principal beneficiaries of that indulgence are the military and their suppliers. And they seem to be exempt from anti-inflationary measures.

Fully to appreciate what the miltiary is getting one has to begin with a disclosure made in the Budget Bureau's presentation of Nixon's budget revisions. Nixon had to squeeze $7.3 billions out of the normal civilian and welfare activities of the government in fiscal 1969 (which ends June 30 of this year) in order to meet the expenditure ceilings imposed by Congress when it enacted the 10 percent surplus income tax. This reduction over and above Johnson's budget for FY 1969 was made necessary by certain "uncontrollable" items. An example is the interest on the public debt which rose by $300 millions. But the biggest uncontrollable item, ten times that much, or $3 billion, was an increase in Vietnam war costs over and above those originally estimated by Johnson.

So all sorts of civilian services during the current fiscal year have had to be pared to meet the unexpected increase in the cost of the Vietnam war. Now let us couple this revelation about the 1969 budget with a basic decision made by Johnson in the 1970 budget. In that budget Johnson for the first time, on the basis of his decision to end the bombing of the North, which was very costly, and perhaps in expectation of less combat on the ground in the South,[4] forecast the first sharp cutback in Vietnam war costs. This was estimated as a savings of $3.5 billion during fiscal 1970.

This was to be the country's first "peace dividend." But instead of applying this $3.5 billion in the 1970 budget to starved civilian and welfare services, or to reduction of the deficit, Johnson added this $3.5 billion *and $600 million more* to the money available for the Pentagon to spend on procurement and activities other than those connected with the Vietnam war. *The total increase in the non-Vietnamese military budget as projected by Johnson was $4.1 billion more, even though he estimated the Vietnam war was going to cost $3.5 billion less.*[5] In his April 14 message, Nixon said of our domestic needs, "what we are able to do will depend in large measure on the prospects for an early end to the war in Vietnam." The Johnson 1970 budget projected the first slowdown but proposed to use the savings entirely for military expansion. Nixon went along with that decision.

From the Pentagon's point of view there could not have been a smoother transition than the shift from Johnson to Nixon. Nixon revised Johnson's social and welfare programs downward but left his military budget essentially untouched. It read like the handiwork of the Johnson who was the ally of the military and the armament industries as chairman of the Senate Preparedness subcommittee during the Fifties. Johnson's last defense budget was not only the highest ever sent Congress—$81.5 billion as compared with the World War II peak of $80 billion in fiscal 1945—but laid the basis for a huge expansion in spending during future years. It gave the go-ahead signal to a wide variety of projects the armed services had long desired.

Nixon had campaigned on a "security gap" but Johnson left few if any gaps to fill. "The number of new programs spread through the new defense budget," *Space/Aeronautics* commented in its February issue, "is astounding in comparison with the lean years from fiscal 1965 to 1969." Among them were $400 million for "major developmental activity on no fewer than six new aircraft" and—biggest item of all—an increase of $1.64 billion to a total of $2.85 billion for the Navy's surface ship and submarine building program. Arms research and development was boosted $850 million to a total of $5.6 billion, including work on such new monsters as missiles which can be hidden on the ocean floor.

This farewell budget also put Nixon in a bind. As *Space/Aeronautics* pointed out in that same editorial, if Nixon tried to cut back appreciably on the Johnson budget, he would open himself to "security gap" charges. On the other hand "if he doesn't defer or cancel at least some of them, and if the war in Vietnam cannot be brought to an honorable close some time next year, he will face a crushing arms bill in fiscal 1971, when many of these starts begin to demand more money." That was the risk Nixon and Laird preferred to take.

Footnotes at end of article.

IV

Nixon claims to have cut $4 billion from 1970 outlays, and taken $1.1 billion, or 27 percent, from the military. Critics have protested that he took $3 from civilian needs for every $1 he took from the military. But even this is illusory.

From another point of view, even if we accept the Nixon cuts at face value, the military will have $3 billion more in fiscal 1970 for non-Vietnamese war purposes than it had in fiscal 1969. We have seen that Johnson budgeted a $3.5 billion cut in Vietnam war costs for fiscal '70 and then added $4.1 billion to the military budget for projects unconnected with the Vietnam war. If you deduct Nixon's $1.1 billion from that $4.1 billion the Pentagon is still ahead by $3 billion.[6] If Nixon had applied the whole projected saving of $3.5 billion on Vietnam to civilian use or deficit reduction, the fiscal 1970 total for national defense would have been reduced to $97,499 million. All Nixon did was to *cut the Johnson increase* by a fourth.

Even this may turn out to be—at least in part—a familiar bit of flim-flam. Since Johnson began to bomb the North in 1965 and take over the combat war in the South, almost every annual budget has underestimated Vietnamese war costs. These have had to be covered later in the fiscal year by supplemental appropriations. The under-estimate in fiscal 1969, as we have seen, was $3 billion. The fiscal 1970 budget is running true to form.

The biggest "economy" item in the Nixon military budget is $1,083.4 million, which is attributed to "reduced estimates of ammunition consumption rates."[7] Just how much of the estimated $1.1 billion "saving" in outlays for fiscal 1970 will be the result of lower consumption of ammunition in Vietnam was not made clear. The $1,083.4 million is given as a net reduction of obligational authority in fiscal 1969 and 1970. It is one of the three main items in that $3 billion cut in obligational authority for fiscal 1970 which make it possible for the new Administration to claim that 55 percent of the total cut in obligational authority for 1970 ($5.5 billion) came from the military. Obligational authority is not necessarily or entirely translated into actual outlays during the fiscal year in which it is granted.

This projected cut in the rate of ammunition consumption is in addition to Johnson's projected cut of $3.5 billion in Vietnam war costs. Though Laird does not blush easily, even he seems to have been embarrassed by this particular "economy." "To be perfectly frank," said Laird, who rarely is, when he first broached this item to the House Armed Services Committee on March 27, "I think the ammunition consumption rates for Southeast Asia are based on rather optimistic assumptions, particularly in view of the current Tet offensive." Yet, under pressure from the White House to show more economy, the optimism rose sharply in the next four days. The following table shows the change in estimated savings for ammunition and its transportation in millions of dollars in those four days:

	Mar. 27	Apr. 1
Ground munitions	−$380.0	−$460.0
Ammunition transport	−34.4	−34.4
Air munitions	−417.9	−511.9
Ship gun ammunition	−47.1	−77.1
Total cuts	879.4	1,103.4

These figures are for total obligational authority for fiscal years 1969 and 1970. Perhaps the Administration hesitated to make public its actual outlay estimates for these two years, since they may easily turn out to be higher rather than lower, and may have to be met later in the year by a supplemental appropriation. Between March 27 and April 1 Laird boosted the estimated reduction in total military outlays for FY 1970 from "about $500 million" to $1,113 million. Most of the increased "economy" seems to have come from this ammunition item.

There are several indications in the official presentations themselves which lead one to think Laird was right to be queasy. The original 1970 budget projected consumption of 105,000 tons a month in ground munitions through December 1970. Actual consumption in January was given as 96,000 tons, but that was before the recent enemy offensive got under way. The consumption of ammunition must have risen sharply with the fighting in February, March, and April, but when I asked the Pentagon for the monthly figures since January, I was told they could not be given out. "We can only say," an official spokesman told me, "that the Secretary's projections are being borne out." If that is true our troops must have been meeting enemy attacks with switch knives.

Another indication—how I love tracking down these liars!—appears in what we know about the volume of bombs dropped on South Vietnam and Laos since we stopped bombing the North. The Pentagon's own figures on total tonnages dropped show little change. Total tonnages dropped in September and October last year, before the bombing of the North stopped, were almost 240,000. Total tonnage dropped in January and February of this year, when it was dropped only on Laos and South Vietnam, was more than 245,000. There was an increase of 5,000 tons. That increase makes the estimate of a saving of more than a half billion dollars in air munitions for fiscal '69 and '70 look very phony indeed.

Laird himself said consumption of air munitions was rising. On March 27 he told the House Armed Services Committee that while consumption had been estimated at 110,000 tons per month for the twenty-four months from January 1969 to December 1970—that doesn't sound like much *de*escalation ahead, at least in the air!—"actual consumption is now running at about 129,000 tons per month." Yet he projected a saving of $42.5 million on air munitions in fiscal 1969 and $375.4 in fiscal 1970. When he got back to the committee four days later, he placed actual consumption even higher, at 130,000 tons a month, but also projected higher savings! Now he was to save $89.5 million on air munitions in fiscal 1969, or twice the figure four days earlier, and $442 million for fiscal 1970, an increase of $47 million over the earlier estimate. Yet Laird said he saw "no indication that consumption will decline by very much during the next twelve-to-eighteen months." How then were expenditures on air ammunition to be lower than expected when the tonnage of bombs dropped was running higher than expected? Non-Euclidean geometry is not half so exotic as Pentagon arithmetic.

The ammunition figures for Vietnam are stupendous. The original Johnson-Clifford '70 budget in January projected the cost of ammunition in Vietnam during fiscal 1970 at $5.2 billion. This expenditure of shot and shell over Vietnam is two-and-a-half times the total 1970 revised Nixon budget of $2 billion for the Office of Economic Opportunity (down $132 million), and more than twice the revised elementary and secondary education outlay for '70 which he set at $2.3 billion (down another $100 million).

V

After this razzle-dazzle on ammunition, the next largest item of military saving in the Nixon-Laird budget revisions is the ABM. Let us return to the formal document sent Congress by the President. There on page 17[8] are given "principal changes in 1970 budget authority resulting from 1969 and 1970 Defense program changes." The second largest of these is $994 million for "Reorientation of the antiballistic missile program to the new Safeguard system." This and the ammunition item make up almost $2.1 billion of that $3 billion cut in military obligational authority on which the new Administration commends itself.

A businessman in financial difficulties who thought up such savings for his stockholders would soon be in jail for embezzlement. The "reorientation" of Sentinel into Safeguard may reduce spending in fiscal 1970 but only by adding at least $1.5 billion and possibly $5.5 billion more in the next few years. This is an expensive rebaptism or, better, if we consider the phallic significance of these monsters, re-circumcision. Nixon had an easy way out of the ABM fight if he wanted one. He could have announced that like Eisenhower he had decided to keep the ABM in research and development until he was sure it would not be obsolete before it was deployed.

If he had been a little more daring, and a little less beholden to the military-industrial complex, he might have cut billions[9] from the military budget immediately by offering a freeze on all new deployment of strategic defensive and offensive missiles if the Russians did likewise as a preparation for strategic arms negotiations. This would not only save at least $5 or $6 billion in the new fiscal year but ensure our present nuclear superiority and fully guarantee against first strike nightmares.[10]

Nixon chose instead a tricky stretch-out. This offered some reductions in the new fiscal year, as compared with Johnson's ABM proposal, but at the expense of higher costs later. This ingenious compromise made it possible to offer an apparent saving to the taxpayer *and* larger eventual orders to the electronics and missile industries. This not only fulfilled the Administration's promise of New Directions but enabled it to move in opposite directions at the same time. Johnson's Sentinel was estimated to cost $5.5 billion; Nixon's Safeguard, variously from $6.7 to $7 billion, or $1.5 billion more. This may prove another official underestimate. An authoritative service which covers all developing major weapons and aerospace systems for industrial and governmental subscribers places the total cost of Safeguard much higher.

This is DMS, Inc. (Defense Marketing Service), a ten-year-old service now a part of McGraw-Hill. I had never heard of it until an anonymous reader sent me a reproduction of its report on Nixon's Safeguard. I checked with its Washington office by telephone and was given permission to quote it. Its detailed analysis places the total cost of the system at $11 billion and ends by warning that "in a program as complex as Safeguard, historical experience indicates costs in the long run are likely to be considerably higher." When Senator Cooper put the DMS analysis into the *Congressional Record* May 8, he noted that it did not include "about $1 billion AEC warhead costs." This would bring the total cost of Nixon's Safeguard past $12 billion.

Since the ABM authorization will soon be before Congress and this defense marketing service is known only to a restricted circle, we give its computations here:

Perimeter acquisition radar (PAR)	$560
PAR unit cost is estimated at $80 million, will be installed at 7 sites	
Missile site radar (MSR)	1,500
MSR unit cost is estimated at $125 million; will be installed at 12 sites	
Spartan missile	1,050
Unit cost of Spartan when deployed is estimated to be $3 million; DMS believes there will be 350 missiles installed	
Sprint missiles	560
Unit cost is estimated at $800,000; DMS believes 700 missiles will be deployed with a greater number at Minuteman sites than at other sites	
Data processing subsystem	1,500

Footnotes at end of article.

Includes new generation computer, memory banks, displays, tapes and discs plus an extensive amount of software	
Command, control and communications	$500
Warheads	210
Figure assumes 1050 warheads at a cost of $200,000 each. AEC funds are used for development and production	
Construction	2,100
Figure assumes construction costs will average $300 million annually through 1975	
Total investment for 12 sites	7,980
Research and development	2,400
Figure assumes R&D costs of $350 million per year through 1975. Does not include the $150 million per year which will support work on new radars and interceptors	
Operations and maintenance	700
Figure based on an average operation cost of $100 million annually through 1975	
Total Safeguard cost through 1975	11,080
Assumes no cost overruns.	

The DMS report notes that we have already spent $4.5 billion on the ABM from fiscal 1956 when the Army started the Nike Zeus program, through fiscal 1968, and that the research efforts which made Nike-Zeus obsolete before it could be deployed are still going on, at a cost of $350 to $500 million annually. "A number of new concepts as well as hardware," the report said, "are currently under investigation." These threaten Safeguard with obsolescence too. "Preliminary research," DMS said, "has pointed the way toward the following types of advances": One was radars of much higher frequency so the interception "would be made with either a much smaller nuclear warhead or even a conventional high explosive charge." Another was a new third stage for Spartan so the missile could fly out at greater ranges and "maneuver through a cloud of decoys to find and destroy the real warhead." A third—most expensive of all—was "defensive missiles carried either in ships or large aircraft deployed closer to the enemy's launching sites."

We give these details to show that in embarking on the ABM we are embarking on a wholly new sector of the arms race with a high rate of obsolescence to gladden the hearts of the electronics companies and of A.T.&T., whose Western Electric has long been the main contractor. The reader should note that the three advances cited in the DMS report are relatively simple and foreseeable developments. All kinds of "far-out" possibilities are also being investigated. The secret hope which lies behind all this Rube Goldberg hardware is that some day somebody will turn up a perfect ABM defense and thus enable the possessor to rule the world because a power so armed can threaten a first strike, knowing it will be immune to retaliation.

The most candid expression of this viewpoint was made by Senator Russell during the defense appropriations hearings in May of last year. "I have often said," Senator Russell observed, "that I feel that the first country to deploy an effective ABM system and an effective ASW [anti-submarine warfare] system is going to control the world militarily." [11] This control of the world, however, may be on a somewhat reduced basis. Six months later, during the Senate's secret session on the ABM (November 1, 1968), Senator Russell admitted, "there is no system ever devised which will afford complete protection against any multiple firing of ballistic missiles . . . we will have no absolutely foolproof defense, I do not care how much money we spend on one, or what we do." Senator Clark replied that casualties would be so high as to destroy civilization "and if there are few people living in caves after that, it does not make much difference." To which Russell made his now famous rejoinder, "If we have to start over again with another Adam and Eve, I want them to be Americans and not Russians." (*Congressional Record*, E9644, November 1, 1968.) Thus we would at last achieve an unchallengeable Pax Americana! And thus the ABM turns out to be another variant of the military's unquenchable dream of an Ultimate Weapon, to leap some day like a jackpot from a slot machine if only they go on pouring money into R and D.

Footnotes at end of article.

VI

I would ask the reader's indulgence for one more foray into the labyrinthine depths of the Pentagon budget. Deeper knowledge of these recesses is necessary if we are ever to hunt down and slay the dragon. I want to deal with the next largest source of the Nixon military "economies." These involve deferrals of expenditures amounting to about $480 million. Most critical comment has been content to note that mere deferral of spending is not real economy, since what is saved in fiscal '70 will be spent later. There is a more important point to be made. These deferrals, if closely examined, provide additional proof of how recklessly and wastefully the Pentagon dashes into production before full testing and evaluation have been completed, before it knows, in other words, that these expensive weapons will work. We will see how much pressure it takes to make the Pentagon admit this elementary error.

To grasp the full significance of these so-called "economies" of Nixon and Laird we must see them against the background of revelations by two Senators, one the leading pillar of the military in the Senate establishment, Senator Russell; the other, a former Secretary of and long-time spokesman for the Air Force, who has turned against the military-industrial establishment, Senator Symington.

During the secret debate on the ABM last November 1, Russell told the Senate one of the "most serious mistakes" he had ever made as Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, which passes on all military requests for authorization, and as chairman of the Senate subcommittee, which passes on all defense appropriations, "was in allotting vast sums to the Navy for missile frigates before we knew we had a missile that would work on them." He said "we built missile frigates, we built missile destroyers and missile escort ships" on the basis of "unqualified" testimony of "everyone in the Department of Defense and in the Navy" that effective missiles were being developed. "It probably cost the taxpayers," Russell said, "$1 billion, because they have had to rebuild those missiles three times.

A more comprehensive statement of the same kind was made to the Senate by Symington on March 7 of this year. He put a table into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (at page 5602 that day) which showed how much had been spent on missiles in the past sixteen years which were no longer deployed, or never had been deployed, because of obsolescence. The total was fantastic. Symington gave the names, the expenditures, and the life-span of each missile. The total cost of those no longer deployed was $18.9 *billion* and the cost of those which were abandoned as obsolete or unworkable *before* deployment was $4.2 billion. The total was $23 billion. Imagine what those wasted billions could have done for our blighted cities!

Symington's table was introduced to underscore his point—buttressed by past testimony from McNamara—that the ABM would soon be another monument to this kind of expensive obsolescence. Another inference to be drawn from this table is how many billions might have been saved if the Pentagon had not rushed so quickly into these miscarriages. Behind the glamorous names which flashed through the appropriations hearings and the ads in the aeronautical and military trade journals—Navaho, Snark, Dove, Triton, and even Plato (what did he do to deserve *this* honor?)—lies an untold story of beguiling missile salesmanship and drunken-sailor procurement methods. It might be worth billions in future savings if a Congressional investigating committee really dug up the full story and its lessons.

The need for such an investigation becomes plain if one examines the funny thing which happened to SRAM (acronym for short-range attack missile) on Secretary Laird's way to and from the budget forum on Capitol Hill between March 27, his first appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, and his second appearance on April 1, just four days later, SRAM is one of the new missiles which have been under development. It is supposed to be mounted on a bomber so it can be rocketed into enemy territory from a position more than a hundred miles away from the enemy's defense perimeter. The idea is to circumvent the enemy's defenses by stopping the bomber out of their range and lobbing the missiles over them.

SRAM has had several predecesors, all expensive, of course; it is not a simple contraption. The predecessors appear in Senator Symington's table. Crossbow, Rascal, and Skybolt were earlier attempts at a stand-off missile; they cost a total of $962.6 million before they were abandoned prior to deployment. Hound Dog A, which cost another $255 million, is another missile in the same family which is no longer deployed. SRAM is very different in capability, range, and complexity. SRAM is intended to do for the bombing plane what penetration aids do for the ICBM. SRAM is supposed to carry all kinds of devices to confuse the radars of the enemy defense.

When Laird appeared before the House Armed Services Committee on March 27 he referred, without further explanation, to "delays experienced in the SRAM development production program." The original Johnson-Clifford budget last January for fiscal 1970 called for the modification of all seventeen B–52 squadrons of series G and H at a total cost of about $340 million to enable them to carry SRAM. The "modification kits," as Laird described them, were to be bought from Boeing "at a total cost of about $220 million," and it was planned to buy kits for twelve squadrons in 1970, leaving the rest to be modified in 1971. Laird proposed to save $30 million in fiscal '70 by equipping only ten squadrons in '70 and the remaining seven in '71. He said "This change will give us a smoother program."

But the White House and the Budget Bureau, desperate for ways to cut, put pressure on the Pentagon and four days later Laird was back before the Armed Services Committee. Now instead of $30 million he proposed a deferral of the SRAM program amounting to $326 million. It now appeared that he had been less than candid with the committee. The cryptic references to "delays" turned out to be quite an understatement. He came forward with new changes in the SRAM program, all of them—he explained—"related to the difficulties encountered in the development of this Short Range Attack Missile." Now it was not "delays," but "difficulties."

Laird went on to quite a revelation. "We have now reached the conclusion," he told the committee, "that procurement of operational missiles should be deferred until the test program conclusively demonstrated that they will work as intended." So "we have deleted most [but not all!] of the missile procurement funds" from fiscal '69 and '70, for a total cut in the two years of $153 million.

Then he proposed to defer not only the missiles but the modifications designed to enable the B–52s to carry them. "Inasmuch as we do not know when operational missiles will be available," Laird said, "we have also deferred all special SRAM modification work on the B-52s and FB-111s." The total net deferral—after adding $17 million to R and D for "a greater portion of the overhead cost" (another consolation fee?)—was to be $326 million.

This shows how much pressure it takes to squeeze the fat out of the military budget, and a little more candor out of the Pentagon. Why didn't Laird tell the committee on March 27 what he revealed on April 1? But for the extra pressure, the Pentagon would have gone on with procurement of the SRAM before knowing whether it would work, and with modification of the strategic bombers to carry the missiles before it was sure that it would have the missiles. What if further testing modifies the missile, and this requires a change also in the kits which modify the planes to carry these missiles? Why risk the waste of millions?

The SRAM story raises similar questions about Laird's rather cryptic references in his budget presentation to a similar deferral of "about $160 million" in the Minuteman ICBM program. The most important part of that "saving" is due, as Laird told House Armed Services on March 27, to "a slowdown in the deployment of Minuteman III." This is the Minuteman which will carry MIRV-"mutiple independently targeted reentry vehicles," i.e., additional warheads independently targeted. It was tested for the first time last August 16 with three warheads.[12] "While we are confident," Laird said, "that the Minuteman III will perform as intended, we believe it would be prudent to reduce somewhat the previously planned deployment rate, at least through the FY 1970 procurement lead-time." Why only somewhat, and what does somewhat mean for the whole program? "This delay," Laird went on, "would serve to reduce the amount of overlapping of R & D and production and provide more time for production." Why risk has overlapping altogether until testing has been completed? Laird himself said he was planning to accelerate operational testing "to help ensure that the missile is working well before we return to the originally planned rate in FY 1971." "Mr. Chairman," Laird said, patting himself warmly on the back, "this reflects our determination to minimize cost overruns resulting from R and D modifications after production has commenced." But perhaps more serious cost overruns could be avoided if Minuteman III, like SRAM, were subjected to further deferrals.

A franker if ironic account of the Minuteman III cuts appeared May 5 in *Aviation Week*. It says "The reason for the reduction is fear of reliability problems with the new missile." It said the Air Force had "decided 'to reduce the concurrency of development and production' of the missile in order to insure reliability of all components." Even the Foreign Service could not have hit upon a smoother phrase to equal that "concurrency of development and production." *Aviation Week* added, "The cutback was publicized by some Defense Dept sources as evidence of US willingness to reduce strategic offensive armaments prior to arms reduction talks with the Soviets, but that was not the reason."

This effort to make the Minuteman cuts look like evidence of Pentagon enthusiasm for arms talks originated in Laird's own presentation on April 1. In a super-slick conclusion he told the Committee, "Our decision to slow the Minuteman III deployment—though necessitated for other reasons—provides a period of time in which arms limitation agreements could become effective at a lower level of armaments. . . . It remains to be seen, of course, whether our potential adversaries will similarly indicate with actions that they, too, are serious about desiring meaningful arms limitation talks." These are the moments when Laird sounds as if he were dreamed up by Molière.

But beyond any question of personality or politics, the almost irresistible momentum of the military machine which is slowly transforming American society finds its ultimate rationale in the theory of deterrence. It is to this and the permanent arms race it generates that I would like to turn in a concluding article.

FOOTNOTES

[1] House Document No. 91-100. 91st Congress, 1st Session. *Reductions in 1970 Budget Requests. Communication from the President of the United States*, p. 17.

[2] AP in Omaha *World Herald*, March 7, 1969.

[3] Carl Kaysen, who was Kennedy's Deputy Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, has given us more precise figures than I have ever seen before in the chapter on "Military Strategy, Military Forces and Arms Control" in the Brookings Institution symposium, *Agenda For The Nation* (Doubleday, 1969). He wrote (pp. 562-3) that the decisions of 1961 and 1962 by Kennedy "called for the buildup by 1965 of a US strategic force of nearly 1,800 missiles capable of reaching Soviet targets; somewhat more than a third were to be submarine-launched. In addition, some 600 long range bombers would be maintained. *This was projected against an expected Soviet force of fewer than a third as many missiles and a quarter as many bombers capable of reaching the United States.*" (Our italics.) The "overkill" was worth billions to the aviation and electronics industries.

[4] According to a little-noticed press release by Senator Stephen M. Young (D. Ohio), a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which has access to much information otherwise secret, Johnson had originally planned a cutback of troops in Vietnam. Young asked Nixon to recall two divisions before July and more later with an announcement, "We have accomplished our objectives in Vietnam. Our boys are coming home." Young said Johnson had decided on a similar announcement last year but was talked out of it by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

[5] Since I have been challenged on this "peace dividend" by some colleagues, and others have wondered by what elaborate computation I arrived at it, I give the source, p. 74 of *The Budget of the U.S. Government for Fiscal 1970*. It says, "As shown in the accompanying table outlays in support of Southeast Asia are anticipated to drop for the first time in 1970—declining by $3.5 billion from 1969. This decline reflects changing patterns of combat activity and revised loss projections. *Outlays for the military activities of the Department of Defense, excluding support of Southeast Asia, are expected to rise by $4.1 billion in 1970, to provide selected force improvements.*" (Italics added.)

[6] Even that understates the case. Down near the bottom of the budget outlays table of the Nixon revisions is $2.8 billion more for "civilian *and military* pay increases." (Our italics.) Laird in his April 1 presentation said this would add $2.5 billion but failed to make clear whether this was for the whole government or only for Pentagon civilian and military—almost half the civilian employees of the government work for the Pentagon. Clifford in his 1970 statement gave a figure of $1.8 billion for Pentagon pay increases but did not make clear whether this included the civilian employees. So pay raises will add between $1.8 billion and $2.5 billion to this $3 billion figure.

[7] See page 17 of House Document No. 91-100, 91st Congress, First Session.

[8] House Document No. 91-100. Reductions in 1970 Appropriation Request Communication from the President . . . together with details of the changes. 91st Congress, First Session.

[9] The Johnson budget for 1970 placed the expenditure for strategic forces at $9.6 billion as compared with $9.1 in 1969 and $7.6 in 1968. Much of this is for deployment of new weaponry.

[10] "Such a freeze," Senator Percy declared in a speech April 17, "should be acceptable to the Defense Department. Secretary Laird has testified that our missiles on land and under the seas as well as our long-range bomber force present an overwhelming second-strike array. If a freeze—fully verifiable by both nations through satellite reconnaissance as well as other intelligence sources—is put into effect, the US deterrent will remain credible into the foreseeable future." But if the deterrent remains credible, what will the poor missile salesmen do?

[11] Department of the Army, Senate Hearings, Department of Defense Appropriations for fiscal 1969, 90th Congress, Second Session, Part II, page 868.

[12] "On August 16, said a special survey in *Space/Aeronautics*, page 88, last January, "Poseidon and Minuteman III were launched with ten and three warheads respectively."

THE 161ST BIRTHDAY OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I think it is appropriate that we take a few moments out to acknowledge the birthdate of one of the giants of America, a man whose moral courage and strength of purpose stand out in history.

Few Americans, Mr. Speaker, remember Jefferson Davis other than as the great President of the Confederate States of America. What most of us do not realize is the place of distinction occupied and richly deserved by this man who looms large, even in an age which produced such great figures as Lincoln, Daniel Webster, and Henry Clay.

Jefferson Davis was born on this day, June 3, in 1808, on the site of what is now Fairview, Ky. The Davis family moved, when the young Jefferson was still very small to Woodville, Wilkinson County, Miss. It was here that he grew up along the banks of the Mississippi River.

At age 16, Davis accepted an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point where he formed ties and attachments which were to serve him well in later life. Among these early close friendships were Albert Sidney Johnston, Robert E. Lee, and Joseph E. Johnston.

Widowed in 1835 after only 3 months of marriage to Sarah Knox, a daughter of the then Col. Zachary Taylor, Davis returned to Vicksburg, Miss. For the next few years, he occupied his time in cotton planting and reading constitutional law.

In 1845, Jefferson Davis was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. During that same year, Davis formed and cemented the liaison with Varina Howell, a 19-year-old belle of Natchez, Miss., who was to be the great love of his life.

The outbreak of war with Mexico saw Congressman Davis resign his seat in the House in exchange for command of the First Mississippi Volunteers. After receiving severe wounds as a result of his heroic service, Davis returned to Mississippi and was appointed to the U.S. Senate. While in that body, he distinguished himself as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

In 1851, after yielding to the urgings of the Democratic organization of the State of Mississippi, Davis saw the only political defeat of his career in his campaign for Governor. In 1853, he was appointed as Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Franklin Pierce. His service in this capacity can only be described as brilliant. During his tenure he was instrumental in obtaining pay raises for military troops, extensive improvements at West Point and Army posts, expansion of the Army, improved coastal defenses and in the engineering of the Gadsden Purchase.

Returning to the Senate in 1857, Davis attempted to close the ever widening gap between North and South, to make the voice of reason heard over that of radicalism. Even after the secession from the Union of South Carolina in December 1860, Davis remained a reluctant secessionist advocating that it should be turned to only as a last resort. Mississippi's secession a month later, however, brought Davis' resignation from the Senate. Returning to Mississippi he was immediately given a commission as major general in the armed forces of Mississippi.

Before he could accept his command, however, the convention meeting at Montgomery, Ala., chose Davis as the provisional President of the Confederate States of America; his inauguration taking place on February 18, 1861. A second inaugural was held on February 22, 1862, with the formal adoption of the permanent Confederate Constitution. Davis' primary concern during the first year of his Presidency was to avoid, at all costs, an open outbreak of hostilities with the North. President Lincoln's call for 75,000 volunteers and his decision to reinforce the U.S. garrison at Fort Sumter, in Charleston, S.C., with the subsequent fall of the fort, made war inevitable.

Davis led the new nation into a war against truly hopeless odds. With only one-fourth the white population of the Northern States, only a small percentage of the manufacturing capacity of the North, no navy, no powder mills, and an overwhelming lack of arms and materials. The South, nevertheless, mobilized and hundreds of thousands of young men abandoned their educations, their farms, and their families to rally to the Confederate colors.

But, cotton and courage could not make up for the essentials of war, and as the conflict progressed, the Confederacy was gradually bled of its substance and its life's blood. Even after the simultaneous fall of Gettysburg and Vicksburg in July 1863, Jefferson Davis continued to inspire his people.

Shortly after the fall of Atlanta to General Sherman in September 1864, an interview with Jefferson Davis appeared in the Atlantic Monthly. Its author, Edmund Rule, described Jefferson Davis as "a man of peculiar ability."

Our interview—explained why with no money and no commerce, with nearly every one of their important cities in our hands, and with an army greatly inferior in numbers and equipment to ours, the Rebels have held out so long. It is because of the sagacity, energy and indomitable will of Jefferson Davis. Without him, the rebellion would crumble to pieces in a day.

On April 9, 1865, General Lee surrendered to General Grant at Appomattox Courthouse, Va., thus ending the military action of the Civil War. President Davis was taken prisoner at Irwinville, Ga., on May 10 of the same year.

Imprisoned at Fort Monroe, Va., Davis was accused of treason. Conditions during his confinement were so bad that his health was severely impaired and he was released in 1867. Treason charges were dropped in 1868.

After the fall of the Confederacy, and the years of reconstruction, Davis was repeatedly urged to reenter the Senate. But, he refused to ask for amnesty. On December 6, 1889, at the age of 81, Jefferson Davis died in New Orleans of complications following a bronchial ailment. His body was returned to Richmond, Va., the Confederate Capital in 1893 for reburial.

Today, marks the 161st anniversary of the birth of this great man, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is fitting that he should be remembered on this date for what he was. As an officer in the U.S. Army, as a Member of this House, of the Senate, as Secretary of War and as President of the Confederate States of America, Jefferson Davis distinguished himself as a soldier and statesman. Although his cause was not nationally popular, his integrity, courage and spirit were held in high esteem by friend and foe.

A STUDY IN PATRIOTISM

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perplexing things about modern society is the lack of patriotism in the attitude of many of the younger generation. This phenomenon cannot be attributed solely to the Vietnam war.

Who has failed to inculcate genuine patriotism in the hearts of our young people? Is it parents? Teachers?

In this connection, the following column, written by Allan C. Brownfeld, and appearing in a recent issue of Roll Call, deserves thoughtful review:

A PATRIOTISM FOR TODAY

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

On the night before her execution, Edith Cavell, speaking to the Rev. Mr. Gahan, noted that "Patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred or bitterness towards anyone."

The modern world seems to be short both on patriotism and on love. In our own country, some have said that we must defend policies of the government, whether they are right or wrong. But is this the level of loyalty we really demand? Cannot we say, with Camus, that we wish to love our country, but to love justice at the same time? Can't we agree with Edmund Burke who, in his Reflections On The French Revolution, wrote that "To make us love our country, our country ought to be lovely?"

Memorial Day is a time when we reflect upon patriotism, upon the nature of love for one's country, upon the sacrifices which nameless men have suffered, often for feelings they cannot express, for reasons they do not understand. For, as Pascal knew, "the heart has its reasons that reason doesn't know." We love our country, perhaps, simply because it is ours, as we love our parents. But this is not enough. Patriotism is, in a sense, a nobler gesture and feeling. Jesus said that even the criminals love their friends and families. Patriotism of this kind is only a primitive defense of one's hearth. And patriotism, of course, is basically this at the beginning. But then it grows outward. "Love," as the lyric has it, "isn't love till you give it away."

Modern critics advance the view that to love one's country means, somehow, less love for mankind as a whole. They urge that men abandon feelings of kinship with a nation or a culture or a civilization, and transfer this feeling of affinity to all men. The goal of men truly living in peace and brotherhood, regardless of their race, their tongue, their religion, or other peculiar national attributes, is surely a good one. It is the traditional goal of our Judeo-Christian religious heritage, as it is of other world religions.

The question, then, relates not to goals but to means. Do we achieve world brotherhood and harmony by denigrating natural feelings of love and loyalty to one's own country, or do we achieve this by nurturing love of country while at the same time opposing both chauvinism and the concept that love of country somehow implies support for the transient policies of a particular government in power?

In this, as in most other areas, the best answer seems to come with some observation of man's nature. It is easier to achieve worthy goals by enhancing man as he is, rather than by tinkering with him. No one has yet changed man's nature, though dictators and tyrants have often made the attempt. Kipling may have understood a portion of this when he wrote: God gave all men all earth to live./But since our hearts are small,/ Ordained for each one spot should prove/ Beloved over all.

The man who is happy with his family is most likely to be happy with the world and with the people he sees and meets. The man who has good feelings toward his country is likely to have good feelings toward other men. Unfortunately, patriotism and love of country have often been used by destructive personalities to stimulate bigotry and hatred. In our own country we have had movements which tried to limit the concept of who was an American. This country, various groups at various times have said, is a "white man's country," or a "Christian country," or a country only of the native born, or a country only for those whose ancestors reached its shores at a specific time. This is not patriotism. It has been answered many times. The Negro leader A. Philip Randolph criticized those who said that this was a country for white men. It was, he said, a country for all of those who had fought and worked and sweated and died for it.

Religion has often been used in the same exclusionary manner. Jonathan Swift saw that men had "enough religion to make them hate but not to love one another." The same may be true with a certain kind of patriotism which looks inward in this manner and is truly destructive. If the critics of the modern world oppose it, they are right. But patriotism which is outward, which springs from love of the land, from happy memories, from ideals which look to all and are not limiting, such patriotism may be the very foundation upon which the brotherhood and peace we seek may be built.

If we destroy love for the things we love first and most naturally, how can we achieve the universal love we seek in the long run? This problem was posed by C. S. Lewis when he challenged the modern intellectual critics who destroyed man's capacity to do the very things they later complained he was not doing.

He stated: "In a sort of ghastly simplicity we remove the organ and demand the function. We make men without chests and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honor and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful."

Part of the feeling of alienation which is inherent in the modern world rests with our growing urbanization, our lack of feeling for natural beauty, our lack of connection with places. John Ciardi wrote, "I have a country, but no town. Where I was born is Interstate Highway 66." Often we cannot return to the scenes of our childhood for the bulldozer has been there first. When a building gets old enough to have memories inhabit the structure, we tear it down. The National Presbyterian Church here in Washington, D.C. has been replaced by an aluminum and glass office building. So what if Presidents prayed there, and history stopped there for moments of meditation and reflection? The old church was demolished and, for many Americans, their ability to gather strength from their roots has been destroyed by the destruction of such roots. "God," Cowper wrote, "made the country and man made the town." Men cannot give their ultimate loyalties to man made things.

Those who muse over the meaning of patriotism on this Memorial Day would do well to consider the fact that the old formulas are not keeping with the situation of today. The patriotism we must recapture is unlike the patriotism we have lost, just as the technological society toward which we are moving is unlike the agrarian society from which we have come. But even in this new world, the honor we hold for those who have paid with their lives for our freedom to reflect as we will, is unchanged. In fact, it is greater. For in a world where free reflection is stifled in all too many places, we still have the ability to chart our own course. Perhaps this is all men can ever really ask.

And patriotism never means that a country has not made mistakes, even grievous mistakes. It does not mean that we must blindly support what our country does if we find it to be wrong. But to love means to help make things better, and not to destroy, to correct flaws, to chart new and better courses. To love means never, in the midst of problems, to withdraw from the relationship. Patriotism demands even more of the critics, and it demands the tolerance of those who agree, as well as those who disagree. From such a patriotism a better world can be built and this after all, is our goal.

COUNTY ACTION FOR CONSUMERS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Nassau County of New York has an outstanding program of consumer protection which is becoming a model for local government throughout the country.

I was recently honored to address the county's first consumer conference. My remarks follow:

REMARKS BY MR. ROSENTHAL

Your Office of Consumer Affairs has been highly successful in protecting and representing the consumers of this county—so successful that it serves as the motivation and model for my legislation to provide federal grants for the establishment and strengthening of state and local consumer protection offices.

Your determination to hold this conference and the themes you have selected show that your Office of Consumer Affairs understands the plight of the American consumer.

Your panel discussion on the "Problems of the Low-Income Consumer" shows that the consumer struggle cannot be fought with the calorie charts of the home economist or the measuring cup of the homemaker.

The consumer revolution confronts the very integrity of the free enterprise system. If that system is to endure, its ultimate goal must be to provide goods and services that are fairly priced, safe, and effective. Today, a crisis in confidence exists for the consumer in the free enterprise system.

For the 20 million poor in our society, the movement toward this goal of equity in the marketplace will determine to what extent they shall enjoy the material fruits of our technological society—whether they are able to obtain credit at fair rates of interest; whether the food they purchase is as cheap, nutritional and wholesome as the food purchased from supermarkets in affluent areas; whether their salaries will be garnisheed and their jobs lost because they were pressured into buying a product at an inflated price. If left unfulfilled, the legitimate demands of the poor will become more and more radical.

On the other hand, your panel discussion on "Consumer Problems of Suburbia" suggests your proper refusal to accept the myth that the only valid consumer complaints concern the unconscionable door-to-door salesman, the disreputable ghetto merchant, or the fraudulent home repair operator. The reality, of course, is that the plight of the consumer is a 24 hour-a-day, 365 days-a-year phenomenon that affects the rich as well as the poor, the educated as well as the uneducated and involves some of our largest and seemingly most reputable industries and producers.

When we talk about economic crime in America, we think of the bank embezzeler or the Wall Street manipulator. But economic crime in America also involves the executives of our nation's largest plumbing fixture firms who bilked consumers out of hundreds of millions of dollars by fixing prices; economic crime also involves the deliberate effort of certain automobile companies to stifle the development of exhaust fume inhibitors and non-pollutant automobile engines; it involves the everyday deception of consumers by fake, misleading or uninformative advertising.

Economic crime in America involves the widespread practice by manufacturers of cleverly shrinking the contents of their packaged products without, at the same time, telling the consumer or reducing the price. Hearings to be held soon by my Special Consumer Subcommittee will show that hundreds and probably thousands of packaged food and toiletry products have experienced such subtle weight decreases and thus causing "hidden" price increases to consumers: Did you know, for example, that the Betty Crocker Country Corn Flakes that was 11 ounces in 1965 is now 10 ounces; that the Franco-American spaghetti that used to be 27 ounces is now 26½ ounces; that the 8 ounce can of Libby chile is now 7½ ounces? Prices go up and contents go down.

Are you aware that the Jergens Lotion that was 12½ ounces is now 10½ ounces; that the 8 ounce can of Breck Hair Set Mist is now 7 ounces; that 12½ ounce family size Halo Shampoo has shrunk by one ounce? Some of you may be interested in knowing that the 21 ounce package of Serutan is now only 18 ounces.

What is incredible to me, however, is that the "public-be-damned" attitude on the part of some producers extends to issues of health and safety. If the consumer revolution is to be won, it is absolutely necessary that society expand its traditional definition of crimes of violence. The number of persons needlessly killed in auto accidents each year is almost 100 times greater than the total death toll in all the riots in our cities in the last three years; deaths relating to gas pipe line and coal mine safety and occupational hazards far exceed the total number of persons killed in felonious assaults in this country annually. The number of hospital patients electrocuted annually by faulty equipment is five times the total death toll in our riots of the last three years.

How callous is industry's disregard for the public health and safety?

Hearings of the National Commission on Product Safety showed that the Hankscraft Model 202-A electric steam vaporizer could easily be tipped over by a child thus drenching him with scalding water. What is especially startling is that the manufacturer refused to take the vaporizer off the market even though more than 100 liability suits had been instituted against the company—40 of them involving explosions.

The Public Health Service has long reported serious burns on small children at the rate of 60,000 a year caused by the country's 4 million gas-fired floor heaters. The American Gas Association held that essentially nothing could be done. But in three weeks and for an $800 fee, a small Baltimore, Maryland firm devised several ways to eliminate the hazard.

For decades, serious injuries resulted from electric wringer washing machines. Since the late 1940's a mechanism which stops the rollers when the victim gets caught has been available to manufacturers at a cost of from $1 to $3. But a voluntary industry-wide standard did not take effect until October 1968, although almost 200,000 persons, half of them children, were being injured each year.

If American industry, then, is often unwilling to protect the consuming public from harm, who then will stand between people and dangerous products? Can we afford the luxury of relying on private organizations that test or rate products? Certainly Consumers' Union's work is excellent—but its resources and the circulation of its magazine are limited. Can we rely on the Underwriters Laboratories which, though performing a useful function, approved 100,000 color television sets with defective tubes that leaked excessive x-radiation?

And what about those magazines that award commendation or guarantee seals? The Goodhousekeeping Institute says it devotes an entire floor to research and testing facilities at an annual cost of approximately $1 million. But I don't always share Good Housekeeping's enthusiasm for its advertisers' products. Let me tell you why:

(1) In June of 1968, the FDA showed that the Sheffield Bronz Paint Corporation of Cleveland violated the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act in that its spray paints were falsely labeled as "non-toxic", even though they were actually highly flammable and toxic.

Three months later, in September 1968, Sheffield Quick Spray Enamels and Lacquer were advertised in the pages of Good Housekeeping, bearing its Seal of Approval;

(2) In April of 1969, the FDA reported that a shipment of Gold Medal flour contained rodent contamination, yet in the same month, Gold Medal flour was advertised in Good Housekeeping proudly displaying the famous Seal;

(3) In 1967 the FDA had withdrawn from the market a quantity of Land O'Lakes butter because it had a strange odor and the flavor of a petroleum distillate, but Land O'Lakes still bears the Good Housekeeping Seal.

(4) In January 1967 the FDA charged that

a shipment of Del Monte canned peaches shipped by California Packing Corporation, Sacramento, contained mold and had been prepared under unsanitary conditions, yet Del Monte peaches still carry the Good Housekeeping Seal.

(5) In the September 1968 issue of Consumer Reports, the Mirro-Matic Electric Coffee Pot was downrated for having a very sharp edge on top of the pot, for having no strength control and for misstating cup capacity. And yet in the following issue of Good Housekeeping, the Mirro-Matic Electric Coffee Pot was advertised with the Good Housekeeping Seal.

(6) In June 1968, Lees and Mohawk Indoor/Outdoor carpeting was rated "not acceptable" by Consumer Reports because of flammability problems, yet in November 1968, Mohawk and Lees were both advertised in Good Housekeeping with its Seal of Guaranty.

If that's not enough, I can also report that more than a dozen products bearing the Good Housekeeping Seal are presently under investigation by the Federal Trade Commission for false or misleading advertising.

Obviously, private organizations alone cannot protect consumers; government must necessarily take the lead in providing this protection.

The arena of consumer protection is one in which all levels of government can and should participate. Our role is to find out precisely what each level of government—local, state and federal—can do best to help the consumer.

Let me suggest a division of responsibilities.

A local government can capitalize on its intimate knowledge of local problems. In this county, we have an outstanding example of an effective consumer program because it is devoted to helping Nassau residents solve Nassau problems.

The local government can also educate. It can inform consumers of their rights and remind businessmen of their responsibilities.

The local government can also give immediate assistance—it can arbitrate disputes between consumers and local merchants or local representatives of national firms.

But local government cannot cross interstate lines. It cannot determine, on its own, if the practices of a local outlet are an isolated example of consumer fraud or part of a statewide or national pattern of deception. It must rely here on state and federal authorities.

What should the role of the state be in consumer protection? New York State, for example, has an excellent and active consumer frauds division under the Attorney General. Our state has improved and expanded consumer education programs. But, when Governor Rockefeller eliminated the Office of Consumer Council, he made statewide consumer protection essentially a one dimensional legal operation which offers a tiny fraction of the consumer services available through your Nassau County Office.

The great advantage the state government has is its ability to cover the larger economic unit with a uniform system of legal protection which benefits both the consumer and the businessman. But there are serious limitations at the state level, too. The most outstanding shortcoming is the states' inability to deal with interstate problems like auto safety, meat inspection, fair packaging and gas pipeline safety.

Another serious defect is the fact that industry lobbyists are in a position to exercise great influence over decisions of state regulatory bodies. So while the consumer gets important help from both the local government and at the state capital, the help is often too late and too limited.

I would like to tell you that consumer protection in Washington is far better, but that would be a blatant case of false advertising. Although the consumer issue has great visibility in Washington, there is no evenhanded and effective representation of consumers' interest in the councils of government. Spokesmen who are committed to the consumer interest either don't exist at all or have little control over the decision-making processes of government.

The results are sometimes depressing. The Food and Drug Administration is charged with protecting the consumer against unsafe drugs, foods, cosmetics, and other products. And yet FDA has approved chemical agents for food products without adequate testing—only to later withdraw them on the basis of tardy studies. Oil of calamus, used for years in fruit, chocolate, root beer, vanilla, and many other food products, was withdrawn in 1968 because it was found to cause malignant tumors in animals. Another food additive, NDGA, was removed from the general safe list only after Canadian studies showing that it may result in hazards to health, resulted in its being banned there.

The consumers' fair weather friend, the Department of Agriculture, administers the Federal Insecticide Act, which is intended to protect the public from dangerous doses of poisons in pesticides. Sixteen years ago, both the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service warned the Department of Agriculture of a possible health hazard from vaporizing devices that use pesticide pellets containing the chemical Lindane. These vaporizers are used in restaurants, so that you and I may have been exposed to the chemical many times over. Last June, the Agricultural Research Service which approved the use of these devices, despite the devastating evidence against Lindane, said that it would allow Lindane pellets for use in the vaporizers. But, after the release of a congressional report last February, with further damaging evidence against Lindane, the Agricultural Research Service tested Lindane vaporizers under restaurant conditions, and reported that, "By the end of five days' exposure, practically all food . . . contained illegal residues of Lindane." And so last month, the Department of Agriculture did what it should have done sixteen years ago and finally cancelled the registrations permitting Lindane pellets in more than thirty products.

Or consider the Federal Housing Administration's persistent refusal to require safety glass for sliding patio doors in homes whose mortgages it insures. The additional cost for each unit would have been $10. Although the Public Health Service reported 100,000 serious injuries a year resulting from collisions with patio doors, FHA did not change its position until I threatened them with a public hearing.

Why has the consumer been virtually ignored by so many federal agencies? The key to understanding the consumers lowly status is his lack of representation when decisions are made that vitally affect his interests.

In 1963 and 1964, the Department of Agriculture asked for comments on two significant changes in beef grade standards. Beef grade standards are important to the consumer because they provide guides as to the quality of meat. Although more than 800 people provided the Department with comments on both changes, only a handful were private consumer representatives. The reason: the Department does not solicit consumer opinion on proposed changes in grades and standards.

The Milk Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture sets the minimum price which farmers receive for their milk. These government decisions determine the minimum price you pay for milk. During all the milk marketing proceedings from 1963–1968 held in New York City and affecting all of New York State, no spokesman appeared for the consumer. The same pattern holds true throughout the nation.

The Oil Import Administration of the Department of Interior holds hearings to set import limits for inexpensive foreign petroleum products. These quotas directly affect the price you pay for fuel for automobiles, furnaces, and a host of other products. In all of the hearings held in the last five years by the Oil Import Administration, not one private consumer spokesman was present to testify on behalf of average citizens. The Oil Import Administration never represented the consumers interest in a way that would have led to lower gasoline and fuel prices. Before setting quotas, consumer representatives should have been actively sought out.

This persistent indifference of federal agencies toward their consumer protection responsibilities leads me to one inescapable conclusion: a central agency must be established in Washington to vigirously represent the consumer, and consumers must organize at the local and national levels and lobby in their own self-interest. To the extent that this conference goes beyond education to consumer action, it provides the proper catalyst for change.

But consumer advocates must adjust their strategies for change to a basic fact of life in the legislative process: once a law is passed, the problem that the law was intended to solve is not automatically corrected. Quite to the contrary, the forces that opposed that type of consumer protection legislation in Congress, swarm to the regulatory agencies administering the law and ultimately accomplish their objective there.

And so, what consumers must do is agitate for change. They must demand new laws when necessary, but they must always insist that existing laws be vigorously enforced and adequately funded.

This is what the consumer revolution is all about.

STUDENT DEFIES ATTACKS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, each morning the front page of the newspaper is filled with stories and vivid pictures of campus violence and disorder, but yet we fail to see news space allotted to the hardworking, nonviolent majority of students whose primary purpose is still to obtain a good education. The following story from the San Diego Union, which describes the activities of one young dedicated Vietnam veteran who refused to allow the hippies and militants to hinder his education, is an inspiring one and I would like to share it with my House colleagues:

LOS ANGELES STUDENT DEFIES ATTACKS, PRESSES BID TO HALT STRIFE

LOS ANGELES.—When militants threw up barricades at entrances to Los Angeles City College this spring, they reckoned without Stephen Frank, 22, a handsome veteran of the Vietnam war.

Frank promptly organized a group of 20 students who tore down the barricades so other students could get to their classes. And he incurred the continuing enmity of the militants.

Since then he has been working to repair damage from fires and acts of vandalism at the junior college, and speaking out against the violence he believes threatens his education, as well as that of 18,500 other students on the campus.

He received a complimentary letter from

President Nixon. He also has been mobbed, threatened and beaten.

THREATS, OBSCENITIES

Militant Negroes, muttering obscenities and threats, shadow him from the moment he steps on the campus. At night meetings, he is warned he will not get home alive.

While he was distributing leaflets in the student center, he was attacked by members of the Black Student Union, who smashed in his face and split his lip.

"Sure I'm scared," the stocky war veteran admitted. "I'm scared every time I walk on that campus. But the militants can't be allowed to prevent the rest of us from getting an education."

Frank is the national president of Voices in Vital America (VIVA), founded nearly three years ago by a group of UCLA students who felt anti-Vietnam war groups on campus presented only one side of the story.

Originally incorporated as the Victory in Vietnam Association, the group changed its name a year ago because the old label had become a misnomer.

NONPARTISAN GROUP

Although VIVA members pack gift boxes for servicemen, the group does not actively support the war. It is nonpartisan and currently interested in uniting college students opposed to violence and disruption on their campuses.

Frank joined VIVA last November, two months after returning to City College after a two-year stint in the Army, including eight months with the Ist Infantry Division in Vietnam.

"My social science teacher assigned the class to go hear a speech by Black Panther leader George Mason Murray on Nov. 8," Frank explained.

"He talked about the flag being a piece of toilet paper and said the only way to deal with Nixon and (U.S. Senate candidate Max) Rafferty was to put a bullet through their heads. I stood up and said I favored free speech, but that I was opposed to violence. Four goons from the BSU picked me up and carried me out. From a speech at my own school! And they weren't even students here," Frank said, still amazed.

"That's when I joined VIVA."

FOUNDED CHAPTER

He founded the Los Angeles City College chapter, which now has 200 members. In March, he was elected national president of the 35-campus organization, with chapters at Tulane, Yale, University of Florida, Ohio State, and Southern Illinois University.

Wearing a VIVA button on his bright red sweater, the speech major set up a table in the center of the campus to pass out VIVA literature.

"Militants overturned my table and burned 200 posters. A couple of days later, I called a rally in front of the administration building. About 200 people showed up. We were passing out literature and a mob suddenly jumped on the table and tried to push me off.

"Their reasoning was that VIVA or any group opposed to the student strike has no right to free speech.

"All students have grievances. I have grievances. But that doesn't mean I'm going to overthrow the government or set fires in classrooms. There are ways of redressing grievances in an orderly fashion.

"ORDERLY DISSENT"

"We want to educate students on the problems of violence and show them the right way to solve their problems. We have an ombudsman program. Each campus has an ombudsman, someone who knows how to get things done. Students go to the ombudsman with their problems, and he tries to solve them. Changes are needed, but we must have orderly dissent."

As far as Frank is concerned, he sees nothing extraordinary in removing barricades at City College.

"When I got to school March 12," he recalls, "there were cafeteria tables piled up six feet high and eight feet wide across the entrances. I just started moving them, and other students came up and began to help. I told them not to get involved in a physical confrontation. Several times we retreated down the steps for a few minutes to avoid violence.

"Sure, I was scared, but I wanted to show the other students that if they show some backbone they can stop the militants from having their way. I think the closing of the school by the militants was a denial of the educational rights of others."

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during its first 4 months in office, the Nixon administration has exhibited an alarming lack of understanding of its responsibility for enforcing equal employment opportunity among Government contractors. As one who has been greatly disturbed at the failure of Government agencies to vigorously enforce fair employment practices throughout Government and Government-subsidized industry, I was appalled by the Department of Defense's recent overruling of its own compliance staff in the case of three large textile firms—Burlington Mills, Cannon Mills, and J. P. Stevens. Such action—taken as it was in the face of strong recommendations for sanctions from compliance officials in both the Department of Defense and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance—only reinforces the reluctance many contractors have to eliminating employment obstacles to minorities. The message to industry—that it is not necessary to take requirements of equal opportunity seriously—will not be lost.

Similarly, the harassment of intimidation of Government officials charged with enforcing equal employment opportunity also diminishes the credibility of the Government's commitment to EEO programs. The attack on Clifford Alexander, former Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN—and the announcement one day later from the White House that Mr. Alexander would be replaced—will seriously impair the ability of the Commission to enforce equal employment opportunity. Coming as it did in the wake of a vigorous campaign by Mr. Alexander to expose and investigate discriminatory employment practices, the effect of this action, again, will be to tell industry that it need not take Government regulations prohibiting unfair employment practices seriously.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has a moral and legal responsibility to enforce the executive orders and Federal statutes which outlaw discrimination in employment.

During the course of last year's Presidential election, a good deal of attention was devoted to the issue of law and order. In the context of the campaign, lawlessness was primarily used to characterize the manifest expression of dissatisfaction and despair by minorities, poor people, students, and others concerned by the inverted and illogical way in which our national resources are being expended.

What was largely ignored, however, was the "lawlessness" which exists in the Government with respect to the enforcement of congressionally approved prohibitions against discriminatory employment practices.

One-third of the jobs in the National economy are attributable to Federal spending. If equal employment were enforced, millions of jobs, jobs previously denied minority citizens through discrimination, could be opened up to citizens now unable to earn a decent living wage.

The executive orders and statutes prohibiting unfair employment practices must be enforced if all our citizens are to have an equal opportunity to share in the affluence of this society. If the administration will not fulfill that responsibility, then it is up to Congress to insure that these laws are vigorously carried out.

I include in the RECORD the text of a resolution on this issue adopted by the National Board of the American Veterans Committee at their May 3-4, 1969, Boston meeting:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NATIONAL BOARD, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE MAY 3-4, 1969, BOSTON, MASS.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

I

AVC expresses its grave concern over the recent actions of the Department of Defense in the handling of its Equal Employment Opportunity Program for Defense Contractors. The return to a practice of direct informal dealings between high Department of Defense officials and top officials of defense contractors which in the past has proved barren of results in promoting effectively equal employment opportunities has seriously impaired the usefulness of this program. Such direct dealing not only in effect grants immunity for past violations and from regular enforcement procedures but also demoralizes the administrative staffs within the Department of Defense and of Labor charged with the administration of the program. For they find themselves by-passed and their authority undermined. Only a return to strict accounting for progress to be achieved under well-defined action programs and their enforcement through regular established procedures, where compliance lags, can restore the damage done by the Defense Department's handling of its program in its dealings with the big Textile firms of Burlington Mills, Cannon Mills and J. P. Stevens.

Moreover, it is time that the Department of Defense publicy account for its stewardship of the equal employment opportunity program for defense contractors. Information on its activities and results in the form of detailed statistical data on initial hiring, upgrading and promotion of minority group employees have been unavailable to the public. General reassuring answers are no longer sufficient. We call on the new Secretaries of Defense and of the military departments to publish full data on the operation of the program so that the success or failure thereof can be assessed and steps taken to render it more effective. We call on the cognizant Congressional committees to obtain and publish relevant information and to exercise their influence to render the program truly useful.

II

We further urge that the Civil Service Commission of the United States take new steps not only to continue to combat or prevent discrimination against employees but also to foster the employment of minority group civil service employees, their promotion to higher positions in the career civil service, than has hitherto been attained, and the correction of earlier acts of discrimination which have prevented in numerous individual cases promotions and advancement of civil service employees belonging to minority groups in the same manner and to the same extent as their white majority fellow employees.

III

We protest the harassment of public servants who devote their best efforts to the promotion of equal employment opportunity in business, industry and Government for employees belonging to minority groups. Instead of senatorial censure they deserve the support and commendation of the National Administration, of Congress and of all citizens intent upon ending discrimination in employment and all other aspects of public and private life. We commend in particular Clifford Alexander, the former chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for his efforts to promote equal employment opportunity in accordance with the laws of the United States and hope that as a member of the EEOC he will continue his efforts in the cause of fair employment for all.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, June 4, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God be merciful unto us and bless us; and cause His face to shine upon us.—Psalm 67: 1.

O Thou who art the bright sun of the world sending Thy light unto all Thy creation, shine Thou upon our hearts as we pray this moment, driving away the darkness of evil and enabling us to walk without stumbling, to live without soiling our lives or the lives of others, and to serve our country without fear and with fidelity.

Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, the way our minds may think, and the way our hearts may feel, that our work may be well done and our lives be filled with the glory of Thy spirit.

Bless our Nation with the grace of Thy favor, our leaders with the greatness of Thy wisdom, and our people with the goodness of Thy love.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMENDING RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT TO BAR DISCRIMINATION ON BASIS OF SEX

(Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill yesterday to bar discrimination on the basis of sex by the Railroad Retirement Act. This act provides that men who have 30 years of service under the act may not retire with a full annuity until they are 65 years of age. Women on the other hand may retire without loss of annuity if they have 30 years service at age 60. This is discrimination and it is illegal, I contend, under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Last week I cosponsored a House resolution which would amend the Constitution to prohibit discrimination against women because of their sex. Now I have introduced a bill to bar discrimination against men. Equal pay for equal work is a principle I have always supported. Similarly, fringe benefits should be the same for male and female workers who have made equal contributions to a retirement system.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I reintroduced legislation to provide for optional retirement after 30 years of service under the act regardless of age. This bill, H.R. 1040, is now pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I mention this bill because in no way do I want the RECORD to show that I intended the bill I have introduced today to be a substitute for H.R. 1040. Rather, today's bill is intended to bring the Railroad Retirement Act into compliance with the view that men and women who make similar contributions should receive equal benefits. I shall continue to fight for earlier retirement rights for all persons—men and women alike who are covered by the act.

THE WORLD-FAMOUS REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL TEAM

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, that the world famous Republican congressional baseball team held its first practice Tuesday morning.

Again this year, our untarnished record in the rollcall congressional baseball game is on the line. But if Tuesday's practice is any indication, my Republican comrades need not fear for the honor and the glory of the Grand Old Party.

Although our distinguished and illustrious ranks have been diminished by the loss of Congressman Don Rumsfeld to OEO, the depth and talent of the Republican sluggers have been strengthened considerably by the addition of Representatives WILMER "VINEGAR BEND" MIZELL, BARRY GOLDWATER, JR.—who will be playing right field—LOWELL WEICKER, and WILLIAM WHITEHURST.

Such a panorama of athletic prowess, including such veteran base-stealers and home-run hitters as "MIDAS-MITT" MICHEL, "RAPID" DON RIEGLE, "ALL-AMERICAN" MATHIAS, among many others, has never before been fielded for the rollcall baseball game.

My only hesitation is that the fans at R. F. K. Stadium, on June 17, after watching us demolish the Democratic baseball team, will be very disappointed watching the Senators and the Orioles.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. In case of emergency, would you consider shifting Congressman GOLDWATER over to left field?

Mr. CONTE. Maybe center field but never left.

POSTAL REFORM LEGISLATION

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while I willingly joined the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) in cosponsoring postal reform legislation, I feel it necessary to make practical comments on the legislative status.

Yesterday the Postmaster General commenced his presentation before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and it was apparent that he has a real selling job to do.

In my judgment the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee will eventually bring forth a bill providing for reform of the Post Office Department. Many provisions will undoubtedly differ from the proposal submitted by the administration. I intend to work within the committee to bring out a practical bill.

Earlier in this session I introduced H.R. 9640 to prohibit political influence with respect to appointments, promotions, assignments, transfers, and designations in the postal field service and to revise the laws governing the appointment of postmasters. I will offer sections of that proposal as amendments to the postal reform measure.

It is my judgment that the bill will be subject to considerable revision on the floor of the House. The Postmaster General has effectively described the archaic structure of the Department. In his presentation he provides basic arguments for reform of the Post Office. The upgrading of postal service with emphasis on modern techniques is certainly in the public interest.

HEALTH AND SAFETY IN THE BUILDING TRADES AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

(Mr. McDONALD of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr.