

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 11888. A bill to amend section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, to include the position of immigrant inspector in the category of hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. AYRES):

H.J. Res. 764. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RUTH:

H.J. Res. 765. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.J. Res. 766. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 282. Concurrent resolution on urgency of arms control negotiations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Res. 432. Resolution relative to the Mormon Church Auxiliary observing the cen-

tennial of the YWMA; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

203. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Arkansas, relative to memorializing President Dwight David Eisenhower, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 11889. A bill for the relief of Peter C. Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 11890. A bill for the relief of T. Sgt. Peter Elias Gianutsos, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 11891. A bill for the relief of Josip Ribaric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11892. A bill for the relief of Gulseppe and Angela Agate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 11893. A bill for the relief of Yee Shaw Ping and his wife, Louie So Sin, and their

children, Suey Jean and Suey Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11894. A bill for the relief of Manuel Andrade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 11895. A bill for the relief of William R. Karsteter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 11896. A bill for the relief of Poor-andokht Rashti Broumand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11897. A bill for the relief of Antonio Praticante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 11898. A bill for the relief of Ferdinand Joseph Methot, Marie Pascalline Methot, Paul Henri Methot, John Arthur Methot, and Rene Noel Methot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 11899. A bill for the relief of Maria Laura Pereira DeMaura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

135. The SPEAKER presented a petition of John Oranc, Corning, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PENSION AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT ACT OF 1969

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Pension and Employee Benefit Act of 1969. This bill is a comprehensive legislative proposal to deal with the major problems and defects in our private pension plan system. It is identical to S. 2167, recently introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. JAVITS, in the other body.

The principal features of the legislation are outlined below. I would like to point out, however, that neither Senator JAVITS nor I are committed to every single detail in this measure. There are a number of points that are still under discussion, but it is our hope that the introduction of specific legislation will stimulate hearings and discussion on this vital problem. There are now over \$100 billion in private pension plans, yet there is almost no Federal regulation of the conduct of these plans, no minimum standards governing their establishment or operation, and, far too often, no practical means by which a beneficiary can secure his rights. Certainly some Federal oversight is necessary to correct these problems.

The legislation we have introduced would accomplish the following:

First, the bill would establish minimum vesting standards for pension plans, thereby giving assurance that no

pension plan could set its eligibility standards so high as to deny pension eligibility to all but a few employees.

Second, the bill would establish minimum funding standards, thereby giving assurance that pension funds will be operated on a sound and solvent basis, enabling the fund to deliver the benefits which have been promised.

Third, the bill would establish a program of pension plan reinsurance so that plans meeting the vesting and funding standards of the bill would be insured against termination, and retirees would be insured against loss of benefits if an employer goes out of business before the plan has been fully funded.

Fourth, the bill would provide for the establishment of a special central portability fund, participation in which would be on a voluntary basis, enabling pension plans to have a central clearinghouse of pension credits for persons transferring from one employer to another.

Fifth, the bill would establish certain minimum standards of conduct, restrictions on conflicts of interest, and other ethical criteria which are to be followed in the administration of pension plans and other plans providing benefits for employees.

Sixth, the bill would establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer the requirements of this bill. The Commission would be given sufficient enforcement powers to insure compliance, but the bill also provides for judicial review, insuring to the maximum feasible extent against arbitrary exercise of the Commission's powers.

Seventh, the bill consolidates in the

Commission most existing Federal regulatory standards relating to pension and welfare plans, thereby relieving employers, unions, insurance companies, and banks of the necessity of dealing with multiple Federal agencies—such as the Labor Department under the Disclosure Act or the Treasury Department under the pension provisions of the Tax Code. Under this bill, a qualification certificate from the Pension Commission will be sufficient to satisfy substantially all Federal regulatory statutes governing employee benefit plans.

And eighth, the bill establishes Federal court jurisdiction of suits involving pension plans, and provides a simplified method for enforcement and recovery of pension rights.

FOREIGN AID IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 27, 1969]

FOREIGN AID IN PERSPECTIVE

While the Nixon Administration examines all aspects of foreign aid in order to determine a future course, one point to remember is that there are limits to what this nation, or other industrial countries, can do to help the less-developed lands.

A great deal of talk has been heard lately of the "failure" of development efforts in the 1960s, as New York's First National City

Bank notes in its Monthly Economic Letter. The implication often is that the wealthier countries have turned niggardly with their aid, and that therein lies the chief, if not the sole, reason for the alleged failure.

Yet the total official and private flow of funds for development reached a record high of \$11.5 billion in 1967, 80% above the level of a dozen years before. According to National City, early data indicate a further rise in 1968 that is likely to continue this year.

Moreover, the only internationally agreed goal for development was contained in a 1961 United Nations resolution, which called for an average 5% annual growth rate in the gross national products of the less-developed countries by the end of this decade. That goal was largely achieved in the 1960-1967 period.

Rising gross national products, of course, can be meaningless by themselves. The sad fact is that in too many countries economic growth has been almost matched by population growth, with the result that the average citizen is little if any better off. "The annual growth rate of per capita income," National City reports, "is only about 1/2 of 1% in South Asia, 1% in Africa and less than 2% in Latin America."

Some of the poorer countries have begun taking steps toward reasonable and humane population control. A number of them, too, are making belated efforts to upgrade their own agriculture, realizing at last that a country that would become an industrial state must first think of feeding its people.

The U.S. can and should continue to encourage progress along both those lines. In these areas and in others, though, the basic decisions must be those of the less-developed countries themselves and not the U.S.

Poorer nations are going to have to start putting to use some of the lessons learned in the past decade: That development at best is a gradual, not an overnight process; that central economic planning can slow, instead of speeding, development; that a proper climate for private enterprise, foreign and domestic, can make significant contributions to progress.

In all of this the U.S. and other industrial nations can and should continue to lend a hand. If real improvements are to be made, however, the poorer countries must recognize that development is in many ways a do-it-yourself project.

THE HIGHWAY AS A KILLER

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for many years over the hazardous conditions prevailing on hundreds of our Nation's highways.

As a member of two public works subcommittees vitally concerned with this problem, I have spent long periods of time seeking ways to cut down the annual slaughter of some 55,000 human beings.

There are numerous causes of highway accidents besides bad driving. Poor layout and construction, improperly placed signs, contour deficiencies, and off-road hazards such as pointed guardrails—these are only a few of the conditions that can result in tragic death.

We in Congress have been aware of this problem. State highway officials and

Federal highway officials also have been aware.

But the general public has not, as a body, been aware of this treacherous situation.

So it is very helpful when a national magazine with the circulation of Life spotlights the problem, as it did in its May 30 issue under the cover title "Our Deadliest Highways."

As Life notes on its cover, "Bad U.S. highways cause one-third of all accidents."

Mr. Speaker, Life's word-and-picture presentation on this subject should be read by every American. The pictures in particular are most graphic.

The sardonic humor of highway officials in Illinois should not be lost on us. As the sign in one photo notes:

Danger—Entering 55 Miles of Treacherous Hwy 20.

As the driver is leaving, another sign comments:

Congratulations—You Have Survived Hwy 20.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the editors of Life for this extremely valuable public service. It is a classic example of responsible journalism, and I trust that its message will get through to every American.

The article referred to follows:

THE HIGHWAY AS A KILLER

Here is something to remember for Memorial Day: more Americans will die in traffic accidents this year than have died in the entire Vietnam war. The blame for such an appalling statistic was once pinned mainly on "the nut behind the wheel." Then Ralph Nader showed that defects in the cars were a contributing factor. Now safety experts are focusing on a third cause: the highway itself. The problem is not just the old roads, but some of the newest and sleekest, and since they carry more traffic faster, they are proving to be even more efficient killers. State highway departments have been more interested in multiplying the miles of new expressways than in making them safe. Many new roads have sharp curves and blind spots, while guardrails, median barriers, signs and signals are often missing. Safety guidelines instituted after a Congressional investigation in 1966 are just beginning to be observed.

Of the old deathtraps, none is worse than two-lane U.S. 20, a coast-to-coast route that was built 49 years ago. In the western Illinois hills, the road is a winding ribbon—only 18 feet wide with no shoulders—and the tractor-trailers that hurtle down it pass so close that their suction can pull cars off the road. Narrow misses like the two pictured here are common. Signs have been posted to warn of the 40-foot dips, bends and blind spots. At one deadly crossing near the town of Lena, a doctor, his wife and four children were wiped out when a truck hit them broadside. But the signs on U.S. 20 haven't stemmed the death rate, which is now running almost four times the national average.

Miscalculations and oversights account for most of the dangers that abound on the roadways built in the last decade. For example there is an unbanked 80-degree curve on Cleveland's Innerbelt that racks up cars regularly. The road was constructed only eight years ago. This summer the curve will be rebuilt at a cost of \$308,000. Few danger spots are simply the result of penny-pinching although the decision to build an elevated section of Chicago's Dan Ryan Expressway in 1960 without any shoulders was made for

reasons of economy. But the economy was false—that road is Illinois' top killer.

Even with care in design and a willing expenditure of funds, unexpected factors may make a highway unsafe. California's surrealistic nightmare, Interstate 15, is a case in point. Laid out across the Mojave Desert, straight and wide and beautiful, for a time it killed proportionately more people than the much smaller road it had replaced. Highway hypnosis is brought on by its long, uninterrupted sight lines. On the Baker grade, an 18-mile-long hill, the median strip is so wide that a driver can forget that the other half of the roadway is there; motorists whose cars stall from overheating have been known to turn around and coast back against traffic to get help. When a wrong-way driver smashed into a bus last year and 20 died, the state finally put up big red warning signs: "You Are Going Wrong Way."

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

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

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY, JUNE 4, 1969

For each of you, and for your parents and your countrymen, this is a moment of quiet pride.

After years of study and training, you have earned the right to be saluted.

But the members of the graduating class of the Air Force Academy are beginning their careers at a difficult moment in military life.

On a fighting front, you are asked to be ready to make unlimited sacrifice in a limited war.

On the home front, you are under attack from those who question the need for a strong national defense, and indeed see a danger in the power of the defenders.

You are entering the military service of your country when the nation's potential adversaries abroad were never stronger and your critics at home were never more numerous.

It is open season on the armed forces. Military programs are ridiculed as needless if not deliberate waste. The military profession is derided in some of the best circles. Patriotism is considered by some to be a backward, unfashionable fetish of the uneducated and unsophisticated. Nationalism is hailed and applauded as a panacea for the ills of every nation—except the United States.

This paradox of military power is a symptom of something far deeper that is stirring in our body politic. It goes beyond the dissent about the war in Vietnam. It goes behind the fear of the "military industrial complex."

The underlying questions are really these:

What is America's role in the world? What are the responsibilities of a great nation toward protecting freedom beyond its shores? Can we ever be left in peace if we do not actively assume the burden of keeping the peace?

When great questions are posed, fundamental differences of opinion come into focus. It serves no purpose to gloss over these differences, or to try to pretend they are mere matters of degree.

One school of thought holds that the road to understanding with the Soviet Union and Communist China lies through a downgrading of our own alliances and what amounts to a unilateral reduction of our arms—as a demonstration of our "good faith."

They believe that we can be conciliatory and accommodating only if we do not have the strength to be otherwise. They believe America will be able to deal with the possibility of peace only when we are unable to cope with the threat of war.

Those who think that way have grown weary of the weight of free world leadership that fell upon us in the wake of World War II, and they argue that we are as much responsible for the tensions in the world as any adversary we face.

They assert that the United States is blocking the road to peace by maintaining its military strength at home and its defense forces abroad. If we would only reduce our forces, they contend, tensions would disappear and the chances for peace brighten.

America's presence on the world scene, they believe, makes peace abroad improbable and peace in our society impossible.

We should never underestimate the appeal of the isolationist school of thought. Their slogans are simplistic and powerful: "Charity begins at home." "Let's first solve our own problems and then we can deal with the problems of the world."

This simple formula touches a responsive chord with many an overburdened taxpayer. It would be easy to buy some popularity by going along with the new isolationists. But it would be disastrous for our nation and the world.

I hold a totally different view of the world, and I come to a different conclusion about the direction America must take.

Imagine what would happen to this world if the American presence were swept from the scene. As every world leader knows, and as even the most outspoken of America's critics will admit, the rest of the world would be living in terror.

If America were to turn its back on the world, a deadening form of peace would settle over this planet—the kind of peace that suffocated freedom in Czechoslovakia.

The danger to us has changed, but it has not vanished. We must revitalize our alliances, not abandon them.

We must rule out unilateral disarmament. In the real world that simply will not work. If we pursue arms control as an end in itself, we will not achieve our end. The adversaries in the world today are not in conflict because they are armed. They are armed because they are in conflict, and have not yet learned peaceful ways to resolve their conflicting national interests.

The aggressors of this world are not going to give the United States a period of grace in which to put our domestic house in order—just as the crises within our society cannot be put on a back burner until we resolve the problem of Vietnam.

Programs solving our domestic problems will be meaningless if we are not around to enjoy them. Nor can we conduct a successful policy of peace abroad if our society is at war with itself at home.

There is no advancement for Americans at home in a retreat from the problems of the world. America has a vital national interest in world stability, and no other nation can uphold that interest for us.

We stand at a crossroad in our history. We shall reaffirm our aspiration to greatness or we shall choose instead to withdraw into ourselves. The choice will affect far more than our foreign policy; it will determine the quality of our lives.

A nation needs many qualities, but it needs faith and confidence above all. Skeptics do not build societies; the idealists are the builders. Only societies that believe in themselves can rise to their challenges. Let us not, then, pose a false choice between

meeting our responsibilities abroad and meeting the needs of our people at home. We shall meet both or we shall meet neither.

This is why my disagreement with the skeptics and the isolationists is fundamental. They have lost the vision indispensable to great leadership. They observe the problems that confront us; they measure our resources; and they despair. When the first vessels set out from Europe for the New World, these men would have weighed the risks, and stayed behind. When the colonists on the Eastern seaboard started across the Appalachians to the unknown reaches of the Ohio Valley, these men would have calculated the odds, and stayed behind.

Our current exploration of space makes the point vividly: Here is testimony to man's vision and man's courage. The journey of the astronauts is more than a technical achievement; it is a reaching-out of the human spirit. It lifts our sights; it demonstrates that magnificent conceptions can be made real.

They inspire us and at the same time teach us true humility. What could bring home to us more the limitations of the human scale than the hauntingly beautiful picture of our earth seen from the moon?

Every man achieves his own greatness by reaching out beyond himself. So it is with nations. When a nation believes in itself—as Athenians did in their golden age, as Italians did in the Renaissance—that nation can perform miracles. Only when a nation means something to itself can it mean something to others.

That is why I believe a resurgence of American idealism can bring about a modern miracle—a world order of peace and justice.

I know that every member of this graduating class is, in that sense, an idealist.

In the years to come, you may hear your commitment to America's responsibility in the world derided as a form of militarism. It is important that you recognize that straw man issue for what it is: The outward sign of a desire by some to turn America inward; to have America turn away from greatness.

I am not speaking about those responsible critics who reveal waste and inefficiency in our defense establishment, who demand clear answers on procurement policies, who want to make sure a new weapons system will truly add to our defense. On the contrary, you should be in the vanguard of that movement. Nor do I speak of those with sharp eyes and sharp pencils who are examining our post-Vietnam planning with other pressing national priorities in mind. I count myself as one of those.

As your Commander-in-Chief, I want to relay to you as future officers of our armed forces some of my thoughts on these issues of national moment.

I worked closely with President Eisenhower. I know what he meant when he said ". . . we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex."

Many people conveniently forget that he followed that warning with another: "We must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

And in that same Farewell Address, President Eisenhower made quite clear the need for national security. As he put it: "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."

The American defense establishment should never be a sacred cow, nor should the American military be anybody's scapegoat.

America's wealth is enormous but it is not limitless. Every dollar available to the Federal Government has been taken from the American people in taxes. A responsible gov-

ernment has a duty to be prudent when it spends the people's money. There is no more justification for wasting money on unnecessary military hardware than there is for wasting it on unwarranted social programs.

There can be no question that we should not spend "unnecessarily" for defense. But we must also not confuse our priorities.

The question in defense spending is "how much is necessary?" The President of the United States is the man charged with making that judgment. After a complete review of our foreign and defense policies I have submitted requests to the Congress for military appropriations—some of them admittedly controversial. These requests represent the minimum I believe essential for the United States to meet its current and long-range obligations to itself and to the free world. I have asked only for those programs and those expenditures that I believe are necessary to guarantee the security of this country and to honor our obligations. I will bear the responsibility for these judgments. I do not consider my recommendations infallible. But if I have made a mistake, I pray that it is on the side of too much and not too little. If we do too much, it will cost us our money; if we do too little, it may cost us our lives.

Mistakes in military policy can be irretrievable. Time lost in this age of science can never be regained. I have no choice in my decisions but to come down on the side of security. History has dealt harshly with those nations who have taken the other course.

In that spirit, let me offer this credo for the defenders of our nation:

I believe that we must balance our need for survival as a nation with our need for survival as a people. Americans, soldiers and civilians, must remember that defense is not an end in itself—it is a way of holding fast to the deepest values known to civilized man.

I believe that our defense establishment will remain the servant of our national policy of bringing about peace in this world, and that those in any way connected with the military must scrupulously avoid even the appearance of becoming the master of that policy.

I believe that every man in uniform is a citizen first and a serviceman second, and that we must resist any attempt to isolate or separate the defenders from the defended. In this regard, those who agitate for the removal of the ROTC from college campuses only contribute to an unwanted militarism.

I believe that the basis for decisions on defense spending must be "what do we need for our security" and not "what will this mean for business and employment." The Defense Department must never be considered a modern-day WPA: There are far better ways for government to help ensure a sound prosperity and high employment.

I believe that moderation has a moral significance only in those who have another choice. The weak can only plead magnanimity and restraint gain moral meaning coming from the strong.

I believe that defense decisions must be made on the hard realities of the offensive capabilities of our adversaries, and not on our fervent hopes about their intentions. With Thomas Jefferson, we can prefer "the flatteries of hope" to the gloom of despair, but we cannot survive in the real world if we plan our defense in a dream world.

I believe we must take risks for peace—but calculated risks, not foolish risks. We shall not trade our defenses for a disarming smile or honeyed words. We are prepared for new initiatives in the control of arms, in the context of other specific moves to reduce tensions around the world.

I believe that America is not about to become a Garrison State, or a Welfare State, or a Police State—because we will defend our values from those forces, external or internal, that would challenge or erode them.

And I believe this above all: That this nation shall continue to be a source of world leadership and a source of freedom's strength, in creating a just world order that will bring an end to war.

Let me conclude with a personal word.

A President shares a special bond with the men and women of the nation's armed services. He feels that bond strongly at moments like these, facing all of you who have pledged your lives, your fortunes and your sacred honor to the service of your country. He feels that bond most strongly when he presents a Medal of Honor to an 8-year-old boy who will not see his father again. Because of that bond, let me say this to you now:

In the past generation, since 1941, this nation has paid for fourteen years of peace with fourteen years of war. The American war dead of this generation has been far greater than all of the preceding generations of Americans combined. In terms of human suffering, this has been the costliest generation in the two centuries of our history.

Perhaps this is why my generation is so fiercely determined to pass on a different legacy. We want to redeem that sacrifice. We want to be remembered, not as the generation that suffered, but as the generation that was tempered in its fire for a great purpose: to make the kind of peace that the next generation will be able to keep.

This is a challenge worthy of the idealism which I know motivates every man who will receive his diploma today.

I am proud to have served in America's armed forces in a war which ended before members of this class were born.

It is my deepest hope and my belief that each of you will be able to look back on your career with pride, not because of the wars in which you served but because of the peace and freedom which your service made possible for America and the world.

CENTRALIZATION OF FEDERAL SCIENCE ACTIVITIES

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, on May 30, I submitted to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, which I have the honor to chair, what I believe to be a significant study on "Centralization of Federal Science Activities."

This is a subject which has been much discussed throughout the Federal and scientific communities and which deals primarily with the possible reorganization of the various science activities in the executive branch.

While the report makes no recommendations in this matter, it does raise the question of whether the Government's science activities should be combined under one organization, in whole or in part, or otherwise be revamped. It further describes a new model organization, the National Institutes of Research and Advanced Studies, as a point for focusing discussion.

The area I am describing is one in which the Science Subcommittee has specific responsibilities, for it directly affects our national research and development effort as well as the technological transfer of that effort toward impor-

tant uses by current society. In other words it impinges on our science resources and how they are being managed.

Mr. Speaker, because this matter is gradually becoming more significant and more difficult to deal with, we believe that it is important to ascertain the views of a variety of experts, within the Government and without, on the desirability of such a move as well as the possible structure of it. Consequently, it is the intention of our subcommittee to hold hearings on this subject at the earliest practicable date, probably during the latter part of July. We would hope that these hearings will help to channel and crystallize the wealth of creative and currently diverse thought which exists in the scientific arena.

It is also our hope that upon the completion of this inquiry, the subcommittee will have concrete recommendations to bring before the House and its appropriate committees.

CUT IN OFFICE OF EDUCATION ALLOCATIONS

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the \$500,000,000 cut in Office of Education allocations by the administration's budget. This money represents the approximate cost of fighting the war in Vietnam for 5 days. As one who has had a great deal of public school experience, I believe that this budget cut will be devastating for our schools. For this reason, I want to commend my colleague, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, for his recent statement concerning this reduction, to the Appropriations Committee. At this time, I want to include that statement in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I want to thank you for your courtesy in permitting me to appear before you today. I know that you have much to do as you consider the 1970 budget. So, I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here.

I come here because I am deeply concerned about the future of education in this country. We all know of the financial crisis of our urban area schools. We know of the increasing demand for higher education—and the strained resources of our colleges. At the very time when our educational needs are greater than ever before the budget you have before you recommends a decrease of \$500,000,000 in Office of Education appropriations for next year. At a time when primary and secondary enrollments are increasing 2 percent per year and when college enrollments are increasing 8 percent each year the present budget contemplates decreasing Office of Education expenditures by 14 percent next year. This increased enrollment tells only part of the increased need for finances in education since cost of instruction per student also grows markedly each year. At a time when the weak and inflexible tax base of state and local governments are burdened to the breaking point, the budget sent to Congress shifts an increasing burden to state and local governments. All of this is occurring in the context of unprecedented prosperity. Our Gross

National Product is higher than it has ever been. I have no doubt that this nation can afford increasing expenditures in education. I think we owe our children the best possible education. This budget does not provide for that kind of education.

I fear that if these cuts are permitted to stand the quality of education provided our students will decrease, the ability of schools and colleges to keep up with changing technological needs will diminish, the creation of new capacity to educate burgeoning enrollments will suffer, and the quality of educational opportunity will be impaired. I also fear that if we short-change our educational needs at this point in history, we will pay for it many times over in the future. I believe deeply that these are not expenses that we can defer. A year of lost opportunity in education can never be regained. A year of substandard instruction can never be corrected. Our neglect now will haunt us in the future.

This is why I'm here today. I hope that this subcommittee will not accept these recommendations of the President. There are several cutbacks which I find especially disturbing.

Library Services. The President's budget has singled out libraries for particularly heavy cuts in the 1970 budget. Elementary and Secondary school library resources (Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) have been cut from \$50,000,000 to nothing. Grants for public libraries (under Title I of the Library Service and Construction Act) will be cut in half—from \$35,000,000 to \$17,500,000. Construction of public libraries (Title II, L.S.C.A.) will be cut from \$9,185,000 to nothing. Aid to College libraries will be cut in half—from \$25,000,000 to \$12,500,000. Funds for training librarians have been cut in half—from \$8,250,000 to \$4,000,000. Even acquisition and cataloging by the Library of Congress has been cut from \$5,500,000 to \$4,500,000.

These proposed cuts are appalling. They will stop Federal assistance for the construction of new public libraries in the future—and may very well jeopardize present projects receiving Federal funds. At least 276 pending projects, in locations throughout the country, will not receive funding. In some instances these libraries do not now have their own buildings. In other instances the buildings are in a dilapidated condition and do not invite extensive public use. In still other instances, there is a need for branch libraries to bring library services within reach of more people.

The proposed budget will also make it difficult for public libraries to expand (or in some instances even keep) existing services. Expansion of collections will be impaired as it becomes necessary to curtail acquisitions. In some instances services will be diminished. Mobile libraries, which often mean the difference between service and no service, will be curtailed. Many libraries may have to adopt shorter hours. Planning for new and better service will decrease. The reduction in college library resources will also decrease the ability of these libraries to make new acquisitions, to bring old collections up to date, and to acquire the very latest research reports.

The cut in library aid to elementary and secondary schools is likely to be particularly damaging. It will severely limit these schools in acquiring up-to-date instructional materials, textbooks, and music materials for use in educational activities.

On top of all this, the budget proposes cuts in training of librarians. This will mean that in future years we won't have the necessary talent to staff our libraries. Coupled with this is a decrease in funds for the Library of Congress in areas which service libraries throughout the country.

All of these proposed reductions must be considered in light of the function of libraries in the education enterprise. They are the storehouse of basic materials. They can

literally make the difference between a mediocre and a high quality education. They can provide a source of stimulation to an otherwise muffled existence—helping children to develop aspirations and to acquire knowledge they otherwise would not receive. Libraries are particularly likely to pay rich dividends in the educational process. That is why I want to encourage you to restore these funds.

College Student Assistance. Federally aided student assistance is particularly important in a time when college costs are increasing much faster than the general increase in the cost-of-living and when it is becoming increasingly important for students to receive college training. National Defense Student Loans, College Work-Study Grants, and Educational Opportunity Grants have helped many receive a college education who, without this help, would have been unable to go to college. That is why I think it especially important that these programs receive vigorous Federal support.

The budget Congress is now considering proposes cutbacks in these programs or such small increases that colleges will not be able to meet the requests (and need) for student assistance as enrollments continue to rise. If the budget proposals are allowed to stand, many fewer students will receive aid next year. And those who will be hardest hit will be first year students, since most colleges will continue to aid students already receiving aid but will refrain from making new commitments.

The budget proposes cutting funds for National Defense Student Loans from \$190,000,000 to \$155,000,000. This will result in at least 44,000 fewer students receiving loans next year. And many of those who will continue receiving loans will only receive part of what they received this year. For example, at Rider College, a private college in Trenton, New Jersey, officials estimate that they will be unable to make any new loans to first year incoming students. And the average loan for continuing students will be decreased from \$500 to \$300. This comes at a time when Rider College has found it necessary to increase tuition charges for next year's students.

The College Work-Study program, with carry-over funds, will spend about \$161,900,000 this year. Under the budget proposal there will be \$161,200,000 available next year. This may seem to be a modest cut, but it must be considered in light of two facts. Wages to students paid by this program increase each year in line with prevailing wage rates. And recently, the number of institutions which qualify to participate in this program has increased by more than 20 percent. This means that the number of students receiving this aid at any given college will decrease markedly. Nationally, 20,000 fewer students will be able to receive funds through this program next year.

Funds providing Educational Opportunity Grants will increase next year under budget proposals. But most of this increase will be absorbed by students already in the program. Because of the forward funding authorized for first year grants in this program, cuts in this year's budget will decrease the number of students receiving first year's grants by 40,300 next year. And next year's budget makes no provision for increasing the number of first year grants.

We may not see the impact of the budget cuts in this area for several years. There is little doubt that these cuts will have the direct impact of keeping hundreds of students who could otherwise benefit from a college education next year. And this cut-back will not only be felt by the very poor in our society. It will also affect low income families whose children qualify for grants or loans, but who cannot get them because of these cuts.

In addition to these undergraduate aids, the budget proposes to cut N.D.E.A. Title IV college teacher fellowships from \$70,000,000

to \$61,469,000. This will result in about 2,000 fewer fellowships being awarded to graduate students next year. It will also put further pressures on the shortage of college faculty—a pressure being felt by colleges all over the country. This is, again, a cut that we will stand to regret at a future date, if we permit it to stand.

The reduction in student aid will have an impact at every university in the country. The example of Princeton University in Princeton, New Jersey offers striking evidence of how a few cuts here and there can add up to affecting a substantial number of students. Princeton is a relatively small school as universities go today. Yet the reductions in student aid will affect a total of almost 300 students there—173 undergraduate and 118 graduate students. The number of students affected by reductions proposed by the 1970 budget is as follows:

- (1) National Defense Student Loans—140 fewer students will receive loans next year.
- (2) Work-Study Program—27 fewer students will receive Work-Study grants next year.
- (3) Educational Opportunity Grants—This program will support 6 fewer students at Princeton next year.
- (4) National Defense Education Act Fellowships—The University will lose 42 of 202 fellowships received in 1969.
- (5) NASA—15 of 24 fellowships will be lost next year.
- (6) NSF Regular Fellowships—20 of 175 fellowships will be lost next year.
- (7) NSF Traineeships—6 of 65 fellowships will be lost next year.
- (8) Reduction in research grants will require reducing by 35 the number of students receiving aid as a result of these grants.

College Construction. Grants to colleges to aid in the construction of needed facilities has increased over the last few years. It has never reached as high as it should have; but it did assist colleges through some very crucial years in making available adequate facilities with which to educate vastly expanding enrollments. Without this aid crowded conditions would be even worse. New campuses could not have been developed. And pressures to raise student charges, which were already high, would have been even greater. It is therefore with a great deal of consternation that I look upon a budget which proposes to cut aid for these vitally needed facilities. In states where vigorous attempts are being made to develop a higher education system, these cuts come at a crucial time. Valuable years of planning will be lost. Developing a delivery system will be stunted. And it will be years before families in many communities have easily accessible higher education facilities.

In my own state of New Jersey, Federal aid for college construction will be reduced from \$5,674,000 this year to \$1,165,000 next year. This decrease of \$4,509,000 represents a cut of more than 80 percent in this vital area. In New Jersey, funds for constructing public community colleges—which are vitally needed there—will decrease from \$2,248,000 to \$1,165,000, a cut of about 50 percent. I think that this is outrageous. It will be a blow to New Jersey higher education from which we may never recover.

Nationally, the budget proposes to cut funds for vocational and community college construction from \$50,000,000 to \$43,000,000. This will curtail the development of new colleges. And it will considerably diminish the provision of easily accessible higher education institutions to thousands of our students. Aid for construction of other undergraduate facilities will be cut out completely (from \$33,000,000, this year) and aid for graduate facility construction will also be cut out completely (from \$8,000,000 this year). Expansion in all phases of higher education continues, and if these cuts are allowed to stand we will find ourselves in the unhappy situation a few years hence without the capacity to educate those who knock

at the door. The shrinking capacity (relative to demand) could reach real crisis proportions. And when it does we will discover just how false our economy move this year will be. For if the past few years serve as any guide, construction costs increase each year. Materials, finance, and land charges will go up, not down. Deferring our needs in this area could thus be especially expensive.

Vocational Education. The budget for vocational education contains no provision for work-study grants authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963. It reduces basic grants, which provide needed flexibility to the states from \$234,216,000 to \$230,336,000. And it reduces funds for research and training from \$11,375,000 to \$1,100,000.

The general impact of the vocational education budget is a serious one for states and local school districts. Basically, the money is shifted from general categories which provide some flexibility to states and local districts into inflexible categories by earmarking funds more than it has in the past. Although shifting emphases are sometimes necessary as we attempt to meet new needs, I don't believe that we should leave present programs to flounder as a result of lack of financing. That is why I believe that we should leave the general grants program and the research and training provisions at their present level of funding. I don't want to see present programs suffer. I want to see states and local school districts retain some flexibility in how they spend their money, since needs vary from district to district. In the State of New Jersey, according to the State Vocational Education office, the present budget will require reductions in funds to 198 school districts in the state. This will affect 152,540 students.

The present budget makes no provision for vocational work-study grants. I find this appalling. This program fills a gap that is not filled by college work-study, by Office of Economic Opportunity programs, or, indeed, by any other Federal program. It has permitted aid to students, in existing vocational education institutions, which has permitted many to acquire a skill which fits them for today's job markets. Summer programs utilizing this money have kept thousands of youth off the street while providing them an education which they considered relevant.

The entire area of vocational education meets a need that cannot be met by any other segment of education in the country. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provided a thrust in the right direction. It has helped this segment of education begin to meet a need that was not met before. I think that this Congress and this subcommittee should do all that it can to provide a viable vocational education program.

Assistance to Federally Affected Areas. This established Federal program has, through the years, provided much needed Federal assistance to many local school districts throughout the country. It has been especially useful in providing small and middle sized communities with the assistance necessary to provide an educational program for children whose parents worked on Federal property. Where these children comprised a large percentage of the school-age population, and where enrollments were subject to rapid fluctuation, this aid was, and is, indispensable to providing an educational program. In 1970, under present formulas, the state of New Jersey qualifies for \$15,350,000 of this aid. Under the budget proposals the school districts in the State will receive \$4,200,000. In practical terms this means that many districts in the State are likely to fall completely. And others will have to operate severely curtailed programs in order to stay in operation. Nationally, the budget proposes to reduce this year's appropriation from \$505,900,000 to \$187,000,000. If these cuts are accepted, and the remaining money is distributed in accordance with Administration plans, it will mean that this assistance will be paid on 400,000 students next year. This

compares with 2,400,000 this year. If the aid is distributed under the same formula next year as it was this year, it will mean that schools will receive about 25¢ next year for every \$1 they receive this year.

I believe that this aid must continue. School districts have come to depend upon it. It means the difference in local schools and no local school in hundreds of school districts. In others it means the difference in providing good and poor instruction. It must be continued.

Elementary and Secondary Education. During the past several years funds have been provided to elementary and secondary school for equipment and minor remodeling. The budget will cut the \$78,740,000 appropriated for this year for this purpose, to nothing for next year. This has permitted renovation of school buildings throughout the country. It has also permitted schools to acquire modern equipment for up-to-date instruction.

The budget has also deleted the \$17,000,000 which was appropriated for guidance, counseling and testing this year. This money has established counseling programs which test students, advise them of the type of curriculum which they should pursue, inform them of the job opportunities available, and encourage them to complete their secondary education.

I think that both of these programs deserve a much higher priority than this budget has assigned to these items. The dropout rates in our high schools are higher than ever. Basically, we must help our schools do the job we expect them to do. We cannot point a finger of shame at our schools, delineate their faults, and then turn our backs on them when it becomes our turn to help them do their job. We must have improvement in our educational system. A child in school is better than one in the streets. Are we going to save our money while we lose our children? I don't think that the 91st Congress wants to go down in history as the Congress which sacrificed our children to economy.

Some of the amounts I've been talking about seem like small sums particularly in the budget which calls for nearly \$200 billion in expenditures, and in a year when our Gross National Product is at its highest. But in individual schools and colleges the cuts are likely to make a significant difference. For example, Trenton State College, in Trenton, New Jersey stands to lose the following from reductions in the Office of Education budget alone:

Higher Education Facilities Act (title I and II)-----	\$1,666,000
Higher Education Act (title VI A)-----	17,000
NDEA loans-----	5,450
College work-study-----	1,150
Educational opportunity grants-----	21,619
Training teachers of deaf, mentally disabled, retarded children-----	22,600
Total-----	1,733,819

I plead with you to restore these funds. With the increased number of students and the increased cost of instruction we actually lose ground when our expenditures remain constant. I think that the least we owe our children is to maintain our efforts in the educational area. If we maintain this effort we may be able to retain some of the gains we've made in this area in recent years. If we don't, we will surely lose them—and it will be impossible to ever recover them. This is an area in which the proposals which have been made are the best examples of false economy I have ever seen. These budget proposals tamper with some of the most fragile elements of our society. I hope that this Committee will do what it can to put a stop to this now.

DEFENSE COSTS NOT EXCESSIVE

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 1, 1969, the Sunday Star carried a column by James J. Kilpatrick, dealing with defense costs and some of the serious inventory shortages, particularly in the Navy, which I find alarming and which cannot be ignored if we are to avoid disaster. Mr. Kilpatrick's observations about the drawdown upon naval aircraft reserves, as well as a lack of replacements, demands the careful consideration of every Member of Congress. The article follows:

DEFENSE COSTS NOT EXCESSIVE

The tidal wave rolls on as May goes into June: It is impossible to pick up a newspaper without reading fresh blasts against the Pentagon—against the generals, the admirals, the top brass—against the whole "military-industrial complex" that is said to be dominating our society and exhausting its wealth.

Everyone is jumping aboard this juggernaut—peacenik students, conscience-stricken colleges, whole covens of U.S. Senators. A House subcommittee publishes a damning report on Pentagon procurement procedures. Such gifted cartoonists as Herblock and Oliphant treat us daily to caricatures of bloated generals playing billion-dollar games. The military budget, we are told, is no longer sacrosanct: Defense spending will be cut to the bone.

In the midst of this orchestrated howling, it is not easy to raise a small voice of reason. Yet the voice has to be raised: This nation is not spending too much on defense. We probably are spending too little.

Sure enough, vast sums have been spent badly, on tanks that won't run, and planes that won't perform, and missiles that go awry. Defense Secretary Laird has a prodigious task ahead of him, in cracking down on defense contractors who have been taking advantage of the government. Laird is a tough hombre, and will do what has to be done.

But the demand that the U.S. spend less for national security is a demand that makes no sense—not at a time when the Soviet Union is upgrading its navy and expanding its missile program. Regardless of the outcome in Vietnam, our general purpose forces must be kept at high levels. To permit their erosion, in effect, is to abandon commitments; eventually, such a course involves the piecemeal yielding of most of the world to advancing Soviet power.

Sad to say, that is the course the false economizers are pursuing. The consequences of this folly already are appearing.

For a case in point, consider the critical situation that has developed in the field of naval aviation. The Navy maintains an inventory of roughly 8,250 planes. Six years ago, the average age of a Navy plane was about three years. Today the average age is more than seven.

Upwards of 2,400 naval aircraft already have outlived their service life; another 2,000 will reach that point of obsolescence within three years. Naval Reserve wings have been stripped of planes and parts. Nothing remains in mothballs. The Navy's inventory of fighters has dropped from 1,700 to 1,100 in eight years. Vice Admiral Thomas F. Connolly, head of naval aviation, has a blunt phrase that sums it up: We are engaged, he says, in "unilateral fiscal disarmament."

It will be five years before the Navy's proud new multipurpose plane, the swept-wing

F-14, begins to arrive in significant numbers. Grumman Aircraft is building this beauty; and in view of the outcry over Lockheed's runaway costs on the C5A, it may be in order to note some of the hard-nosed provisions of Grumman's contract on the F-14.

The Navy wrote into that contract certain specific requirements on design and performance—weight, range, acceleration, landing speed, and the like. Penalty clauses are attached. If Grumman goes over the maximum weight by as much as a hundred pounds, a \$440,000 penalty will be imposed. Grumman will have to pay \$1 million for every 10 miles of range by which it misses. The penalty for missing the maximum approach speed is \$1 million a knot. The company is confident that it will meet these requirements, on time, within the target price.

The Navy ought to be ordering 1,000 planes a year at a cost of \$4.8 billion. The economizers threaten to whack this replenishment schedule almost in half—and the Navy is not alone in its appropriation troubles. All our basic defense forces are in the same fix. This way lies disaster; that's where we're headed now.

RICKOVER VIEWS ON ARMS DEBATE

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the views of Admiral Rickover, as expressed in a letter to Senator PASTORE and reported in the following article by columnist James J. Kilpatrick, are particularly timely. His letter is a forceful answer to those who would downgrade the need for a strong defense posture. It follows:

RICKOVER VIEWS ON ARMS DEBATE MERIT ATTENTION

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Several weeks ago, Sen. John O. Pastore wrote to Adm. H. G. Rickover. The senator asked for the admiral's views on where the nation is going and what needs to be done in a military way at a time of national debate on preparedness.

Rickover responded with a letter that merits the widest possible reading. Let me give him the floor:

"The first point I would like to make," Rickover wrote, "is that in judging between conflicting views on this matter, the deciding factor must be their relevance to the world as it is, not as we would wish it to be. Granted the hideousness of modern war, can we deduce therefrom that mankind is now wise enough to forgo recourse to arms? A look at history should put us on guard against those who claim that humanity has now reached a state where the possibility of armed aggression can be safely disregarded in formulating national policy.

"I am reminded of the intense opposition to the Navy's 15-cruiser bill in 1929. It was argued by many that with the signing of the Kellogg Peace Pact the year before, it was no longer necessary to build new warships. And this in light of the lessons of World War I which erupted despite the various Hague Peace Treaties! These ships were of inestimable value in helping us to win World War II. The war itself was prolonged because the Congress—heeding the 'merchants of death' argument—in 1939 prohibited shipment of war materials to Britain and France.

"Then, too, weight must be given to the credentials of those propounding opposite views. Are they public servants, charged with the awesome responsibility to secure our country against foreign conquest? Or are they private individuals not accountable for

the consequences of their opinions, who feel free to express their personal abhorrence of war and to agitate for a reduction of the financial burden military preparedness imposes on the taxpayer?

"Would the majority of the electorate accept their argument that, given our unmet domestic needs, we cannot afford an effective defense position vis-a-vis our potential adversaries? Or that war is so horrible that it is better to suffer defeat than to fight?"

"As for the high cost of preparedness, it is in fact no greater proportional to total U.S. output than 10 years ago—8.8 percent of total U.S. goods and services. Omitting the costs of the Vietnam war, and allowing for inflation, our armed forces have less buying power today than a decade ago.

"In the Soviet Union, on the other hand—according to the annual report of the congressional subcommittee on foreign economic policy issued last June—resources have been diverted from the farm sector to defense, where outlays rose dramatically in 1966-67, after remaining static since 1962. . . .

"If history teaches anything, it is surely that weakness invites attack; that it takes but one aggressor to plunge the world into war against the wishes of dozens of peace-loving nations if the former is militarily strong and the latter are not. . . .

"As a lawyer, you are familiar with Blackstone's statement that security of the person is the first, and liberty of the individual the second 'absolute right inherent in every Englishman.' Just so, the first right of every American is to be protected against foreign attack, and the first duty of government is to keep our nation alive. Given the world situation, this calls for maintenance of a defense capability which is adequate to discourage potential aggressors. . . .

"There can surely be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to relinquishment of our defense capability, recognizing full well that there will then be no one left to prevent the takeover by Communist power. Whether one takes the optimistic view that a permanent East-West detente can be negotiated, or the pessimistic view that ultimately we shall have to fight for our liberties, this nation has no future if it allows itself to be out-matched militarily."

**MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES OF 1969,
GETTYSBURG NATIONAL CEMETERY,
ADDRESSED BY JOE BARTLETT**

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln dedicated the Gettysburg National Cemetery November 19, 1863.

On Friday, May 30, 1969, the 102d consecutive Memorial Day exercises were held at this cemetery, and all nature appeared to put on one of its finest displays. The sun shown from a cloudless blue sky, and a gentle breeze was responsible for a comfortable temperature. The purple beeches, the stately old oaks, the magnificent hemlocks, the beautiful pines and firs—all these added dignity to the occasion.

In the course of this ceremony, little children performed a touching act of respect by sprinkling blossoms on the veterans' graves. Anyone present who was not thrilled by this tribute to our honored dead is cold indeed. One can

only hope that in the years ahead, it will not be necessary for those children of another generation to strew flowers upon the graves of others who were required to make a supreme sacrifice in our country's interest.

It has been said that Gettysburg is a place where patriotism survives and thrives. Each year speakers are inspired to pay a glowing tribute to our honored dead at the site of the Gettysburg National Cemetery. This year was no exception, and the distinguished speaker was our senior reading clerk in the House of Representatives, Joe Bartlett.

Joe's address was both meaningful and inspirational, as he spoke of the debt we owe to those of the past and of democracy's hope for the future. Because of the highly significant and moving nature of Mr. Bartlett's message, I insert it into the RECORD. Also, I insert the ceremony's opening prayer, delivered by Rev. Arthur F. McNulty, Jr., vicar, Prince of Peace Episcopal Church, Gettysburg; and the closing prayer, which was presented by Rev. Peter A. Posca, assistant pastor of St. Francis Xavier Church, Gettysburg.

We were honored to have in attendance the distinguished Representative from Michigan, the Honorable PHILIP E. RUPPE, his lovely wife, and two of their children.

The material referred to follows:

OPENING PRAYER

(By Rev. Arthur F. McNulty, Jr.)

Almighty God, Who guides us into the pathway of peace. On this Memorial Day we offer up our prayer for those who have given their lives that we can be free. May we turn the fields of battle hallowed by their blood into fields of peace hallowed by our hearts. May we turn the armaments of hate into the implements of love. May we turn the fear of yesterday into the hope for tomorrow. Take our hands, Dear God, and use them to create this peace. Take our minds, Dear God, and give us the knowledge of this love. Take our vision, Dear God, and let us see this hope. And take our hearts, Dear God, and set them on fire with Thy spirit. Now and forever. Amen.

CLOSING MEMORIAL DAY PRAYER

(By Rev. Peter A. Posca)

On this Memorial Day, Lord, we want to remember every one who has died for this nation: from the first to do so to those dying in Vietnam today. We include, too, those whose lives have been given fighting for freedom at home. Lord, we know you are not the property of our nation or of any nation. Every Man's spilled blood is a sign of your judgment upon us all, the blood of those who fought for this country and the blood of those they killed. We cannot claim you like a flag or use you like a slogan. We know you are not a God of nations and wars but of communities and peace. We ask that the memory of these dead may bring us to a great love of being alive, and of those good things for which it is right to lay down our lives as they did. We ask this in Jesus' name. Amen.

**MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY JOE BARTLETT,
GETTYSBURG NATIONAL CEMETERY, MAY 30,
1969**

Reverend Clergy; Mr. Chairman, Colonel Shriver; Mr. Mayor, Colonel Weaver; my dear friend, Congressman George Goodling; and my fellow citizens.

Before we turn our thoughts to heroes of another day, may we take solemn note of the men of our Armed Forces who have served and fought, bled and died, in the cause of freedom, in Southeast Asia.

Their exemplary conduct and valor is unexcelled in all the annals of our history. They take their rightful place in the most honored ranks, and in the grateful hearts, of our Nation.

Even at this very hour in Vietnam, they close with a relentless enemy. We pray that soon, freedom may be secured, and the fighting ended. Until then, let us be ever mindful of these brave men in the vanguard of our defense.

As Benjamin Franklin was leaving the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in September of 1787, he was asked:

"What kind of a government have you given us, Mr. Franklin?"

To which he replied:

"A Republic, Sir—if you can keep it!"

For nearly two centuries now, Americans have been striving, against recurring challenges, to keep that Republic.

We are met today on ground hallowed by perhaps the most significant struggle in the entire history of that Republic.

We meet here to pause, and to reflect, in reverent respect for those who have died that this Nation might live.

The words of Abraham Lincoln's perfect eulogy still clutching at our hearts, persuades me of the inadequacy of my puny attempts to describe their sacrifices, or to define our debt or our duty.

And no words could possibly match the beautiful, touching tribute, of your little children, gently sweeping across the graves, strewing flowers of remembrance.

We will never forget that scene—but far more importantly, these children will never forget that experience! As long as they live, they will be better citizens because, as a child, they had the opportunity to take part in this lovely patriotic expression.

Children have a wonderful simplicity about such things. When my young daughter, Laura, was three or four years old, I gave her a little flag on a stand, that had been presented to me. She put it on the window sill in her room, where she could watch it while the breeze unfurled its colors. She was very proud of that little flag. She saluted it. She practiced her pledge of allegiance to it. She was eager to learn everything she could about the flag.

Someone—not I—told her that if the flag dropped to the ground it was defiled and must be burned.

One day she came to me, obviously very upset. Through her tears she blurted out her story that the breeze had blown her flag to the floor. Clutching her little flag, she begged that she did not want it burned.

"Daddy," she implored, "don't you think my flag would be all right again if I just kissed it?"

You can imagine what that did to her "Daddy!"

Would you like to meet Laura?

[Laura Bartlett was received by applause; as was her sister, Linda Bartlett; and their mother, Mrs. Virginia "Jinny" Bartlett.]

It is inspiring just to be in Gettysburg. Your good neighbor, General Lester Light, was discussing this in Washington the other day. He concluded with the obvious: "Gettysburg," he enthused, "is one place where patriotism still thrives!"

And indeed it does! Perhaps more than any other community in this country, in Gettysburg patriotism is your occupation and your preoccupation—your labor and your love. And it does you great credit!

In an atmosphere such as you enjoy here, it must come to you as shocking and appalling—as it does to the better part of your fellow countrymen—that there is abroad in our land, a vile and vociferous element, ignorant of the meaning of our heritage, insolent toward our institutions; people who would willfully and wantonly do serious harm to the very fabric of our form of government.

Their actions ask (if they do not): "Why should we keep the Republic?"

Some no longer even question, but arrogantly demand the destruction of our institutions as the only acceptable way to achieve their selfish purposes. And they have not the vaguest concept of the consequences of such anarchy!

Even while we deplore their irresponsible attacks, we would do well to deal with their questions: "Is our form of government obsolescent?" "Is our Republic worth keeping?"

Governments are instituted to *serve men*. And when they no longer meet the needs of their people, they have, of course, outlived their usefulness.

Has the Republic that the Constitutional Convention gave us in 1787, outlived its usefulness in a mere 182 years? How goes this government of ours in this year of 1969?

Permit me to qualify my answer: During the past three decades, it has been my privilege to play a small role in the inner workings of that institution which is the keystone of our Republic—the House of your elected Representatives. And I have come here today, for one purpose above all others—to bear witness to the incredible genius and the inestimable worth of our republican form of government!

As I have come to know its virtues intimately, so have I come to recognize its weaknesses.

No less a person than Winston Churchill is supposed to have described democracy as the worst possible form of government—"except for all the others!"

Democracy is, by its very nature, expensive. Democracy is inherently, inefficient. Any form of arbitrary government can show a better "cost-to-effectiveness" ratio. Any dictator can move from situation to decision to action, with far greater dispatch.

But, unfortunately, he likely will have dispatched with our voices and our liberties—if not our heads—in the doing.

Democracy, too, has its price. Democracy is not a spectator sport, whereby we can sit on the sidelines and watch others carry the ball. Democracy—if it is to work—requires the active participation of each and every citizen.

Democracy can keep in perspective the persuasions of special interests, only while the general interests of the nation are being heard from and attended.

If you have ever wondered if we have a responsive government, may I testify most assuredly that we do. Oh my! how the Congress and the agencies of government can act when the voice of the people is clear!

It has been aptly put that, in a Republic, the people get a government as good as they, by their participation, provide. Or, as good as they deserve.

Truly, our government is a direct reflection upon us, whether that image is good and becoming, or otherwise.

Around the Capitol we are given to judge the people of an area by the kind of men they choose to send to Congress to represent them. (Parenthetically, may I say, that hundreds of my associates, whom you have never met, hold you, the people of the 19th District of Pennsylvania, in very high esteem!).

In that regard, may I attest that the Members of Congress, generally, are an outstanding group of public servants. Able, widely experienced, dedicated, and honorable. Tomorrow's history, I am confident, will compare them favorably with the giants of the past.

But a truism, of which I am equally certain, is that public officials will be just as faithful to their trust, as you, their constituents, by your expressed concern, cause them to be!

Though you may not think it fair, you must accept it as a fact, that, in a Republic, the ultimate burden and the ultimate blame lies with the people; for with the people lies the ultimate power!

So, what will history say of us? What will it say of our stewardship of this Republic, given to us by our founding fathers, and

passed along to us by succeeding generations of patriots?

As an instrument of government, will we keep it as vital and as valid as we received it?

And of the future? We know not what challenges await us. We know only that there will certainly be challenges, and we hope we may be equal to them.

I mentioned earlier the "incredible genius" of our system. For to watch it working is to admire it in wonder. I have long been convinced that our Constitution is too exquisite a framework of government to be explained, except that its brilliant authors were favored with the collaboration of Divine guidance.

Neither is there any explanation that will satisfy me, for the outcome of countless crises we have faced as a nation, and over which we have somehow, miraculously, prevailed—no explanation, except that we have been granted the generous grace of a merciful and almighty God.

And today, as the problems of the Republic loom larger than ever—from within and far away—while we work for the solution of these problems, let us pray our cause may be worthy of the only Sure Ally in time of trouble; for though the wrong seems oft so strong, God is the ruler yet!

And at this hour, when we pause to remember those who have given their lives for us, let us be prayerfully grateful that their sacrifice was not altogether in vain; that the Republic they served so sublimely, lives yet.

We have, I believe, a sacred covenant with these dead—to live—to live in keeping with the beliefs for which they died.

Democracy is not something locked up in the vaults of the National Archives in Washington. Democracy dwells in the hearts of our countrymen—or not at all!

So, let us drink deeply of the inspiration of this hallowed place.

Let us fill our souls with the flavor of grateful remembrance and pride of country.

And on this, the first day of the rest of our lives, let us resolve to do our part . . . to help . . . to keep this cherished Republic . . . that this government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth!

RUMSFELD'S PROMISE OF WISER SPENDING

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, now that the Senate has confirmed our former colleague, Don Rumsfeld, as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, we have noted his pledge for a closer evaluation of various anti-poverty programs.

A good place to start might be right in our own home State of Illinois and, specifically, in East St. Louis and Chicago where large sums of Federal money have been wasted with no appreciable results.

An editorial appearing in the June 3, 1969, edition of the Chicago Tribune points out the efforts of my good friend and colleague, Congressman Ed DERWINSKI, in trying to get to the bottom of this rather smelly situation. We must all hope that Congressman DERWINSKI will get some answers and even more importantly that there will be changes and improvements in these job training projects so that they will accomplish the objectives for which they were established and not

become just another rathole for the disposal of the taxpayers money. Under unanimous consent I submit the editorial for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

RUMSFELD'S PROMISE OF WISER SPENDING

A two-year extension of the federal anti-poverty program was proposed yesterday by the Nixon administration. The cost for the first year was placed at 2 billion dollars.

Donald Rumsfeld, director of the office of economic opportunity, said the President had decided to ask Congress for a two-year program to make possible longer-range planning and "more orderly and efficient allocation of funds." He said evaluation of the anti-poverty ventures had been neglected in the past but would have high priority in the Nixon administration.

Let us hope that these promises will be kept. As a starter, how about an evaluation of the 1.7-million-dollar job training program in East St. Louis which was featured by shootings, robberies, and burglaries at the training center? This program blew up last March, but a million dollars in federal funds is expected to be provided to get it moving again soon.

"We made a few mistakes in the first program, and we hope to correct them this time," said Lewis F. Nicolini, director of the Regional Manpower administration in Chicago. He complained that his office is handicapped by lack of staff for proper supervision of training projects. If so, the remedy would seem to be an adjustment of staff to make sure that all projects are watched.

Mr. Nicolini's office is the same one which failed to give proper supervision to a Chicago project to train 200 installers of aluminum siding. Auditors have been trying for months to find out what happened to \$387,000 in federal funds granted to this program, which graduated only nine trainees. Apparently most of the money was wasted and stolen.

Rep. Edward J. Derwinski [R., Ill.] asked the labor department for an explanation of this fiasco but got no response. Yesterday he asked the department if it knew what it was doing in reviving the East St. Louis project.

The importance and urgency of training "hard core" unemployed persons are recognized, and most taxpayers probably accept the necessity for a certain amount of experimentation. But there is no excuse for repeating mistakes that waste tax dollars.

Before voting another 2 billion dollars for anti-poverty programs Congress should get some assurance that the administrators will close up the ratholes.

ONE YEAR LATER

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, Resurrection City is no longer a physical entity in front of the Lincoln Memorial, but the memory of it and the hopes of many of its residents still live. Not all of the poor who dwell for a time in our midst left their dreams and hopes behind in the mud by the Reflecting Pool. Many returned to their homes inspired and determined to make their own unique contributions toward solving the massive problems of poverty in their communities.

One such group is the Household of God Bible-Way Church, Inc., located in my district in Compton, Calif. A member of the group has written a summation of

the accomplishments and future plans of this group. I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

ONE YEAR LATER

When the Government evicted and jailed the Rev. Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and many of his followers of Resurrection City, Washington, D.C., a year ago, they said that it was all over, in essence, that there would be no Resurrection from the dead. Many wept, many gave up, many believed that there was no hope, many accepted the militant attitude, some mocked them, some accused them of being unrealistic and insincere, some of the Government officials pierced them in the side with their false charges and their financial statement as to the cost of the demolition of Resurrection City. Many of the poor had begun to believe that that was the death of Resurrection City.

"Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die," and "that which thou sowest—thou sowest not that body that shall be." People are working from coast to coast, day and night, White and Black hand in hand, to reverse the priorities of the richest country in the world with 30 million Americans who are forced to lead lives of poverty and despair. . . .

One such person lives here in California, South Central Los Angeles, in the Watts-Willowbrook Area. He is the Rev. J. H. Mims, pastor of the Household of God Bible Way Church, located at 12611 Willowbrook Avenue, Compton, California. Rev. Mims and his group made news from coast to coast, when they took their little old yellow school church bus and went to Washington, D.C. to join their fellow poor in the Poor People's Campaign. They did not return home and cry about how poor they were. Rev. Mims and his group took a little initiative and went to work because prior to their departure, they too, had a dream . . . A dream for the Household of God Condominium in Watts to resettle families now living in over-crowded, ramshackle dwellings. Most of the families survive on a small pension, supplemented by welfare aid or what aid they can get.

Within the past year, Rev. Mims and his staff, working day and night solicited jobs and aid for people. They have acquired jobs for more than fifty teenagers and thirty adults. At their own expense they sent more than \$500.00 worth of gifts, clothing, and toys to the people in the Delta of Mississippi. One man 62 years old learned his ABC's by a toy donated by Mattel Toy Company. Shoes and clothing made many have a Merry Christmas. Five of the group gave up their holiday vacation to caravan the things to Mississippi, with trailers attached to their cars. They showed concern with the poverty stricken in another area. This they classify as foreign mission work.

With little or no money these people returned with a mind to work. First they developed some run-down property near the church into a guest house and rehabilitation center to house emergency cases, such as fire, storms or flood eviction victims. The guest house serves as a place where interested parties can come and live or visit with the indigent people of their community. Recently this place was televised for the benefit of informing the community. Rev. Brother Timothy Brown, who was the driver of the bus, stands ready to welcome all to be his guest at the guest house. They hope that they shall soon be able to develop their rehabilitation center to a point where they can offer at least one hot meal a day to those in need.

Being inspired by what they saw and the love that was shown in the many different cities, they had a desire to rebuild their store front church into a modern sanctuary as a sense of pride to their community and

as an expression of their new found inspiration, they joined hands and dedicated themselves to this idea. Now in the midst of a burned down, rat infested poverty stricken area of Willowbrook, which has more of the poor people per square mile than any other community in the Los Angeles Area, they have a beautiful suburban type church which is a sight to behold. They have a Head Start Program for children which is second to none, meeting all of the requirements of the Health Department, Fire Department, and Building and Safety Department. This is a feat in itself that few of the churches can claim, thereby saving the Government many dollars by not having to install costly portables in the community.

They are now preparing for another long hot summer. Along with three acres of playground space which have been developed with trees and shrubs, swings, slides, they are now remodeling an old double two-story garage into a little off street theatre and recreation center (16 mm. film needed or help in this area). They have now applied for a license to become a child day care center which will mean employment for approximately seven people which also would provide for the children while their mothers would work in order to rise above the welfare program eliminating the burden of the tax payer.

Rev. Mims says we still hope to build a condominium but we must do first what we can for ourselves then maybe someone or some group will come along to help us sincerely to help ourselves. To his people he says most folk are always willing to help you serve at the table in the poor house because their service in this manner is the only food that will quench their starving ego. They don't want to help you out of the poor house. If they did these folks would starve to death. He tells his people to stop depending and waiting on others to help do for you what you can do for yourself.

To depend upon and believe in what the word Emmanuel means (God with us) with this kind of instruction and faith in their leader you can never visit this little creative environment and not see someone working in and around in that community. Rev. Mims and the Household of God members are trying to elevate as much as possible.

This then is Resurrection City. The weak are growing strong. The proud are becoming humble. The unknown are becoming known. The Outcast are becoming respectable and they have a Dream that they and their poverty stricken community will one day by the sweat of their brow and the help of others rise above the poverty level.

ROTC TRAINED ASTRONAUTS

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every college administrator and certainly every Member of Congress who may be concerned about the wisdom of continuing ROTC college programs should read with appreciation an article written by my constituent, John Chamberlain, and published throughout the country in his syndicated column.

The article, "ROTC Trained Astronauts," points out among other things that Navy Comdr. John Watts Young and Navy Comdr. Eugene Andrew Cernan, two of the Apollo 10 astronauts, received their first military training in ROTC.

I think no more need be said but I

commend the column to our college folk as must reading, as follows:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, May 30, 1969]

ROTC TRAINED ASTRONAUTS

(By John Chamberlain)

It might be of interest on Memorial Day, when we are supposed to indulge in the anachronistic convention of rendering homage to our patriotic heroes, that two of the Apollo 10 astronauts received their first military training in ROTC.

Navy Comdr. John Watts Young, the commander of the ship which remained in a 70-mile-high orbit of the moon while "Snoopy," the lander module, was making its exploratory descent to within 10 miles of the lunar surface, was a member of the Naval Reserve Officers Training unit at Georgia Tech. and Navy Comdr. Eugene Andrew Cernan, who was in the two-man Snoopy crew, was in ROTC at Purdue in Indiana.

As of the moment of writing this column, I have looked in vain through our so-called mass media of the written word to find any mention of the fact that ROTC contributed to the training and the discipline of two of the three men chosen to make the most perilous space voyage to date. But practically every issue of the media contains some long account of the fumbling and temporizing and double-talk of college administrators who are bowing to the demands of Students for a Democratic Society to kick the ROTC off campus.

Memorial Day, hah! What were the soldiers of the Blue and the Gray in the War Between the States but a "bunch of stooges" for the military-industrial complex of Abe Lincoln's and Jeff Davis's day?

You feel like asking what's the matter with our college presidents, deans, faculties and trustees in not facing up to the SDS anti-patriots. But you also wonder about the failure of the services to provide good P.R. work in defending the ROTC institution that helps produce men like Navy Comdr. Young and Navy Comdr. Cernan. Why aren't we told how many men in the moon-shot program are ROTC graduates?

There is a positive side to the ROTC question that was never once brought out by the Navy or by NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) when the radicals at Columbia University, for instance, were agitating to throw out the local Naval Reserve Officers Training program.

The biographies of Comdr. Young and Comdr. Cernan ought to be rubbed in the faces of the college faculty members who have bowed to the demands of the SDS. The face-saving argument heard at Harvard and at Yale and at Stanford is that ROTC courses lack "intellectual content." This is a fine thing to be bringing up at this point in the history of American university course substance.

You can study hotel management at Cornell (and I'm not against it), you can get credit for a course in fly-casting at some of the middle western universities, you can turn innumerable courses in so-called sociology into a year's participation in totally unscientific bull sessions. If this sort of thing gets the blessing of the SDS, there is absolutely no argument against the "intellectual content" of ROTC even when it doesn't give the student any rigorous appreciation of the fine points of Clausewitz on the relations between war and diplomacy.

Congress is so angry that it is cracking down on giving federal money for scholarship grants to campus rioters. At the rate we are going it will be doing any boy or girl a favor if we make it impossible for him (or her) to attend college. The boy or girl of the future will get more "intellectual content" just by avoiding certain of the learned ones of our college faculties who don't seem to know that there is such a thing as the law of trespass, or the law of assault and battery.

AN EDUCATOR SUPPORTS ROTC

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have read and heard reports about violence and demonstrations on campuses throughout the Nation protesting our military Reserve officers training programs. In many instances, college officials have been timid in their support of ROTC as a means of preserving the citizen-soldier program as the mainstay of our national defense posture. Today I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks on ROTC of a respected and honored educator, Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., president of the University of Connecticut:

It is a great pleasure to welcome you to these ceremonies recognizing the accomplishments of cadet members of the University's Reserve Officer Training Programs. I take pleasure in commending those who are to be honored here this evening, and in thanking those who sponsor the awards themselves. And I would compliment also the officers and men who staff the Army and Air Force Reserve Officer Programs; they are in my judgment a credit to their services, and a great asset to the University community.

R.O.T.C. is under attack on many college campuses across the Nation. At the University of Connecticut, such attack has been scattered and localized, but the issue has, in fact, been joined. Arguments will, predictably, range all the way from the need for improvements to demands for its abolition. And we do not know fully, at this time, what the consensus is within our student, alumni and faculty bodies. But there is no reason for you to be in doubt with regard to the views of the President of the University. I am for R.O.T.C.

I know of no human institution—R.O.T.C. included—that cannot stand improvement. And there is every reason to believe that officials of the Department of Defense are quite prepared to accommodate legitimate institutional recommendations for change in the program. And I am confident we will see many such changes in the next few years. These changes will, appropriately, vary from campus to campus.

But these changes at the University of Connecticut, at least, will strengthen, not weaken the R.O.T.C. as a means of preserving the citizen-soldier as a mainstay of our Nation's defense structure.

The University of Connecticut is dedicated, by both its Federal and its State charters, to the provision of instruction in military science and tactics. The University of Connecticut has a proud tradition of preparing citizen-soldiers for service to their Nation in both peace and war. Those charters and that tradition have my respect and support, and I intend to lend my personal and official efforts to their preservation.

SAVE THE SPECIAL DELIVERY SERVICE

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I will today introduce a bill that will preserve a vital postal service, the special delivery service. I understand the desire on the part of the new team in the Post Office De-

partment to eliminate postal services that are not revenue producing. The special delivery service, because of the nature of the service, cannot reach a break-even point.

Postmaster General Blount has decided to raise special delivery rates and cut the number of deliveries a day. This will bring in increased revenue but will reduce a vital service.

The special delivery service is vital because in our crowded urban cities, especially on the eastern seaboard, the last mile of a mail delivery is the most difficult. There is a need for a service that can provide speed for letters, that serves a middle ground between telegrams and regular mail.

This bill will set a floor under special delivery service so that it cannot be reduced any further and the public will continue to receive the same service. I think otherwise the pattern that is becoming apparent will continue; that is, of raising postal rates and reducing services.

This is also an example of the need for constant congressional intervention where a vital public service is concerned. If we ever have a postal corporation, the raising of rates and the lowering of service standards will continue on non-money-making postal routes. The only guide for Congress as to what a postal corporation will be like is to examine examples of management decisions before the corporation takes effect. Once a corporation becomes a matter of law, nonpaying services will be reduced with ease. I think rural Congressmen should watch our hearings very closely before they take a stand on the postal corporation, since in economy drives in the postal service the first areas hit are rural areas, and I cite the example of the threatened cutback in rural service by Postmaster General Watson last fall during an economy drive. Rural areas do not have the population to provide the revenue necessary to balance the postal budget.

I ask the Postmaster General, and I will send him a letter to this effect, to delay his plan of drastically reducing special delivery service by July 1 until my subcommittee and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has the opportunity to thoroughly examine the question.

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY, JUNE 4, 1969

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the decennial graduation of officers from the U.S. Air Force Academy. America takes great pride in her fighting men, and in particular the men upon whom the great burdens of decision must rest. Today, 670 young men will assume these burdens as commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force. We wish them well.

In an address to the graduating class and the Academy, the President of the

United States in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, offered a nine-point credo for the "defenders" of our Nation. I interpret this word to mean all Americans, civilian as well as military, who are committed to the defense of the principles which have fortified this great Nation of ours, and indeed, the free world, through many trials and tribulations.

I would like to share this nine-point credo with my fellow "defenders" here in Congress and throughout the Nation:

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY, JUNE 4, 1969

I believe that we must balance our need for survival as a nation with our need for survival as a people. Americans, soldiers and civilians, must remember that defense is not an end in itself—it is a way of holding fast to the deepest values known to civilized man.

I believe that our defense establishment will remain the servant of our national policy of bringing about peace in this world, and that those in any way connected with the military must scrupulously avoid even the appearance of becoming the master of that policy.

I believe that every man in uniform is a citizen first and a serviceman second, and that we must resist any attempt to isolate or separate the defenders from the defended. In this regard, those who agitate for the removal of the ROTC from college campuses only contribute to an unwanted militarism.

I believe that the basis for decisions on defense spending must be "what do we need for our security" and not "what will this mean for business and employment." The Defense Department must never be considered a modern-day WPA: There are far better ways for government to help insure a sound prosperity and high employment.

I believe that moderation has a moral significance only in those who have another choice. The weak can only plead. Magnanimity and restraint gain moral meaning coming from the strong.

I believe that defense decisions must be made on the hard realities of the offensive capabilities of our adversaries, and not on our fervent hopes about their intentions. With Thomas Jefferson, we can prefer "the flatteries of hope" to the gloom of despair, but we cannot survive in the real world if we plan our defense in a dream world.

I believe we must take risks for peace—but calculated risks, not foolish risks. We shall not trade our defenses for a disarming smile or honeyed words. We are prepared for new initiatives in the control of arms, in the context of other specific moves to reduce tensions around the world.

I believe that America is not about to become a Garrison State, or a Welfare State, or a Police State—because we will defend our values from those forces, external or internal, that would challenge or erode them.

And I believe this above all: That this nation shall continue to be a source of world leadership and a source of freedom's strength, in creating a just world order that will bring an end to war.

THE VOTING AGE SHOULD BE LOWERED TO 18

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the youth today are seeking participation and involvement in our society and govern-

mental process. However, few avenues are open through which they can make meaningful contributions to the improvements of our Nation.

I am reintroducing a bill proposing an amendment to the Constitution granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

Lowering the voting age to 18 would strengthen the fabric of our democratic society. We have told our young people that they may participate in war, but not in their Government. I strongly urge my colleagues to help prepare for the leadership of tomorrow by investing in the youth of today. Robert Kennedy had this to say about the youth of today and their role vis-a-vis the Federal Government:

We may find some of their ideas impractical, some of their views overdrawn. Still, there is no question of their energy, of their ability, above all of their honest commitment to a better and more decent world for all of us. It is for us now to make the effort, to take their causes as our causes, and to enlist them in our own to lend to their vision and daring the insight and wisdom of our experience.

I believe that the time has come to do everything possible to enlist young people into our Government. They need our experience and we their youth, vigor, and vision. We can sustain with them a mutually beneficial contact which will attempt to bridge the generation gap and provide for responsible and responsive leadership for tomorrow. I implore the Congress to act. Let us provide for those talented young men and women who want to sincerely participate in and contribute to the workings of our Government.

Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have supported a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age. I feel that the hour in history has arrived to replace action with words, to replace spectators with participants. This amendment should be enacted to insure a future America blessed with the idealism, enthusiasm, and imagination of youth, tempered and commonsense of experience.

RICKOVER VIEWS ON ARMS DEBATE MERIT ATTENTION

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD today an article by James Kilpatrick which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, June 3, 1969. The article is entitled "Rickover Views on Arms Debate Merit Attention," and it contains excerpts from a letter from Adm. H. G. Rickover to Senator JOHN PASTORE concerning the military needs of this Nation at the present time. The article follows:

RICKOVER VIEWS ON ARMS DEBATE MERIT
ATTENTION

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Several weeks ago, Sen. John O. Pastore wrote to Adm. H. G. Rickover. The senator

asked for the admiral's views on where the nation is going and what needs to be done in a military way at a time of national debate on preparedness.

Rickover responded with a letter that merits the widest possible reading. Let me give him the floor:

"The first point I would like to make," Rickover wrote, "is that in judging between conflicting views on this matter, the deciding factor must be their relevance to the world as it is, not as we would wish it to be. Granted the hideousness of modern war, can we deduce therefrom that mankind is now wise enough to forego recourse to arms? A look at history should put us on guard against those who claim that humanity has now reached a state where the possibility of armed aggression can be safely disregarded in formulating national policy.

"I am reminded of the intense opposition to the Navy's 15-cruiser bill in 1929. It was argued by many that with the signing of the Kellogg Peace Pact the year before, it was no longer necessary to build new warships. And this in light of the lessons of World War I which erupted despite the various Hague Peace Treaties! These ships were of inestimable value in helping us to win World War II. The war itself was prolonged because the Congress—heeding the 'merchants of death' argument—in 1939 prohibited shipment of war materials to Britain and France.

"Then, too, weight must be given to the credentials of those propounding opposite views. Are they public servants, charged with the awesome responsibility to secure our country against foreign conquest? Or are they private individuals not accountable for the consequences of their opinions, who feel free to express their personal abhorrence of war and to agitate for a reduction of the financial burden military preparedness imposes on the taxpayer?

"Would the majority of the electorate accept their argument that, given our unmet domestic needs, we cannot afford an effective defense position vis-a-vis our potential adversaries? Or that war is so horrible that it is better to suffer defeat than to fight?

"As for the high cost of preparedness, it is in fact no greater proportional to total U.S. output than 10 years ago—8.8 percent of total U.S. goods and services. Omitting the costs of the Vietnam war, and allowing for inflation, our armed forces have less buying power today than a decade ago.

"In the Soviet Union, on the other hand—according to the annual report of the congressional subcommittee on foreign economic policy issued last June—resources have been diverted from the farm sector to defense, where outlays rose dramatically in 1966-67, after remaining static since 1962. . . .

"If history teaches anything, it is surely that weakness invites attack; that it takes but one aggressor to plunge the world into war against the wishes of dozens of peace-loving nations if the former is militarily strong and the latter are not. . . .

"As a lawyer, you are familiar with Blackstone's statement that security of the person is the first, and liberty of the individual the second 'absolute right inherent in every Englishman.' Just so, the first right of every American is to be protected against foreign attack, and the first duty of government is to keep our nation alive. Given the world situation, this calls for maintenance of a defense capability which is adequate to discourage potential aggressors. . . .

"There can surely be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to relinquishment of our defense capability, recognizing full well that there will then be no one left to prevent the takeover by Communist power. Whether one takes the optimistic view that a permanent East-West detente can be negotiated, or the pessimistic view that ultimately we shall have to fight for our liberties, this nation has no future if it allows itself to be out-matched militarily."

TRUMAN WARD

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is not one among us who cannot say as Members of the House, "Truman Ward has been here ever since I can remember." Regardless of our own longevity—the success some of us have had in persuading voters to return us again and again to Congress—none of us has out-served Truman Ward. I do not mean merely in terms of time, either. This unfailingly courtly gentleman was not only a master of his craft which enabled us all to communicate with the citizens we represent, but unswerving in his devotion to the best interests of the House of Representatives. He served these interests by freely sharing the vast store of knowledge he had gained over the years with all who crossed his path, whether as Members of the House, as staffers, as caretakers or custodians or casual passers-by. He shared not only knowledge, but his pride in this institution known as the House of Representatives. His death leaves a void which probably can never really be filled because truly, he has "out-served" us all.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD my current Washington Report which will be sent to my constituents this week. Some of the subjects discussed in this newsletter are of national importance.

My colleagues may be interested in incorporating these items into their own reports to their constituents.

The text follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN
HASTINGS KEITH, 12TH DISTRICT, MASSACHUSETTS, JUNE 1969

TEN YEARS IN CONGRESS AND BUSIER THAN
EVER

DEAR FRIENDS: When I came to Washington in 1959, our nation was at peace at home and abroad. My constituent mail centered on the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore and the crisis in the cranberry industry. But the intervening years have bred a litter of extraordinary problems: violence at home and abroad; a skyrocketing cost of living; unprecedented pollution of our environment—and a host of others!! Accordingly, my job has changed—whereas my predecessor had a staff of 4, mine numbers 12, some of them specializing in the complicated work of the Committees on which I serve.

SOME IMPORTANT ISSUES ON WHICH WE ARE
AT WORK

Merchant marine: While our merchant fleet has been encountering heavy seas and fog in recent years, the Russians have been building 10 times as many vessels as the U.S. Newly appointed Maritime Administrator, Andrew Gibson, graduate of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, is the most knowl-

edgeable official to hold that post in more than a decade. Congress awaits his plans for improvement of the Merchant Marine so that we can again be a prime competitor in shipping American goods to world markets.

Consumer protection: Recently, Congress has enacted a host of consumer protection measures—the Wholesome Meat Act and a Poultry Inspection bill among the foremost.

Last winter, I travelled to Norway and Portugal to see how they operate their fish inspection programs. The trip provided a good basis for my own recently introduced bill calling for mandatory fish inspection.

New Bedford, always tops in quality seafood, should be aided by this legislation as competing ports have to meet our high quality standards.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, 1890-1969

General Eisenhower's death brought back memories of my war-time service as a Major on his staff . . . Some have said: "He was this Century's finest Soldier-Statesman." To this I would add, that much of the peace and the stability which we have enjoyed in recent years we owe, in large measure, to him.

Oil pollution: The voices of irate Cape Codders, joined by Californians also threatened by oil pollution, are now being heard. If the Senate concurs with the already-passed House bill on this subject, Secretary Hickel will have the ability to stop further oil drilling in areas like the Santa Barbara Channel and Georges Bank. The Coast Guard will have the authority to prevent the messes like that of the Torrey Canyon disaster.

The haddock shortage on Georges Bank is so serious that it has brought together, in an attempt to find a solution, the divergent segments of the American fishing industry, as well as our foreign competitors. The problem of conservation of fishing resources will be high on the agenda of an international conference slated to get underway in Warsaw very shortly.

Endangered species: Is the alligator to meet the same fate as the heath-hen and the passenger pigeon? Not if our endangered species bill is enacted. For several years Congress has been listening to testimony from concerned nature-lovers. At last we have legislation which will take the profit out of poaching.

The ABM has been a cause of much concern in the past few months. The Administration maintains that we must have this anti-missile in order to protect our "second-strike" missiles from a Russian first-strike. Opponents of the system call it a "Magenot Line in the Sky" and question the Pentagon's assessment of the Russian threat.

An increasingly skeptical Congress, which has watched many cases of wasteful defense spending brought to light in the past few months, will be grappling with this all-important issue in the upcoming weeks.

Oil import quotas: I have joined with other Massachusetts Congressmen in filing legislation to gradually eliminate the quotas on imported oil. Our domestic oil industry doesn't need the quota system which has enabled it to reap great profits at the expense of New Englanders. If Congress acts favorably on our bill, savings for the consumer could amount to \$7 billion.

Campus unrest and its causes: College campuses during the past year have been marked by increased unrest. Many people—in and out of the Congress—are calling for a "crackdown" on "troublemakers," and a shutoff of Federal funds to violence-plagued colleges.

I believe, as President Plimpton of Amherst College said in a recent letter to President Nixon, that turmoil among young people and among those who are dedicated to humane and reasoned changes will continue until the Congress and the Nation tackle more effectively the major social problems of our country.

Part of this turmoil comes from the distance separating the "American Dream from the American Reality." Educational institutions are rightly dedicated to inquiry into basic problems and have opened students' eyes to the shoddiness of many aspects of our society.

However, protest which ignores the rights of the majority and which resorts to violence and the destruction of property, crosses the boundary between reform and revolt. It cannot be tolerated.

Outside forces should not have to be involved in our college difficulties. The best prospect for a resolution of the problems lies within the universities themselves. Enlightened leadership from officials like President Plimpton, and a reasoned response from truly concerned students are our best hopes for putting an end to violence on the campus.

ODDS 'N ENDS

My daughters, Carolyn, and Helen Brink, recently attended Tricia Nixon's masked ball at The White House . . . Carrie graduates from Smith this month—in September she'll be teaching in a ghetto area.

Helen's husband, Rusty, begins active duty with the Army in July . . . The Post Office Department is considering issuing a special commemorative stamp honoring the 350th Anniversary of the Pilgrims' landing at Plymouth. We now have a new Washington office: 2344 Rayburn House Office Building. Come in for cranberry juice!

Sincerely,

HASTINGS KEITH,
Member of Congress.

COPPER EXPORT QUOTAS NEED
REEVALUATION BY U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF COMMERCE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the international demand for copper and the resultant higher prices for this commodity outside of the United States, a major problem has been created in the United States relative to critical shortages that have been created due to the large amounts of exports. One plant in my district produces 11 percent of the U.S. copper supply—the United States Metal Refining Co. at Carteret, N.J.

The study that is subsequently set forth reveals these results:

First. Effective export control makes more scrap available to domestic consumers and insures greater employment in U.S. plants.

Second. Effective export control acts as a brake on inflationary prices.

Third. Effective export control makes more copper available to domestic industry.

In addition, this study calls for the U.S. Department of Commerce to re-evaluate its "export control program." Restoration of the original quota of 33,000 tons from the 50,000 quota is called for. The effects of this reduction are expected to relieve some of the dire shortages that are now confronting the industry and also attempt to reduce the inflationary pressure on the market.

Due to the impact that this problem may have in many other Members con-

gressional districts, I am herewith making it available for their information.

Correspondence and data relative to the impact of this problem follow:

UNITED STATES METALS REFINING Co.,
New York, N.Y., May 28, 1969.

HON. EDWARD PATTEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATTEN: United States Metals Refining Company, a subsidiary of American Metal Climax, Inc., operates at Carteret, New Jersey, a major copper smelter and refinery, employing 1800 people. This plant produces approximately 11% of the U.S. copper supply. As members of an industry-wide committee representing custom smelters and brass and bronze ingot makers, we visited the Department of Commerce on May 27th in an effort to roll-back the export quota of copper and copper-base alloyed scrap—our main source of raw material. A copy of the Committee's letter dated May 23rd is attached for your information.

You will recall that during October 1968, we visited you in conjunction with members of the U.S. Steel Workers of America, who represent our employees, in connection with the export of scrap. Through your efforts the Department of Commerce curtailed the flow of scrap to Canada effective 1st of January 1969. This action has been extremely helpful.

The attached letter presents information showing there is an increased demand from domestic consumers for scrap supplies and a further aid in providing sufficient raw material for the custom smelting industry, as well as the ingot makers, is required. Any assistance you can give us in obtaining a rollback in the export quotas will be deeply appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

MELVIN KRIEDEL,
Vice President.

SECONDARY METAL INSTITUTE,
New York, N.Y., May 23, 1969.

Mr. F. D. HOCKERSMITH,
Acting Administrator, Business and Defense
Services Administration, Department of
Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOCKERSMITH: As the Department of Commerce prepares to review the export quota program for copper scrap and copper-base alloy scrap for the second half of 1969, we should like to point out that consumers of these grades of scrap in the United States are facing critical shortages of materials and that inflationary price levels have resulted from such shortages.

The demand for copper scrap and copper-base alloy scrap is worldwide and the scarcity creates inordinate hardships for domestic consumers, such as copper refineries, secondary smelters, brass and bronze ingot manufacturers, foundries, etc. One result has been the abnormal competition among the domestic consumers for the scrap tonnage available after exports of scrap, and this in itself has caused a disturbance in the flow of scrap through normal and traditional channels.

The demand for both virgin copper and for scrap has become so sharp that not a day passes without some comment on this in the daily newspapers. On May 8, in the American Metal Market, Copper Range president James Boyd was quoted as saying: "Despite the attempt by the Government to slow down the boom, copper—at least virgin copper—remains in short supply and we expect it to remain so throughout the year".

In the same issue, the well known U.K. firm of Phillip & Lion, was quoted as follows: "The U.S. scrap shortage has been endemic ever since the refiners absorbed large tonnages after the end of the U.S. strike last

year and rushed to turn it into refined material in order to assuage the serious shortage of electro created by the strike. There is no reason to suppose that the scrap shortage is diminishing to any large extent . . ."

These reports have been echoed daily by other experts and authorities in the field. One only has to analyze the price pattern in copper scrap to see clearly how the supply squeeze has been contributing to the inflationary pressure on the U.S. economy.

As of May 20, the published price of No. 2 copper scrap was 48¢, or approximately 5¢ over the price quoted at the beginning of the year. But—and this must be remembered—the published scrap price had already declined about 4½¢ a lb. from its 1969 high, which very recently was about 10¢ over the price at the start of the year.

About a year ago (June 25, 1968) the Department of Commerce broadened the existing quotas for copper scrap and copper-base alloy scrap, from 33,000 tons per annum to 50,000 tons per annum. Our committee, in its memorandum of May 27, 1968, warned that the copper market was in a precarious position and that any increase in export quotas would have a harmful effect on the domestic market. What we warned about did, in fact, happen.

Here is a brief comparison of prices last June when the Department of Commerce permitted the scrap quota to be increased and as of today, one year after that increase—prices based on American Metal Market.

June 25, 1968: IME cash copper, L 475 (50.50 cents); U.S. producers, 42 cents; No. 2 copper scrap, 36 cents.

May 20, 1969: IME cash copper, L 604 (64.40 cents); U.S. producers, 48-50 cents; No. 2 copper scrap, 48 cents.

For some time now, the IME copper prices have been recognized as the highest in the Free World. Based on this market for copper, the foreign demand for U.S. scrap has first priority and is limited to the amount of the export quota. The remaining amount of scrap is sold to domestic consumers.

We firmly believe that the additional 17,000 tons which were permitted to be exported—plus the unknown quantities of ex-quota scrap which have been shipped—have had the specific effect of contributing to the shortages that now exist in the United States and have also added to the inflationary aspect of the market by putting sharper pressure on prices of scrap supplies.

It should be clearly remembered that the United States is a net importer of copper and that for every pound of copper contained in scrap which is exported, we have to import a pound of additionally finished copper. Since the price of finished copper is commensurately higher than that of copper contained in scrap, this exchange leads to a drain of dollars and aggravates the U.S. balance of payments.

Only through an effective export control program can the U.S. Government reduce the domestic scarcity of scrap and keep a rein on inflationary price levels.

The effectiveness of export controls on scrap can be clearly illustrated in Tables I & II: (Statistics: U.S. Bureau of Census)

TABLE I.—EXPORTS OF COPPER SCRAP

[In tons]			
Destination	Unalloyed	Alloyed	Total
October to December of 1968:			
Total	7,890	15,074	22,964
Canada	7,058	4,773	11,831
All other	832	10,301	11,133
January to March of 1969:			
Total	1,917	12,091	14,008
Canada	1,349	1,181	2,530
All other	568	10,910	11,478

What stands out strikingly in Table I is the fact that when the Department of Commerce imposed export quotas for Canada—it reduced exports to Canada by 9,300 tons but—it left the amount of exports to other destinations virtually unchanged.

TABLE II.—SUPPLY OF COPPER SCRAP

[In tons]			
	Copper scrap purchases by copper refiners	Total exports of unalloyed copper scrap ¹	Total supply
1969	90,384	2,556	92,940
1968	66,122	14,429	80,551
1967	87,903	2,394	90,297
1966	84,301	9,717	94,018
1965	75,015	15,860	90,875
1964	69,305	6,589	75,894
1963	61,949	3,489	65,438

¹ For the period January to April.
² Projected.
Statistics: U.S. Copper Association and U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Table II shows that during the January-April 1969 period, purchases of copper scrap by copper refiners hit an all-time high. We have listed such purchases over a seven year period, also showing exports of unalloyed copper scrap and the total supply. It would seem obvious that the reduced exports in 1969 (as a result of the imposed Canadian quota) resulted in heavier purchases by copper refiners. The imposition of quotas to Canada has proven to be most helpful to U.S. consumers of scrap.

We draw the following results from our studies:

1. Effective export control makes more scrap available to domestic consumers and insures greater employment in U.S. plants.
2. Effective export control acts as a brake on inflationary prices.
3. Effective export control makes more copper available to domestic industry.

The outlook for copper supply (both virgin and scrap) is not encouraging. With insufficient refined copper available, competition for scrap supplies will become even keener. There are several factors which should be considered in analyzing the future scrap supply:

1. Since last year, there has been additional pressure on the available supply by the entrance into the purchasing picture of a large copper company. There has also been revived buying by other consumers who were not as heavily in the market previously.

2. It is also apparent that the domestic refineries are expanding their operations and require larger tonnages of scrap to fill their capacity. Many of these domestic refineries have open capacity and could use additional tonnages of scrap but they simply cannot secure sufficient material. In this regard, allowing scrap to be shipped to a foreign country on conversion simply removes that much work from the labor force in the United States. Bear in mind that the labor force in domestic refineries include a large percentage of minority workers.

3. Another factor that is putting heavy pressure on scrap, is the diminishing supply of imported blister material from certain copper-producing countries. Because of rising nationalism in many of these countries, they are either building facilities to refine their own blister, or shipping it elsewhere for higher world prices. As a result, many of the U.S. companies that formerly were dependent upon blister for their furnaces will either have to do without it or will have to replace it with scrap.

Brass and bronze ingot manufacturers are particularly hard hit by the scarcity of scrap and the "serious" competition for supplies available to consumers. Because of the dislocation in the flow of scrap, custom smelters have had to purchase certain grades (such

as yellow brass, for example) which normally move to ingot manufacturers. Ingot-making grades, having a high copper content, are desirable export items and are therefore in short supply domestically. It is reported that inventories at ingot manufacturing establishments are low and that the scramble for available material grows more competitive daily.

If this critical situation continues at its present pace—and we anticipate that it will become even worse—a number of domestic consumers will be faced with decisions to reduce operations and lay off workers in their plants. It will simply be impossible to operate if scrap is not available.

It is therefore urgent that the Department of Commerce re-evaluate its export control program.

We think it was a mistake to have increased the quota last year from 33,000 tons to 50,000 tons.

We now ask that this 50,000 ton quota be revised and that the Department of Commerce reimpose its original quota of 33,000 tons.

We also urge the retention of the present Canadian scrap quota which has proved to be very effective.

We believe that the reduction of 17,000 tons in the quota will help immeasurably in relieving some of the dire shortages which are now plaguing the industry and also help to reduce the inflationary pressure on the market.

Sincerely yours,

BEN KAUFMAN,
Chairman, Copper & Brass Liaison Committee, Secondary Metal Institute, H. Kramer & Co., Chicago & Philadelphia.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

William Bullock—W. J. Bullock, Inc. Fairfield, Ala.

Paul Fine—Federated Metals Division, American Smelting & Refining Co., New York, N.Y.

Theodore Gruen—International Minerals & Metals Corp., New York, N.Y.

Robert Jacobson—Reading Metals Refining Corp., Ft. Lee, N.J.

Melvin Kriegel—American Metal Olimax, Inc., U.S. Metals Refining Division, New York, N.Y.

Ralph Saffer—New England Smelting Works, Inc., West Springfield, Mass.

Milton Schwab—Franklin Smelting & Refining Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

HUNGER IN ILLINOIS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, although there has been much talk about what the Federal Government should do about the problems of hunger in America, there has been all too little action. This body's action in providing full appropriations for existing Federal hunger programs in the recent agriculture appropriations bill was a step in the right direction—but only one step. There remains much to be done both legislatively and administratively before we can boast that there is no longer hunger in our Nation.

One of the resources which remains largely untapped in our fight against hunger and malnutrition in America is the ability of individual States to recognize and react to this pressing need of its citizens. Recently, I was pleased to read the testimony of Rev. Jesse L. Jackson

on this subject before the committee of the whole of the Illinois House of Representatives. Reverend Jackson is a constituent of mine, and leader of the foremost community self-help organization in the city of Chicago—Operation Breadbasket, a part of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Jesse Jackson's testimony contains both an astute analysis of the problems of hunger and poverty and some specific suggestions for State and local action to help solve them. I commend these remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

The testimony referred to follows:

TESTIMONY OF REV. JESSE L. JACKSON

We come before this body to make an appeal concerning the greatest domestic crisis of this century. We face great divisions in this state and in the nation at large. There are divisions between young and old, (which we casually call "the Generation Gap"), divisions between hawks and doves over how we prosecute a war which persecutes a nation of poor people. There are divisions growing out of racial antagonisms which polarize the relationships between blacks and whites in this society. There are divisions between the rich and the poor, the "haves" and the "have-nots." Poverty itself is a form of oppression which threatens man's existence, for men will steal before they will starve. The Book of Proverbs warns us that if a man is given too much, he will deny the Lord, but also that if a man is given too little, he will steal and defame the name of the Lord. (Proverbs 30). It is understandable that those who are malnourished, and who thus might be physically deformed or psychologically impaired by this circumstance, are in a state of destitution, desperation, and despair. It is also understandable that these people might resort to violence for a solution to their problems. However, their leaders must have the vision to see beyond their predicament to the elimination of poverty, which is the root of their dilemma.

For example, on the surface Cairo is racially tense; but underneath, its greatest problem is that hunger and starvation, poverty, unemployment, underemployment, and a seasonal welfare system have driven people into an advanced state of cannibalism. Poor blacks and poor whites have come to feel that the elimination of each other as competitors for basic needs of life is the solution to their problem. We know that the elimination of poverty is the only answer to theirs and the nation's major crisis. As long as the majority of families in Cairo have incomes of under \$3,000 per year, the problem there will not be solved, and may in fact become even more severe.

Last night, as every night, two-thirds of the world went to bed hungry because of maldistribution, poor transportation, and, in some instances, the scourge of war and international crisis. Thus it is understandable though not justifiable that this condition would exist in many parts of the world. In some instances, the lack of agrarian development and technology accounts for the problem. In many instances the topography and eroded and depleted soil is the reason. In other instances the land is over-populated, resulting in under production and consumption beyond the available supply. For instance a nation such as India can elicit a compassionate response to their hunger problem from those who understand the gravity of this cycle of under-production and over-consumption.

America, however, over-produces and under-consumes. We live in a land of surplus at one end, and starvation at the other end. The great problem is the corruption at the level of distribution which reinforces the gap between the over-fed and the under-fed, between the greedy and the needy.

In this nation of 200 million people with a gross national product of over 900 billion dollars, we still have (conservatively) 40 million people listed as "poor," that is with incomes of less than \$3,000 a year for a family of four. This is validated by government research and categorized by hunger committees as malnourished due to insufficient commodities.

But fully 10 million of the 40 million who are included in that 1/5 of the nation listed as destitute, are children with bloated stomachs and brain damage, who resort to eating red dirt, laundry starch, and lead paint. Physicians call this disease *pica* where hunger manifests itself in these abnormal ways.

It is understandable but not justifiable that this would be true in states that are not blessed with fertile soil or where the ecology does not provide but the resources such as rivers and lakes which attract manufacturing industries or firms. However the state of Illinois cannot be judged with the state of Utah, for our soil is fertile, here in Illinois. Moreover, Illinois is the number one agricultural export state in the nation, and the number one manufacturing export state in the nation. According to recent studies, Illinois is the third wealthiest state in the nation. The state possesses some 329 million dollars of earmarked monies in special funds, and a total of 861 million dollars in all earmarked funds. This is money that we choose not to spend or to make available to the general treasury funds.

Our abuse of opportunities to feed the hungry and eliminate poverty in this state is most vividly expressed by the fact that we levy the same taxes for corporations as we do for individuals, thus compelling the poor to pay more. Illinois has the second highest sales tax in the nation, outranked only by the tax levied in Alabama. Moreover since 60% of the state revenues are from sales taxes, the poor bear the burden of providing the major share of state revenues. Illinois likes to compare itself with New York and California in citing its achievements; however if our corporation tax compared to that assessed by New York or California, the burden of the poor would be measurably lightened.

Some 97 million dollars comes into Illinois in subsidy payments to affluent farmers, according to Representative Paul Finley; these payments are made to farmers not to grow food or fiber. Yet the state has not chosen to match a six million dollar grant to conduct a school lunch program. As a result only 14,000 children in Cook County could receive free school lunches, when there are actually some 200,000 poverty families with school-age children in that area. Again, according to the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, there are some 629,000 Illinois households where hunger is a daily reality.

The Governor indicated that this figure is not valid enough for him, but that his own research is not complete on this matter. Thus he has disregarded an official report, but has not chosen to utilize the research or the resources of his own office. His research is not faulty in finding persons to tax or draft for military service. We feel that the research suggested on the part of the Governor is for the most part a farce. It is evident that hunger is not on the Governor's agenda.

Families on welfare are forced to live on welfare budgets which guarantee that they will starve or steal. Reputable physicians state that a balanced diet for a family of four for three meals a day costs \$7.00, using the National Research Council's minimum nutritional standards. The state allots only \$2.17 a day for a family of five. The ceiling on Public Aid deepens the hunger of its recipients. The 125 million dollar reduction proposed by House Speaker Ralph Smith is tantamount to declaring a murderous war on the poor, and represents a commitment to genocide.

We can applaud the Governor's courage as expressed by his request for a state income tax, but we regret and deplore his priorities.

We cannot support the tax bill as it is presently written, for we did not know about it and did not help formulate it; it came from the top down, formulated by the Few for the Few and to victimize the Many. Those representing the poor cannot see the elimination of poverty, nor the forces that create poverty, in the Governor's proposal. We could support the tax proposals, but only on certain conditions:

(1) that the Governor would consider the 629,000 Illinois households who are in poverty and hunger serious enough to declare hunger in this state a disaster. This would mean invoking the man-made disaster act.

(2) That this state recognizes earthquakes, fires, floods, as acts of nature or God, as acts of disaster, the state should also recognize erosion of soil, misuse or improper use of funds and the existence of massive hunger, as man-made disasters. In such man-made disasters, the state would employ all the necessary emergency apparatus, such as emergency food and medical supplies, to cope with the situation.

(3) That a percentage of the income tax sufficient to eliminate hunger would be earmarked for that purpose.

(4) That the state initiate forthright drives to give people vocational training for jobs, and would conduct concerted attacks on those trade unions which lock black and poor people out of the job market.

(5) That the Governor would understand the irreparable psychological damage to the poor and the disinherited created by the suggestion of Representative Ralph Smith that the allotments to sustain them be reduced in this state legislature. We are saying that in this session of the legislature, where Mr. Ogilvie reigns as Governor, not he but the Speaker of the House asked that the monies be reduced from \$47 per month to \$32 per month. This means that the budget for food for poor people is cut from 18¢ to 10¢ a meal. If this was done and he remained silent, the silence would sanctify the cruelty and would be a betrayal of the poor.

Men of justice cannot halt between two opinions when tens of thousands of lives are at stake.

The Governor should challenge Superintendent of Public Instruction Ray Page to use his office to see that the food programs are properly administered and extended to all in need. He should challenge Public Aid Director Harold Swank to request that this session of the legislature enact a hunger tax sufficient to eliminate the malnutrition plaguing 629,000 Illinois households.

The bills presented by Representative Robert Mann and those bills presented by a number of the black legislators deserve greater attention on the part of the Governor as they would provide a constructive approach to the alleviation of the problems of poverty and hunger.

We contend that the very attitude of the public toward the poor and toward welfare must be changed. Why cannot this change begin in the Land of Lincoln. We maintain that those persons on welfare should not be seen as criminals or prisoners, nor as the results of an innate will not to work. Rather the poor must be seen as products or as results of advanced technology. It must be recognized that their years of blood, sweat, tears, cheap labor, and human sacrifice helped to usher in that advanced technology. These years represent an investment that should not be returned marked "Insufficient Funds."

As opposed to "welfare" we should use the term and develop the concept of *human subsidy*. The poor would then not be viewed as prisoners, who have committed some wrong, but would be recognized as the very vanguard of the twentieth century. Let us strike the word "welfare" from the records, remove all reference to the Paupers Act, and subsidize the poor just as we presently subsidize the rich.

In this way we would employ the under-

standing of authentic worship as expressed in Biblical writings of the prophet Micah, the sixth chapter, verses 6 through 8, namely, we will follow his admonition to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God by walking honestly and acting decently before our fellow man.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT STRIKE INTERFERENCE

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, American workers have suffered and are suffering, because their Defense Department and their Armed Services purchase goods from plants where a strike is in progress. The AFL-CIO and its affiliated unions have sharply protested for many years, but to no avail.

The Department claims that "it takes no sides in labor disputes." But its purchases from plants where such disputes exist and where strikebreakers are in action clearly harms workers.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, has faced many problems, because of Defense Department purchases for over a decade. It is currently concerned about large-scale procurement by the Department and its auxiliary units from the Lorenz Neuhoff meatpacking empire.

This strike began at the Frosty Morn Packers in Clarksville, Tenn., and has spread from there. I have repeatedly contacted the Defense Department about its interference with proper collective bargaining processes.

The executive board of the Amalgamated, a 500,000-member union, has voted a strongly worded policy statement to express its views on the Defense Department and armed services actions.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Defense Department will reconsider its procurement policies concerning plants which are involved in a labor dispute. It is high time it did.

I insert the policy statement by the executive board of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, in the RECORD at this point:

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT STRIKEBREAKING

The Defense Department and the Armed Services of the United States often and repeatedly act as strike breakers. They use tax dollars—many of which have been paid by wage earners—for large scale purchases from firms which are being struck by their workers. Many efforts of wage earners to organize or to achieve decent collective bargaining agreements have been defeated because of the willingness of the Defense Department to deal in this dirty business.

It is irrelevant to the Department that the product it is purchasing can be bought from hundreds of other firms which follow enlightened and fair labor policies. It is irrelevant to the Department how bad conditions at the plant are. Department officials arrogantly state that they "do not take sides in labor disputes" and continue the strike-breaking purchases. If a plant can produce with a scab force, the Department of Armed Services will buy.

Dozens of Cases: The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO) has, in more than a decade, called several dozen such situations to the attention of officials of the Defense Department. We have appealed to them to stop the purchases while the strike exists. We have offered to provide alternate suppliers. We have received sometimes polite, sometimes arrogant brushoffs.

Other Unions have had the same experiences. Some of the most viciously anti-labor employers have counted, in the midst of bitter strikes, parts of the Defense Department among their best customers. This occurs when many private firms have taken their business elsewhere.

The appeals of Congressmen and Senators on behalf of the striking workers have also been of no avail. The Department is determined in its anti-labor policy. It repeats endlessly that it "does not take sides in a labor dispute" while making it possible for the employer to battle his workers.

Neuhoff Problem: Currently, units and auxiliary parts of the Armed Services are assisting the Lorenz Neuhoff empire in fighting the efforts of his workers to improve their conditions by organizing into unions. The strikes at the various Lorenz Neuhoff plants are battles against incredibly substandard wages, against 19th Century labor conditions, against fantastically dangerous working conditions. But the Armed Services continue to support Lorenz Neuhoff's efforts to maintain these conditions by buying the products.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO) therefore condemns the Defense Department and the Armed Services for their strike breaking purchases. We hereby label them with the name they have earned—SCAB.

Change Now: We take this action in sadness. For we believe the Department and the Armed Services should represent all of the people of the United States and should be pointed to with pride. We regard it as tragic that they stubbornly adhere to the policy of helping to beat back wage earners.

We urge the President of the United States—the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces—to end the strike breaking evil of the Defense Department. We hope his actions will remove the name of SCAB from the Department.

FIFTH SUMMIT CONFERENCE OF EAST AND CENTRAL AFRICAN STATES

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, two major documents that illuminate the problems of southern Africa deserve the attention of this House. In southern Rhodesia, Ian Smith's regime has just proposed a new constitution that will institutionalize racial separation and insure the continuing political and economic domination of that country's 4.4 million African inhabitants by its 235,000 whites. In April, in Lusaka, Zambia, the leaders of 14 independent African states issued a remarkable manifesto on southern Africa. It rejects black as well as white racism. It calls on the white minority regimes to recognize that all men have equal rights to human dignity and respect and to move toward the gradual emancipation of their black majorities before racial

strife becomes inevitable. I wish to make the text of this manifesto a part of the RECORD of this House. It follows:

MANIFESTO ON SOUTHERN AFRICA

1. When the purpose and the basis of States' International policies are misunderstood, there is introduced into the world a new and unnecessary disharmony, disagreements, conflicts of interest, or different assessments of human priorities, which provoke an excess of tension in the world, and disastrously divide mankind, at a time when united action is necessary to control modern technology and put it to the service of man. It is for this reason that, discovering widespread misapprehension of our attitudes and purposes in relation to Southern Africa, we the leaders of East and Central African States meeting at Lusaka, 16th April, 1969, have agreed to issue this Manifesto.

2. By this Manifesto we wish to make clear, beyond all shadow of doubt, our acceptance of the belief that all men are equal, and have equal rights to human dignity and respect, regardless of color, race, religion, or sex. We believe that all men have the right and the duty to participate, as equal members of the society, in their own government. We do not accept that any individual or group has any right to govern any other group of sane adults, without their consent, and we affirm that only the people of a society, acting together as equals, can determine what is, for them, a good society and a good social, economic, or political organization.

3. On the basis of these beliefs we do not accept that any one group within a society has the right to rule any society without the continuing consent of all the citizens. We recognize that at any one time there will be, within every society, failures in the implementation of these ideals. We recognize that for the sake of order in human affairs, there may be transitional arrangements while a transformation from group inequalities to individual equality is being effected. But we affirm that without an acceptance of these ideals—without a commitment to these principles of human equality and self-determination—there can be no basis for peace and justice in the world.

4. None of us would claim that within our own States we have achieved that perfect social, economic and political organization which would ensure a reasonable standard of living for all our people and establish individual security against avoidable hardship or miscarriage of justice. On the contrary, we acknowledge that within our own States the struggle towards human brotherhood and unchallenged human dignity is only beginning. It is on the basis of our commitment to human equality and human dignity, not on the basis of achieved perfection, that we take our stand of hostility towards the colonialism and racial discrimination which is being practiced in Southern Africa. It is on the basis of their commitment to these universal principles that we appeal to other members of the human race for support.

5. If the commitment to these principles existed among the States holding power in Southern Africa, any disagreements we might have about the rate of implementation, or about isolated acts of policy, would be matters affecting only our individual relationships with the States concerned. If these commitments existed, our States would not be justified in the expressed and active hostility towards the regimes of Southern Africa such as we have proclaimed and continue to propagate.

6. The truth is, however, that in Mozambique, Angola, Rhodesia, South-West Africa, and the Union of South Africa, there is an open and continued denial of the principles of human equality and national self-deter-

mination. This is not a matter of failure in the implementation of accepted human principles. The effective Administration in all these territories are not struggling towards these difficult goals. They are fighting the principles; they are deliberately organising their societies so as to try to destroy the hold of these principles in the minds of men. It is for this reason that we believe the rest of the world must be interested. For the principle of human equality, and all that flows from it, is either universal or it does not exist. The dignity of all men is destroyed when the manhood of any human being is denied.

7. Our objectives in Southern Africa stem from our commitment to this principle of human equality. We are not hostile to the Administrations of these States because they are manned and controlled by white people. We are hostile to them because they are systems of minority control which exist as a result of, and in the pursuance of doctrines of human inequality. What we are working for is the right of self-determination for the people of those territories. We are working for a rule in those countries which is based on the will of all the people, and an acceptance of the equality of every citizen.

8. Our stand towards Southern Africa thus involves a rejection of racialism, not a reversal of the existing racial domination. We believe that all the peoples who have made their homes in the countries of Southern Africa are Africans, regardless of the colour of their skins; and we would oppose a racialist majority government which adopted a philosophy of deliberate and permanent discrimination between its citizens on grounds of racial origin. We are not talking racialism when we reject the colonialism and apartheid policies now operating in those areas; we are demanding an opportunity for all the people of these States, working together as equal individual citizens, to work out for themselves the institutions and the system of government under which they will, by general consent, live together and work together to build a harmonious society.

9. As an aftermath of the present policies it is likely that different groups within these societies will be self-conscious and fearful. The initial political and economic organizations may well take account of these fears, and this group self-consciousness. But how this is to be done must be a matter exclusively for the peoples of the country concerned, working together. No other nation will have a right to interfere in such affairs. All that the rest of the world has a right to demand is just what we are now asserting—that the arrangements within any State which wishes to be accepted into the community of nations must be based on an acceptance of the principles of human dignity and equality.

10. To talk of the liberation of Africa is thus to say two things. First, that the peoples in the territories still under colonial rule shall be free to determine for themselves their own institutions of self-government. Secondly, that the individuals in Southern Africa shall be freed from an environment poisoned by the propaganda of racialism, and given an opportunity to be men—not white men, brown men, yellow men, or black men.

11. Thus the liberation of Africa for which we are struggling does not mean a reverse racialism. Nor is it an aspect of African Imperialism. As far as we are concerned the present boundaries of the States of Southern Africa are the boundaries of what will be free and independent African States. There is no question of our seeking or accepting any alterations to our own boundaries at the expense of these future free African nations.

12. On the objective of liberation as thus defined, we can neither surrender nor compromise. We have always preferred, and we still prefer, to achieve it without physical

violence. We would prefer to negotiate rather than destroy, to talk rather than kill. We do not advocate violence; we advocate an end to the violence against human dignity which is now being perpetrated by the oppressors of Africa. If peaceful progress to emancipation were possible, or if changed circumstances were to make it possible in the future, we would urge our brothers in the resistance movements to use peaceful methods of struggle even at the cost of some compromise on the tiring of change. But while peaceful progress is blocked by actions of those at present in power in the States of Southern Africa, we have no choice but to give to the peoples of those territories all the support of which we are capable in their struggle against their oppressors. This is why the signatory states participate in the movement for the liberation of Africa under the aegis of the Organisation of African Unity. However, the obstacle to change is not the same in all the countries of Southern Africa, and it follows therefore, that the possibility of continuing the struggle through peaceful means varies from one country to another.

13. In Mozambique and Angola, and in so-called Portuguese Guinea, the basic problem is not racialism but a pretence that Portugal exists in Africa. Portugal is situated in Europe; the fact that it is a dictatorship is a matter for the Portuguese to settle. But no decree of the Portuguese dictator, nor legislation passed by any Parliament in Portugal, can make Africa part of Europe. The only thing which could convert a part of Africa into a constituent unit in a union which also includes a European State would be the freely expressed will of the people of that part of Africa. There is no such popular will in the Portuguese colonies. On the contrary, in the absence of any opportunity to negotiate a road to freedom, the peoples of all three territories have taken up arms against the colonial power. They have done this despite the heavy odds against them, and despite the great suffering they know to be involved.

14. Portugal, as a European State, has naturally its own allies in the context of the ideological conflict between West and East. However, in our context, the effect of this is that Portugal is enabled to use her resources to pursue the most heinous war and degradation of man in Africa. The present Manifesto must, therefore, lay bare the fact that the inhuman commitment of Portugal in Africa and her ruthless subjugation of the people of Mozambique, Angola and the so-called Portuguese Guinea, is not only irrelevant to the ideological conflict of power-politics, but it is also diametrically opposed to the politics, the philosophies and the doctrines practised by her Allies in the conduct of their own affairs at home. The peoples of Mozambique, Angola, and Portuguese Guinea are not interested in Communism or Capitalism; they are interested in their freedom. They are demanding an acceptance of the principles of independence on the basis of majority rule, and for many years they called for discussions on this issue. Only when their demand for talks was continually ignored did they begin to fight. Even now, if Portugal should change her policy and accept the principle of self-determination, we would urge the Liberation Movements to desist from their armed struggle and to co-operate in the mechanics of a peaceful transfer of power from Portugal to the peoples of the African territories.

15. The fact that many Portuguese citizens have immigrated to these African countries does not affect this issue. Future immigration policy will be a matter for the independent Governments when these are established. In the meantime, we would urge the Liberation Movements to reiterate their statements that all those Portuguese people who have made their homes in Mozambique, Angola or Portuguese Guinea, and who are willing to give

their future loyalty to those states, will be accepted as citizens. And an independent Mozambique, Angola, or Portuguese Guinea may choose to be as friendly with Portugal as Brazil is. That would be the free choice of a free people.

16. In Rhodesia the situation is different insofar as the metropolitan power has acknowledged the colonial status of the territory. Unfortunately, however, it has failed to take adequate measures to re-assert its authority against the minority which has seized power with the declared intention of maintaining white domination. The matter cannot rest there. Rhodesia, like the rest of Africa, must be free, and its independence must be on the basis of majority rule. If the colonial power is unwilling or unable to effect such a transfer of power to the people, then the people themselves will have no alternative but to capture it as and when they can. And Africa has no alternative but to support them. The question which remains in Rhodesia is therefore whether Britain will re-assert her authority in Rhodesia and then negotiate the peaceful progress to majority rule before independence. Insofar as Britain is willing to make this second commitment, Africa will cooperate in her attempts to re-assert her authority. This is the method of progress which we would prefer; it could involve less suffering for all the people of Rhodesia, both black and white. But until there is some firm evidence that Britain accepts the principles of independence on the basis of majority rule, and is prepared to take whatever steps are necessary to make it a reality, then Africa has no choice but to support the struggle for the people's freedom by whatever means are open.

17. Just as a settlement of the Rhodesian problem with a minimum of violence is a British responsibility, so a settlement in South West Africa with a minimum of violence is a United Nations responsibility. By every canon of international law, and by every precedent, South West Africa should by now have been a sovereign, independent State with a Government based on majority rule. South West Africa was a German colony until 1919, just as Tanganyika, Rwanda and Burundi, Togoland, and Cameroon were German colonies. It was a matter of European politics that when the Mandatory System was established after Germany had been defeated, the administration of South West Africa was given to the white minority Government of South Africa, while the other ex-German colonies in Africa were put into the hands of the British, Belgian, or French Governments. After the Second World War every mandated territory except South West Africa was converted into a Trusteeship Territory and has subsequently gained independence. South Africa, on the other hand, has persistently refused to honour even the international obligation it accepted in 1919, and has increasingly applied to South West Africa the inhuman doctrine and organisation of apartheid.

18. The United Nations General Assembly has ruled against this action and in 1966 terminated the Mandate under which South Africa had a legal basis for its occupation and domination of South West Africa. The General Assembly declared that the territory is now the direct responsibility of the United Nations and set up an ad hoc Committee to recommend practical means by which South West Africa would be administered, and the people enabled to exercise self-determination and to achieve independence.

19. Nothing could be clearer than this decision—which no permanent member of the Security Council voted against. Yet, since that time no effective measures have been taken to enforce it. South West Africa remains in the clutches of the most ruthless minority Government in Africa. Its people continue to be oppressed and those who advocate even peaceful progress to inde-

pendence continue to be persecuted. The world has an obligation to use its strength to enforce the decision which all the countries cooperated in making. If they do this there is hope that the change can be effected without great violence. If they fail, then sooner or later the people of South West Africa will take the law into their own hands. The people have been patient beyond belief, but one day their patience will be exhausted. Africa, at least, will then be unable to deny their call for help.

20. *The Union of South Africa* is itself an independent sovereign State and a Member of the United Nations. It is more highly developed and richer than any other nation in Africa. On every legal basis its internal affairs are a matter exclusively for the people of South Africa. Yet the purpose of law is people and we assert that the actions of the South African Government are such that the rest of the world has a responsibility to take some action in defense of humanity.

21. There is one thing about South African oppression which distinguishes it from other oppressive regimes. The apartheid policy adopted by its Government, and supported to a greater or lesser extent by almost all its white citizens, is based on a rejection of man's humanity. A position of privilege or the experience of oppression in the South African society depends on the one thing which it is beyond the power of any man to change. It depends upon a man's colour, his parentage, and his ancestors. If you are black you cannot escape this categorisation; nor can you escape it if you are white. If you are a black millionaire and a brilliant political scientist, you are still subject to the pass laws and still excluded from political activity. If you are white, even protests against the system and an attempt to reject segregation, will lead you only to the segregation, and the comparative comfort of a white jail. Beliefs, abilities, and behavior are all irrelevant to a man's status; everything depends upon race. Manhood is irrelevant. The whole system of government and society in South Africa is based on the denial of human equality. And the system is maintained by a ruthless denial of the human rights of the majority of the population—and thus, inevitably of all.

22. These things are known and are regularly condemned in the Councils of the United Nations and elsewhere. But it appears that to many countries international law take precedence over humanity; therefore no action follows the words. Yet even if international law is held to exclude active assistance to the South African opponents of apartheid, it does not demand that the comfort and support of human and commercial intercourse should be given to a government which rejects the manhood of most humanity. South Africa should be excluded from the United Nations Agencies, and even from the United Nations itself. It should be ostracised by the world community. It should be isolated from world trade patterns and left to be self-sufficient if it can. The South African Government cannot be allowed both to reject the very concept of mankind's unity, and to benefit by the strength given through friendly international relations. And certainly Africa cannot acquiesce in the maintenance of the present policies against people of African descent.

23. The signatories of this Manifesto assert that the validity of the principles of human equality and dignity extend to the Union of South Africa just as they extend to the colonial territories of Southern Africa. Before a basis for peaceful development can be established in this continent, these principles must be acknowledged by every nation, and in every State there must be a deliberate attempt to implement them.

24. We reaffirm our commitment to these principles of human equality and human dignity, and to the doctrines of self-deter-

mination and non-determination and non-racialism. We shall work for their extension within our own nations and throughout the continent of Africa.

ELIMINATION OF GRADE CROSSINGS

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Railroad Passengers has strongly endorsed Federal assistance to railroads to make hazardous grade crossings in the Northeast Corridor safe. The NARP was formed in 1967 to serve as a spokesman for the Nation's railroad passengers. NARP has urged prompt action on pending legislation, not only for reasons of safety but so that the high-speed trains now operating in the Northeast Corridor can be operated at higher speeds.

There are thousands of my constituents who commute by rail in the Third Congressional District of New Jersey. I have been highly pleased with the work of the National Association of Railroad Passengers, and have high praise for its chairman, Anthony Haswell, and its executive director, Woodruff M. Price, for their fine contribution on behalf of railroad passengers throughout the United States. I think the letter addressed to Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Committee on Public Works, will be of interest to my colleagues and for this reason I am placing the text of the letter in the RECORD:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RAILROAD PASSENGERS,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1969.

Re elimination of grade crossings.
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Roads, House
Committee on Public Works, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The National Association of Railroad Passengers strongly supports legislation now before your Committee to authorize Federal assistance for the elimination of hazardous grade crossings in the Northeast Corridor.

NARP was formed in 1967 to serve as the spokesman for the railroad passenger. Our interest in this legislation is two fold. We are of course concerned with the grave safety hazard posed by these grade crossings, especially in view of the beginning of high speed service between New York-Washington and Boston. Unguarded grade crossings are not only a constant hazard to the motorist, but a potential danger to the passenger train rider, should a high speed train be involved in a crossing accident.

The second reason that NARP supports these bills is that unprotected grade crossings are creating a serious impediment to the efficient operation of high speed trains. This is particularly true on the New Haven portion of the Corridor. The TurboTrain has not been able to operate at its designed speed because of the number of grade crossings on its run. In this regard, we would urge the Subcommittee to approve legislation which will apply to the entire Northeast Corridor, as the greatest number of crossings lie between New York and Boston.

The TurboTrain is one of the best hopes for a solution to the problem of efficient,

profitable inter-city passenger service. But the demonstration now underway will demonstrate nothing unless the TurboTrain can operate at its designed speed. The highly successful Metroliner has demonstrated that by reducing travel time by an hour or an hour and a half, many passengers will be attracted from increasingly crowded highways and airways. At present the TurboTrain because of operating restrictions has only reduced the Boston-New York run by 15 minutes. It is therefore vital that these restrictions be eliminated so that the TurboTrain can prove its worth. It would surely be folly to allow the grade crossing problem to be the Achilles' heel to a government funded demonstration project.

We need not repeat to this Committee which has jurisdiction over money spent to subsidize other forms of transportation, such as trucks, airlines and barges, that the railroad industry has been almost totally ignored in the Federal transportation budget. The modest assistance proposed by this bill will not only lead to safer roads and railroads, but will give the railroad industry some sorely needed assistance.

In conclusion we would urge the Subcommittee to give serious consideration to extending this assistance on a nationwide basis. The grade crossing problem exists everywhere there are railroads, not only in the Northeast Corridor. In 1967, for example, throughout the country 1,632 people were killed and 3,812 were injured. Spending the money to protect these crossings seems a small price to pay in terms of the lives that would be saved and injuries prevented.

We would appreciate if this letter were made part of the permanent hearing record on H.R. 4808, H.R. 8955 and related measures.

Respectfully,

ANTHONY HASWELL,
Chairman.

MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN GLOCESTER, R.I.

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to revise and extend my remarks and to include a copy of a resolution passed by the Rhode Island General Assembly on May 16 entitled "Resolution Memorializing Congress To Establish a National Cemetery in Glocester, R.I."

The resolution follows:

MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN GLOCESTER, R.I.

Whereas, Rhode Island, one of the most densely populated states in the country, has no national burial facilities; and

Whereas, Adequate and proper burial facilities for Rhode Island's honored veterans are badly needed and earnestly desired; and

Whereas, In every other region of the country there are at least for national cemeteries, but in New England there are none; and

Whereas, It is grossly unfair that the New England area which gave birth to this nation and particularly Rhode Island, the first of the original American colonies to formally renounce allegiance to Great Britain, remains without a national cemetery; and

Whereas, The historically rich state of Rhode Island, which has contributed so much to the greatness of this nation, should be permitted a national cemetery within its boundaries; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the general assembly of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations

hereby respectfully requests congress to enact such appropriate legislation to establish a national cemetery in Glocester, Rhode Island so that veterans can be properly laid to rest in a cemetery befitting their service to this country; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in the congress of the United States in the hope that they will give his matter their personal attention.

I, August P. La France, Secretary of State of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, hereby Certify that the foregoing is a true copy of resolution (H. 1860) entitled "Resolution Memorializing Congress to Establish a National Cemetery in Glocester, Rhode Island," taken from the records in this office and compared with the original resolution (H 1860) passed by the General Assembly at the January Session, A.D. 1969 and approved by the Governor on the sixteenth day of May, 1969 and now remaining on file and of record in this office.

In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Rhode Island, this twenty-eighth day of May, anno Domini 1969.

AUGUST P. LA FRANCE,
Secretary of State.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I introduced, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and a bipartisan group of 13 other Members, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act to provide for a program of investment guarantees in Latin American countries to encourage local participation in self-help community development projects.

Our bill, if approved by our colleagues, would authorize U.S. Government guarantees on the repayment of up to 25 percent of loans made by private banks and other institutions in Latin America to groups of campesinos for rural and urban community development projects. The private Latin American banks making the loans would assume the remaining 75 percent of the risk. The loans could be used to finance waterpumps, wells, farm machinery, schoolhouses, short access roads, improved seed, fertilizer, and pesticides, small health centers, sanitation facilities, or whatever other items a community itself feels is important to its development.

Although our proposal would be administered through the Agency for International Development, the loans would go directly to the people. It is hoped that this procedure will provide communities with quick, visible, and practical improvements to assist development. The campesinos involved, because they would repay the loans, would retain their own dignity. The plan would bypass local governments and put funds to use directly—without their being diluted through bureaucracy.

A program similar to the one we are proposing has been administered by the Pan American Development Foundation for the past 2 years. The repayments record of campesinos participating in the foundation's program has been 95 percent on loans involving more than 400 different community projects costing \$700,000.

It is anticipated by Latin American banking officials that the rate of default under our proposal will be less than 5 percent, and will certainly not exceed that figure. If the United States, through the Alliance for Progress program, were willing to risk the loss of \$1 million, we could guarantee \$20 million worth of loan money. If the United States guarantees \$20 million, private Latin American banks have indicated their willingness to add \$60 million, making a total of \$80 million available for loans for community projects. We would therefore get \$80 worth of development for each \$1 potentially lost—which is surely a better rate of return than we normally achieve.

In the foreign aid message sent to the Congress May 28, the President said:

We must enlist the energies of private enterprise, here and abroad, in the cause of economic development. We must do so by stimulating additional investment through businesslike channels, rather than offering ringing exhortations.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more practicable proposal than this one for encouraging the investment of Latin American banks in projects in their own countries. The legislation has the support of officials of the Agency for International Development and the Department of State. It will have the support of the campesinos of Latin America, who must now borrow money at usurious rates, if at all. A number of my colleagues indicated their interest in the growth of democratic institutions in 1966, when they added title IX to the Foreign Assistance Act. Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to their attention and urge its early consideration by this body.

U.S. DISSENTERS ENCOURAGE HANOI

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 3, 1969. The article is entitled "U.S. Dissenters Encourage Hanoi," and points out the way North Vietnam is exploiting the criticism, being expressed by certain prominent Americans, of the President's policies in Vietnam. I believe that this article deserves wide attention.

The article follows:

U.S. DISSENTERS ENCOURAGE HANOI

(By David Lawrence)

The war in Vietnam is being prolonged and peace talks in Paris are not making progress. The North Vietnamese, aided and

supported by the Soviet and Chinese Communists, are determined to make no concessions of importance. They insist upon the abject withdrawal of American troops from Southeast Asia.

The persons responsible for the weakening of the position of the American government at the negotiating table are here in the United States. Some of them are Communists who help to instigate riots and disturbances in many countries. Some of them are misguided individuals in the colleges who are opposed to the war in Vietnam. Some of them are members of Congress who are attacking their own Government in the midst of war—an unprecedented instance of what would have been regarded as disloyalty during past wars.

Dissension within the United States has been one of the biggest benefits to the Communist cause. An example of how much America is being damaged by internal criticism is to be found in a broadcast made at 8 o'clock yesterday morning over CBS radio by Bernard Kalb from Hong Kong. He said:

"North Vietnam is exploiting Senator Kennedy's recent criticism of President Nixon's policies on Vietnam. Interestingly, the senator's remarks were featured today in several Vietnamese language news broadcasts—that is, broadcasts for domestic consumption—indicating that Hanoi believed that this criticism of Washington's policy would boost or strengthen North Vietnamese morale.

"In its broadcast, Radio Hanoi maintained that—and this is a quote—'Statements by U.S. senate leaders show that progressive Americans resolutely oppose the Nixon policy of supporting the traitor administration of Nguyen Van Thieu.' Thieu is president of South Vietnam.

"The Hanoi broadcast named Senators Kennedy, Mansfield, Javits and Mondale, but they concentrated on the remarks made by Senator Kennedy.

"Radio Hanoi quoted the Massachusetts senator as sharply criticizing the Saigon regime. About two weeks ago, Senator Kennedy spoke out for the first time in the Senate against the Nixon administration's Vietnam policy, charging that military action such as the recent battle for Hamburger Hill were both senseless and irresponsible."

President Thieu of South Vietnam is convinced that, even if the Communists accept some form of peace settlement at Paris, they will be doing so just to obtain the withdrawal of allied forces. He made a speech to that effect on his visit to South Korea a few days ago. He said:

"Afterward, as they have done so often in the past, they can violate again the agreement and reinfiltre their troops to renew and reactivate the war while the machinery for allied troops to intervene again will be much more cumbersome."

Secretary of State William P. Rogers, who has been traveling throughout Southeast Asia, has talked frankly with friendly governments who have expressed privately their fears about our policy. The belief is growing that the dissenters inside America will influence future decisions and that a bigger war in Asia may come within a few years if the United States pulls out now and there is no firm guarantee that Communist aggression will cease.

The prospect of obtaining national unity has recently been dimmed by speeches in Congress criticizing military strategy and otherwise belittling the military command. This is something that encourages our adversaries to believe that the disunity in America must inevitably result in the equivalent of surrender.

There has been some quibbling about the fact that no actual declaration of war has ever been made with respect to Vietnam. But the truth is that Congress not only has by joint resolution authorized the use of American military forces in Southeast Asia, but has appropriated funds regularly to carry

on the Vietnam war. There was no declaration of war when the United States entered the Korean war under the auspices of the United Nations, and Congress had ample opportunity then, as it has today, to pass a resolution opposing the continuance of the war.

The United States is engaged in a war involving more than a half-million men in the armed services, but is being harmed by the discord at home. In fact, the casualties have increased and the war has been lengthened due to the belief of the enemy that America is full of dissatisfaction and will eventually accept "peace at any price" and order its forces to come home.

CONGRESS MUST SET GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE REDISTRICTING

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group of New York Members of the House joined me Tuesday in sponsoring legislation to establish guidelines for future congressional redistricting.

No guidelines exist in law now and it has become essential that Congress act in the light of the many harassing court challenges which have resulted from the original one-man, one-vote ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Our proposal is to set a leeway for each district of 2½ percent in population above or below the mean average for the districts in a State. In New York State, for example, the mean average for the 41 districts under the 1960 decennial census was 409,324.

As the court decisions stand today, new congressional districts must have zero variance from the mean average. This is ridiculous and completely unrealistic, yet this is the way the court decisions have left the situation in the absence of legislative directive.

If the States are to avoid endless harassment after the redistricting upon the basis of the 1970 decennial census, it is mandatory that Congress enact legislation to install reasonable guidelines in law.

It is not the job of the court to set the guidelines, it is the job of the Congress. The endless court challenges which have faced New York and other States in the past several years make indelibly clear the necessity for putting specific guidelines into law.

It should be noted that the courts seem to be attributing greater validity to census data than is the Census Bureau itself.

The Census Bureau itself acknowledges that its population headcount in 1950 and 1960 was only 97 percent accurate.

What is more, today's extremely mobile population makes census figures outdated before they are compiled. Thus the Court's zero-target—or as the Court says: "absolute equality"—is actually unattainable across the board.

Setting a 2½-percent variation allowance is within the range of census data accuracy and will permit the States to have slight leeway that can avoid much disruption to normal geographic lines.

The Supreme Court's ruling in April this year has forced the State to begin preparations for another million-dollar congressional reapportionment of the State for the 1970 election.

The Court ruled that the State's 1968 redistricting did not meet the Court's zero-variance interpretation, although the redistricting plan was approved at the time by a lower Federal court.

Our bill also includes a section aimed at avoiding the necessity for another redistricting in New York in advance of the 1970 decennial census.

It provides that any State whose present districts in Congress are within 10 percent of the average shall be considered the districts for the November 1970 election. New York meets this criteria with a variance of about 6 percent each way.

I recognize that for New York to avoid the new redistricting for the 1970 election, even under the provision of this bill, New York would have to ask the Supreme Court to set aside its earlier ruling in the light of the legislation.

Whether the Court would agree remains to be seen, but I believe the effort should be made since the special redistricting will cost the State about a million dollars and will be done on the ridiculous basis of census data that are nearly 10 years old.

New York State will need to redistrict again on the basis of the 1970 census because the State is expected to lose one or more districts under national reapportionment.

The most important job for Congress—and the sooner the better—is to put specific guidelines in law so that New York and other States will know exactly in their 1971 redistricting what is the maximum variance from the State average.

Cosponsors of the bill with me include: MESSRS. ADDABBO, BIAGGI, BINGHAM, BUTTON, FARBSTEIN, HALPERN, HANLEY, HASTINGS, HORTON, KING, McEWEN, OTTINGER, PIKE, POWELL, STRATTON, and WOLFF, all of New York.

SECRET DIPLOMACY—THE ENEMY'S ADVANTAGE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in his Public Affairs Bulletin—6157 Kellogg Drive, McLean, Va. 22101—Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S.A.F., retired, presents a most enlightening view of secretly negotiated international agreements and reminds us that this type of defeatist diplomacy, inconsistent with American principles, can only serve as another weapon for the enemy in pursuing the ultimate downfall of these United States.

I include General Lane's June 10 Public Affairs Bulletin in the RECORD:

U.S. GOVERNMENT DISTRUSTS THE PEOPLE

WASHINGTON.—Years ago, in revulsion against the Yalta and other agreements negotiated by a sick President, the American people clamored for "open covenants openly arrived at". The people felt that their repre-

sentatives should stand forthrightly for what was honorable and reasonable, that secret agreements could only be damaging to their interest.

Today our President says that open diplomacy is not practicable. Our diplomats have persuaded him that progress can be made only in secret negotiations. In recent decades, some practical adjustments of interest have been reached with the Soviet Union through such talks.

The error in this resort to secret diplomacy is that we accept the Soviet standard of international conduct. We negotiate secretly while they revile us publicly. It is demeaning to engage in such talks at all.

When diplomacy had higher standards of objectivity, friends and enemies were recognized and treated accordingly. Enemies were opposed until they changed their attitudes. It would have been dishonest to pretend to your own people that an enemy harbored no evil designs against you.

Why does the United States bow to Soviet diplomacy which makes a mockery of our principles? We say we are not interested in words, only in deeds. But Soviet leaders know the importance of words in shaping the minds of men. If the Soviet Union insists on prosecuting the propaganda war, we should win that war before turning to other issues. We should expose the cynical fraud of a communism which promises utopia and delivers a dungeon.

Far from winning the propaganda war, we are not even fighting it. We have abandoned the field to the enemy. Our officials never speak harshly to Soviet counterparts. They have based their hopes of peace on avoiding offense to the enemy. It is futile to suppose that expressions of firm resolution can offset the effect of such behavior. Negotiation under such conditions can only be a process of surrender.

This shameful posture of our diplomacy influences other traditional attitudes in government. Because our leaders seek to avoid offense to the other side, they must try to suppress domestic attitudes in conflict with their policy. They must keep the real dimensions of Soviet aggression from the American people for fear that the people, fully informed, would compel the government to oppose Soviet expansionism. Every abrasive facet of our confrontation with the Soviet Union is concealed or misrepresented.

This is the nature of American politics today. Our leaders, ably seconded by our news media, have embraced the false thesis that stopping Soviet aggression would lead to nuclear war. They can avoid the confrontation they fear only by keeping the truth from the American people. This is the heart of the credibility crisis in our society.

In the May 24 issue of Human Events, Phyllis Schlafly and Chester Ward called upon President Nixon to publish the strategic war plans of the Soviet Union delivered to us in 1961 by Colonel Oleg Penkovsky, a senior officer of Soviet Military Intelligence. Penkovsky was discovered and executed, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson kept the Soviet plans secret. Exposure would have been inconsistent with their courtship of Soviet favor. It would have aroused public concern and forced our presidents to change their policies. That is why the people could not be trusted with information of enemy plans. Mrs. Schlafly and Admiral Ward argued cogently that the information should have been publicized long ago to inform our people about the nature and intentions of the enemy we face.

President Nixon can never be credible while he adheres to the Johnson standard of diplomacy. He must return government to the old standard of revealing all information which does not compromise our own security and adjusting diplomacy to the judgments of the American people.

A President who does not trust the American people cannot be trusted by them. This is the Johnson lesson.

THE SHIFTING BALANCE OF
NUCLEAR POWER

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, although I have serious reservations about the deployment of the ABM system at this time, I do feel that both sides of the issue must be thoroughly discussed and evaluated. Along this line, I am submitting for the RECORD today some thoughtful remarks prepared by a proponent of the ABM system. The author, Mr. Richard J. Whalen of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, has set forth a thoughtful case which I believe should be incorporated in the public dialog. The text of his remarks follows:

THE SHIFTING BALANCE OF NUCLEAR POWER
(By Richard J. Whalen)

I

Gentlemen, it is an honor and privilege to be with you in the Grove today.

My friend, Admiral Arleigh Burke, the Director of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, told me before I left Washington: "Dick, the Bohemian Club has a rule—they don't talk business while they're in the Grove."

Obviously, the rule does not apply to the public business. Under our democratic system of government, it is ultimately we who determine the basic policies, and thus the destiny, of our country. We meet in this magnificent forum as free men to consider a vitally important piece of public business.

Sometime this summer, Congress will vote on President Nixon's proposal to begin deployment of the Safeguard antiballistic missile system. Since Mr. Nixon announced his decision in March, a national debate has been raging on the ABM. It is our responsibility to inform ourselves on this issue, make a judgment, and then make our views known to those who represent us in Washington.

The immediate questions before Congress are narrow in scope: whether or not to begin construction of ABM defenses around two Minuteman bases in Montana and North Dakota; and whether or not to acquire the additional sites that would be needed in later phases of the Safeguard program, should the decision be made in the future to go ahead with a full deployment.

Much of the debate on these questions has been politically inspired, emotional, and confusing in its technical complexity. It is very easy to ignore the whole argument, trusting that the experts will thrash out their differences and the politicians will reach some compromise. This attitude is reflected in an early Gallup poll, which showed almost two-thirds of those polled having no opinion on the ABM. Americans generally seem to believe that not very much is at stake.

I would suggest that the stake in the ABM dispute is enormously greater than many recognize. Indeed, we may be deciding now what kind of world we will be living in ten years from now, and perhaps whether America and other free societies will survive in the world of the late 1970s.

In my conversations around the country, I find that Americans of all persuasions are becoming weary of involvement in the fate of other nations. We are anxious to turn inward and devote attention and resources to the ills of our own strife-torn society. Our disillusionment grows out of our agonizing national experience in Vietnam, where we are waging the longest and least popular war in our history. Our thoughts

of the future are strongly colored by Vietnam's domestic backwash of student unrest and mass protest. We want an end to all that, as swiftly as possible. And while we are at it, we want an end to dubious foreign entanglements that might lead to another Vietnam and further domestic upheaval. We want, in a word, peace.

Unfortunately, history is not like an indulgent parent, who gives us what we want when we want it. The world of our desires remains distant from the world of reality, and it may elude us entirely if we fail to see our present situation clearly and act accordingly.

The changing mood of America has not gone unnoticed overseas. When I was in Western Europe early this year, participating in a study of the impact on NATO of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, I found that European officials, scholars, and strategists were keenly interested in the capture of the *Pueblo*. Although they were too polite to express it in so many words, the source of their concern was obvious. They were asking themselves: If the United States could not go to the assistance of a warship bearing its own flag, would it come to our aid in a time of crisis?

Since then, the North Koreans have committed an even more brazen and murderous outrage, and the United States has done nothing about it. From Japan to West Germany, our allies have become more apprehensive. Of course, they publicly praise our restraint. Privately, however, they are preparing for a time when the pledges of the United States may prove unreliable.

In its annual survey of the global military and political scene, the Institute for Strategic Studies in London said this spring: "The future historian may mark the year 1968 as the close of a twenty-year era of American history in which . . . the pattern of international politics had to a very large extent been determined by American policy alone." Further on, the Institute reported as a fact "the end of the American desire and ability to be the universal and dominant power."

If this is indeed a fact, and the visible evidence supports it, we have entered a period of transition toward an unknown destination. One kind of world order is ending and something else, unclear and uncertain, is emerging. This great change forms the broader framework of the ABM decision.

II

Let us look at the world order which America dominated.

It grew out of the Second World War, the first truly global conflict in mankind's history. The United States alone came out of that destructive war much stronger, with a monopoly of unprecedented nuclear power, but without any clearcut objectives. If we had been ambitious and ruthless, we then had the means to establish a worldwide empire.

However, we were armed, not for conquest, but for peaceful cooperation. We were inspired, not by imperialist dreams, but by moral idealism. In our terrible innocence, we regarded other peoples as essentially Americans at heart, lacking only the experience in democracy and the material prosperity necessary to fulfill what we assumed was a universal aspiration.

In spite of ourselves, we soon acquired an empire of a sort. We fell heir to the wreckage of other empires. We assumed the obligation of defending war-ravaged allies and former enemies alike. Practically to every nation seeking it, we extend our promise of protection, asking almost nothing in return. And we sealed this one-sided bargain with a fantastic outpouring of material aid.

To be sure, there was a motive of self-interest mixed with our idealism. After the Iron Curtain fell on Eastern Europe, we sought to protect ourselves against the po-

tential threat of Communist expansion, especially in divided Europe. But the reality of the period we call the Cold War, as we look back on it, was overwhelming American strength and obvious Communist weakness. We had the power to enforce the restraining lines we drew.

The exception proving this rule was Korea. There, the Communists were uncertain as to where America had drawn the line, and uncertainty tempted them into a miscalculation. Americans were frustrated by this strange "limited war," but it seemed virtually a disaster to Communist strategists—an adventure leading to grave setbacks. For as a result of the Korean War, the United States embarked on a policy of permanent mobilization and rapidly built a large peacetime military establishment. We also built a network of bases around the Communist camp.

From the early 1950s to the early 1960s, although there was much ideological bluster from the Communist camp and continual probing along the line, the vast superiority of American military power, especially nuclear power, enforced, if not genuine peace, at least a favorable truce. Under our nuclear umbrella, our conventional land and sea forces could intervene at will in local trouble spots. We may recall, as an illustration of America's freedom of movement in those years, the intervention in Lebanon in 1958, when Marines waded ashore to be greeted by ice cream peddlers and girls in bikinis.

Of course, we respected both sides of the line between East and West. When anti-Communist uprisings occurred in East Germany, Poland, and Hungary, we turned a deaf ear to the pleas for help from the captive nations. The Republicans who had attacked Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Yalta agreements so long and loud, in the end, confirmed that Eastern Europe lay within the Soviet sphere.

More than that: the United States began looking hopefully toward the Soviet Union as a partner in maintaining the stability of a divided world. When, in 1956, France and Great Britain, intervened in the Middle East and occupied the Suez Canal, we joined with the Soviets in condemning our allies and forced their withdrawal. It was then that Britain's Harold Macmillan sent a terse, cryptic message to his old friend, President Eisenhower: "OVER TO YOU."

Over to us, at our insistence, came full responsibility for policing the non-Communist world. Our allies, who had recovered to the point where they might have shared some of our peace-keeping burdens, were told, in effect, don't bother.

III

Now, let us look at how this world order dominated by America began to change.

In the perspective of history, the events of a year or even a decade lose much of their significance. What matters is the decisive event, the turning-point, and the new trend it indicates.

According to the conventional wisdom, such a decisive event occurred in October, 1962, when, under the American threat of nuclear retaliation, the Soviet Union removed its offensive nuclear missiles from Cuba. Out of this crisis, we are told, came a tacit understanding, not only between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev but their successors as well, that neither side would again push its ambitions to the brink of nuclear war. Their common, overriding stake was survival.

The Cuban missile crisis did represent a turning-point. But I strongly disagree with the conventional wisdom. The Soviet leaders were frightened by the risk of nuclear war, but there is no evidence that they were converted to the cause of peace. We are no closer to *detente* than we were seven years ago. Meanwhile, the Soviets—and this, I believe, is the true turning-point—are very close indeed to gaining nuclear superiority.

The haze of instant myth obscures the way in which the Cuban missile crisis was actually resolved. The Soviet Union had at the time fewer than 75 intercontinental ballistic missiles, which were vulnerable to attack. It backed down before our manifest nuclear superiority. Even if the Soviets had been mad enough to attack first, and Khrushchev was no mad man, we had the means utterly to destroy the Soviet Union as a modern nation. And the threat of such destruction, as Secretary of Defense McNamara later testified, was the only reason for the humiliating Soviet withdrawal of their missiles.

President Kennedy carefully saw to it that Khrushchev's humiliation was not complete: by agreeing to retreat, Khrushchev gained, as he later boasted, an American guarantee that no further attempt would be made to overthrow Castro's regime. This was the concrete outcome of the missile crisis: an American agreement to tolerate what had earlier been branded intolerable: a base for Communist subversion within the Western Hemisphere.

Thus, while we respected the Communist sphere, the Soviets did not respect ours. While we took as the objective of our military power the maintenance of the status quo, they took as theirs the overthrow of the status quo. While we identified nuclear war as the greatest danger, they identified nuclear inferiority as the greatest obstacle to their ambitions.

I do not use the advantage of hindsight in stating these conclusions. Immediately following the missile crisis, Soviet leaders stated their views plainly. The Soviet Minister of Defense, the late Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, declared that the U.S.S.R. had to accelerate its efforts to exploit the strategic potentials of modern science and technology. He promised:

"We do not intend to fall behind in development or be inferior to our probable enemies in any way. . . . In the competition for quality of armament in the future . . . (our) superiority will ever more increase."

But we ignored such words as empty saber-rattling. We listened instead to the much more encouraging words of President Kennedy, who described peace as "the necessary rational end of rational men." Speaking at American University in June, 1963, the President expressed the belief that the United States could influence the Soviet Union by example. "We must conduct our affairs in such a way," he declared, "that it becomes in the Communists' interest to agree on a genuine peace." This would not come about immediately he concluded, but "at least we can help make the world safe for diversity."

The echo of Woodrow Wilson struck a deep response among the idealistic, optimistic American people. We had never surrendered our belief that an inherent harmony exists among all men and nations, if only they will seek to understand each other. Our vision was of a world naturally tending toward peace. As long as our power was vastly superior and our enemies were deterred, we could imagine that our vision was being fulfilled.

But the vision of the world held by the men who succeeded Khrushchev was of a world naturally tending toward conflict, according to the doctrines of Marxism-Leninism. To say this is not to deny the possibility of change within the Soviet Union; it is merely to inject realism where wishful thinking runs rampant. The evolutionary softening of the attitudes of Soviet leaders must inevitably take generations, for the Communist system rigorously promotes orthodoxy and guards the apparatus by which the ruling elite reproduces itself.

For seven years, under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, Robert S. McNamara served as Secretary of Defense, becoming perhaps the most influential Cabinet member in our history. He believed the United States could anticipate a softening of Soviet attitudes

before it occurred. We attempted to influence the strategic policy of the Soviet Union by our example. We stabilized the number of our land- and sea-based offensive missiles. We steadily reduced spending for strategic forces, dropping from \$11.3 billion in 1962 to \$6.8 billion by 1966. We scrapped many advanced projects and stretched-out others. The aim of our research and development effort was shifted away from innovation, which was deemed provocative to the Soviets, and toward refinement of existing weapons. We were determined not to lead an arms race, which was praiseworthy. But we were also told by prominent scientists, who aggressively ventured into politics, that even a technological race was futile: we had reached a "plateau." That was dangerously untrue.

Thus, the dubious objective of our foreign policy, preserving the status quo, filtered back into our defense policy, which adopted as its goal a nuclear stalemate. Yet it was only the sustained effort to preserve our superiority, technological as well as military, that made possible our static foreign policy.

While the United States declined to exercise the initiative in strategic weapons, the Soviet Union bent every effort toward seizing it. The Soviets developed and deployed as rapidly as possible not only offensive missiles but also the first antiballistic missile system in the world. The official reaction from Secretary McNamara was approval. It seemed obvious to him that the Soviets were seeking the same capability we had attained earlier: an Assured Destruction capability—that is, the ability to ride out a first strike and then retaliate so devastatingly that the enemy, weighing the damage he could not prevent, would be deterred from striking. No one knew what level of damage the Soviets would deem "unacceptable," but Secretary McNamara ventured what seemed to him a "reasonable" assumption: The destruction of one-fifth to one-fourth of the Soviet Union's population and one-half to two-thirds of its industrial capacity, he declared, "would certainly represent intolerable punishment."

Secretary McNamara, an extremely able and intelligent man, was also an intellectually arrogant man. Because he was so thoroughly persuaded of the logic of Assured Destruction, which he could "prove" by using statistical tables, he assumed the Soviet defense planners would also be persuaded. He scoffed at the early Soviet ABM defenses. Indeed, he lectured the Soviets directly in his public statements. "If our assumption that the Soviets are also striving to achieve an Assured Destruction capability is correct, and I am convinced that it is, then in all probability all we would accomplish by deploying ABM systems against one another would be to increase greatly our respective defense expenditures, without any gain in real security for either side."

The Soviets, under men like Marshal Malinovsky, weren't listening — and why should they? They alone were responsible for defending the Soviet Union. If technology promised to make a defense against missiles possible, they would commit the nation's resources to making it as effective as they could. Soviet leaders, such as Premier Kosygin, publicly declared that antiballistic missiles were not provocative. What was wrong with preventing the deaths of millions of people in the event of a nuclear war? The American Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed with Kosygin, and twice unanimously recommended that the United States go ahead with deployment of its own antiballistic missile system, but Secretary McNamara overruled them.

The Secretary of Defense, so intrigued with his brilliant logic, became a man in the grip of a fixed idea. Because he believed there was no point in the Soviets' attempting to achieve nuclear superiority, he predicted flatly that they would stop building offensive missiles. As late as 1965, he said they had

given up the attempt to match our missile force in size. But the Soviets, once again, disappointed Mr. McNamara. They not only continued their buildup, they accelerated it. Soviet missile production surged ahead, from an annual rate of perhaps 40 in 1962 to a rate of close to 300 in 1968.

Today, the Soviets have surpassed us in the number of land-based missiles. They have built and are continuing to build, a large force of SS-9 missiles, each capable of delivering 25 megatons with a high degree of accuracy. They are building nuclear submarines similar to our Polaris. They have demonstrated the capability of putting nuclear weapons into orbit. This buildup is the result of having out-spent the United States by better than two-to-one on strategic nuclear forces during the 1960s. Just as important, the Soviets are very close to achieving technical parity. While our expenditures on research and development remained stable in the 1960s, theirs were growing by more than 10 percent a year.

From the mid-1960s, as the Soviets stubbornly continued to deploy both offensive and defensive weapons, Secretary McNamara tried to hedge against growing uncertainties by improving the quality of our offensive missiles. The United States made plans to put a new front-end on our Minuteman and Polaris missiles, consisting of several warheads, each capable of being guided to a different target. The multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicle, known as MIRV, introduced a radical new element into the strategic nuclear equation, for the number of missiles alone no longer determined the balance of power. Now, each Soviet launcher became merely a vehicle to carry a number of warheads—how many, our intelligence satellites could not tell us.

It should be noted here that MIRV was being developed in our highly secret laboratories in the early 1960s, at the very time when prominent scientists were asserting that strategic technology had reached a plateau. Also coming into view at that time were future improvements in the guidance accuracy of missiles which disarmament-minded scientists not only failed to predict, but said were impossible. In this age of science, we accord scientists a unique authority, even in areas of inherent uncertainty and in fields outside their competence. We are especially trusting and superstitious when scientists tell us emphatically that what we want to believe.

iv

Now, we come to what may be called the moment of truth, the beginning of the ABM drama that soon will reach a climax in the Congress.

When the Johnson Administration reluctantly decided that the deployment of an antiballistic missile system could be delayed no further, it proposed to take certain necessary steps for preposterous reasons. Secretary McNamara, speaking in San Francisco in the fall of 1967, announced a decision to deploy the Sentinel ABM system, as it was then called, around major American cities as a defense against the threat from Communist China in the late 1970s. In passing, he mentioned that such a system might also be useful to protect our Minuteman missiles against a Soviet attack.

In Congressional hearings that winter, expert witnesses demolished the nuclear "Yellow Peril" as the major justification for deploying an ABM system. Obviously, the only threat justifying ABM came from the Soviet Union. To admit the existence of such a threat, however, would have undermined not only Secretary McNamara's logic and the deterrent forces based on it, but also the Johnson Administration's almost desperate hopes for *detente* and for Soviet assistance in getting out of Vietnam on acceptable terms.

The whole debate over ABM, therefore,

has been warped by the tyranny of fashionable opinions. Only slowly, by stages which have needlessly confused the American public, has the rationale for deploying an ABM system been brought into conformity with reality. We have dropped the idea of defending cities, except for Washington, and we have focused on the potential danger to our land-based retaliatory missiles.

The result of this realistic policy by the Nixon Administration has been to open up for debate the intentions of the Soviet Union. Those in America who want to get out of Vietnam tomorrow, who want to cut back drastically on military spending, who want to retire into self-indulgent isolation—all those who have a strong vested interest in presuming that Soviet intentions are benign are emotionally opposed to an ABM system based on a prudent assessment of Soviet capabilities.

Am I unfair to critics of the Safeguard system? Perhaps to some, but not to such leading opponents as Dr. Jerome Wiesner, who commands attention as the former science adviser to President Kennedy, but whose credentials for judging the political and strategic implications of nuclear-weapons are dubious.

Early in 1967, Dr. Wiesner and I spent much of an afternoon together, discussing the issues raised by ABM. He conceded that the idea of defending Minuteman silos might have a great deal of merit, if the Soviet threat increased—as it has. Toward the end of our interview, he cautioned me to take care in quoting him. It was surely his right to be quoted accurately. But his concern had a different motive. He said he did not want his words presented in a way that would offend unnamed parties in the Soviet Union. He explained that he went to the Soviet Union each year, keeping up contacts made at the Pugwash disarmament conferences, and he wished to be permitted to enter the country.

I must confess that I was appalled. Dr. Wiesner, a free man in a free society, hailed as a man of science committed to free inquiry, was perfectly willing to censor his opinions in order to please the authorities in a state where individual freedom did not exist. Ordinarily, it is wrong to look beneath a man's arguments and inquire into his motives. But, in the case of some of the opponents of the Safeguard system, I must admit that I profoundly distrust their motives. They are engaged in the falsification of reality in order to preserve cherished illusions.

v

At this point, we may briefly consider some of the opposing arguments raised. For example, we hear speculation that the Safeguard system will cost fantastic sums of money, running into the scores of billions of dollars. Such speculation is intended solely to frighten the public. For the first year, Safeguard would cost about \$900 million. The Administration estimates the cost of a full deployment, between now and the mid-1970's at some \$8 billion. That works out to around two billion dollars a year—which is less than we are currently spending in Vietnam each month. A more relevant comparison is this: The average annual cost of the full Safeguard program is estimated at less than one-fifth what the United States was spending for defense against manned bombers at the end of the 1970s. As we grow richer, apparently, we can afford to do less to defend ourselves.

The Soviet Union, unhappily, does not share this curious philosophy. With a gross national product roughly half the size of ours, the Soviets maintain a level of defense spending at least equally as large—and they, of course, are not consuming \$25 billion a year in Vietnam.

Consider the argument that Safeguard won't work. Eminently qualified experts testify that it will indeed work in meeting the threat against which it is designed. To

the layman, this may seem a standoff, and perhaps a reason for waiting until we are certain. Why spend money, after all, on something that won't do the job?

The essence of the changing strategic situation is *uncertainty*. Judgments concerning the effectiveness of highly complicated weapons systems are inherently uncertain. We know that the Soviets are deploying extensive ABM defenses—sixty-seven sites around Moscow alone—but we do not know how effective these defenses are. Because we are uncertain, we have spent billions of dollars, and we will spend billions more, equipping our missiles with devices enabling them to penetrate Soviet defenses. To the extent that the Soviets have forced us to make these expenditures, and to the extent that we reduce the payload our missiles can deliver, their defenses have already "worked" very satisfactorily.

In the task of strategic analysis, there is a measurement called "the cost-exchange ratio," which expresses the relationship between offensive and defensive costs. Early in the 1960s, the cost-exchange ratio was officially assumed in the United States to be about 100:1, that is, \$100 spent on defense could be overcome by spending only an additional dollar on improving the offense. So rapidly has the technology of defense advanced during the 1960s that the present cost-exchange ratio is approximately 1:1 or parity. Conceivably further technological advance or a breakthrough we cannot anticipate would shift the ratio decisively in favor of the defense. If we do not now begin ABM deployment, we shall be prevented from discovering what we don't know.

But this is heresy among those who have committed themselves and our security to the proposition that, in the nuclear age, the offense possesses an eternal advantage. This proposition underlies our present strategic posture. The difficulty is that the Soviets seem to reject the proposition. They give every indication of believing precisely the opposite—namely, that the dynamic force of technology can carry them past stalemate, or parity, and provide them with a nuclear superiority that can be demonstrated without war and exploited to achieve political objectives.

This, too, is heresy in the view of those who until recently shaped our strategy. They assume that "superiority" is a meaningless concept under conditions of mutual deterrence. They are wrong. Just as deterrence is a state of mind—the opponent's state of mind, so the concept of superiority is highly subjective. The Soviets know from bitter experience how it feels to be inferior. In their minds, superiority may be the absence of the feeling of inferiority and freedom from the strategic inhibitions it inspires. When we assess the immense Soviet buildup, with its heavy claim on scarce resources, it is unreasonable to assume that they have invested so much merely to draw even with the enemy. The investment undoubtedly has been justified on the basis of a future political payoff.

If the Soviets should come to believe they possess superiority, how might they demonstrate it? Obviously, in a confrontation with the United States. Such a showdown could occur in the explosive Middle East: the Soviets might extend the umbrella of their nuclear deterrent over their Arab allies in the next round of their war with Israel. Or a confrontation could occur over the fate of the symbolic city of West Berlin, the encircled and indefensible western enclave which survives only because of the American nuclear guarantee. Or the Soviets, just to be certain the world did not miss the point, might re-introduce missiles into Cuba and announce that they were there to stay.

vi

We cannot predict the future; we can only weigh probabilities. Dr. Philip E. Mosely, Professor of International Relations and Director

of the European Institute at Columbia University, who has devoted much thought to the political consequences of the shifting balance of nuclear power, has sounded this warning: "In any future period in which (the Soviet Union) might attain either nuclear equality or nuclear superiority, however that may be measured in terms of the ration between offensive and defensive systems, we would be prudent to assume that Soviet policy would be tempted to undertake a more extensive, more acute, and more dangerous range of risks in order to pursue its declared long-range ambition to reshape the world according to its dogma."

During the Cold War, we took very seriously the threat to our security contained in declared Soviet ambitions, even though the Soviet Union, outside Europe, lacked the means to fulfill those ambitions. In recent years, the Soviet Union has begun to gain a truly global military capability: for the first time in Russian history, Moscow commands a large and growing blue-water navy, the classical instrument of imperialist expansion; the Soviets have entered the Mediterranean in strength, they dominate the Middle East waterways, and they are moving toward the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. They have reactivated their sea-borne infantry, similar to our Marines, and built a pair of helicopter carriers, the nucleus of quick-reaction forces capable of local intervention. Moreover, in justifying their occupation of Czechoslovakia, the Soviets have declared the doctrine of the "limited sovereignty" of states within the Socialist Commonwealth, the scope of which Moscow will define as events dictate. It may be extended to embrace not only the Eastern European satellites but any socialist state in the world.

While the Soviet Union moves toward acquiring the means of global maneuver and intervention, thus fulfilling the potential of a decade ago, the perception of the Soviet threat within the United States has declined dramatically. We have put the Cold War of the 1950s behind us, and we are unable or unwilling to recognize that a quite different, more menacing contest has succeeded it—what I call the *Second Cold War*, in which we confront, not a weak opponent whose chief weapon is propaganda, but a very strong opponent who challenges us face-to-face.

Much of what has happened to the United States can be summarized in a single word: Vietnam. While we have been utterly preoccupied with the tragic war in Southeast Asia, the Soviets have been free to move in the world. To Soviet strategists, Vietnam may appear more and more the opposite of what Korea was—an historical opportunity to seize global dominance while the United States is tied down. Contrary to the wishful thinking that persists in Washington, it is difficult to see why the Soviets should want the Vietnam war ended. Supplying the North Vietnamese costs the Soviet Union perhaps a billion dollars a year, compared with the United States' commitment to South Vietnam of at least \$25 billion annually and 545,000 men. In a time of rising tension between the Soviet Union and Communist China, America's military presence in Southeast Asia serves Moscow's vital interests by keeping Peking off-balance.

Just as important, the Vietnam war has divided and demoralized our society. Instead of our turning to meet the rising Soviet challenge, in our anger and frustration we have turned against each other. Most especially, we have turned against the military establishment and practically everything connected with national defense. The military deserve to be criticized for their waste, their bureaucratic rigidity, their astonishing naïvete concerning modern revolutionary warfare, and a number of other shortcomings. But the military does not deserve to be made the scapegoat for the fallings of an entire system and society.

We are "down" on the American military today as part of a general deflation of our self-image. In a time of runaway prosperity,

we are sunk in a psychological depression the like of which America has seldom if ever experienced. We sense that we are losing our grip, both at home and abroad. We are making the military the scapegoat because, for more than a generation, we have defined America's power and position in terms of military strength. Our military power, so enormous and impressive, has stood as a substitute for hard thought concerning the nature of the modern world, the forms of conflict within it, and the uses and limits of military power.

The United States has won the conventional military war in Vietnam, but it is losing the unconventional political war. Trapped in the habits of mind of another era, we have outfought the enemy, but he has *out-thought* us.

On the domestic political front, where the outcome of the revolutionary struggle in Southeast Asia may ultimately be decided, we have trapped ourselves in comforting illusions. As these have collapsed, so has our morale and our self-image. "To endure the pain of power," Stewart Alsop has written, "a nation needs a conviction of its own righteousness. Our agonized effort to prevent a Communist minority from taking over by force in South Vietnam is surely at least as righteous as imperial Britain's wars. . . . And yet we have no Kipling to celebrate the war in Vietnam, and a sense of our righteousness is precisely what we wholly lack."

We are, in a word, *drained* of the sustaining idealism and sense of mission with which we entered the world and assumed leadership only a generation ago.

VII

It is quite different with the Soviets. They are a rising New Class of convinced imperialists, full of a sense of their own righteousness and ruthlessly willing to use their power. In these circumstances, with the United States yearning to pull back and the Soviet Union eager to move forward, the danger of nuclear war through miscalculation is growing. Though we endlessly argue over Soviet intentions, we forget that they continually assess *our* intentions as well. If we appear bent on headlong retreat from world politics, our weakness may tempt the Soviets into aggression and confrontation, with possibly disastrous consequences.

We are living, according to Milovan Djilas, in "the most crucial moment in history since World War II." Djilas, the well-known Yugoslav writer, may be the best-informed source available to the West on the workings of the Communist mind. He was a Communist revolutionary before World War II and a frequent wartime emissary to Stalin. He became vice president of Yugoslavia under Marshal Tito, but his growing intellectual disenchantment with communism led to his imprisonment. In his cell, he wrote *The New Class*, a revealing study of the bureaucratic police-state from inside the system.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, Djilas wrote early this year, was not the end of a policy, but the beginning of one—"a new policy of aggression, not only by economic and political subversion, but by raw, naked military force. And unless altered in time from without, this course will inevitably lead to a collision with vital interests of the West which will have to be defended—even by arms." Djilas, who personally knows many of the Soviet ruling elite, offers this urgent advice: ". . . the West must rid itself of any lingering illusions that the present Soviet leaders are sophisticated men who eventually will come to their senses." Instead, they are frightened, heavy-handed bureaucrats, who will resist change within the system and their empire at any cost. If peace is to be preserved Djilas declares, "the West must ensure that it possesses overwhelming military superiority"—the margin must be so great that "even the Soviet bureaucracy can understand it."

The argument for deploying the Safeguard

anti-ballistic missile system comes down to this: if it is *not* deployed, the danger of nuclear war will increase.

The United States, if it defends neither its population nor its land-based missiles, presents an inviting target to the mind of the Soviet military bureaucrat. He faces questions he may be tempted to solve. How reliable are his missiles? Will they strike close enough to assure the destruction of their assigned targets in the United States? How effective is his anti-submarine warfare against Polaris submarines? How heavy a counterattack can his ABM defenses handle? What level of damage will he accept in order to assure the destruction of the United States?

In short, the Soviet planner enjoys "a bookkeeper's dream." It may be possible for him to design a plausible mathematical model of a first-strike attack. But with the introduction of ABM defenses in the United States, the model breaks down, for now there are questions entirely outside the control of the Soviet planner. He cannot say with the necessary degree of confidence how effective the American defenses are, and how much of the minuteman force will survive an attack. At the very least, he must redesign and re-equip his missiles, a very expensive undertaking. Even then, he may be forced to conclude that the Soviet Union must settle for a second-strike capability, which, of course, is precisely what the United States desires.

I do not suggest that the Soviets are planning their missile forces for a first-strike attack, as Secretary of Defense Laird did early in the ABM debate. We simply do not know. But we do know enough concerning Soviet capabilities, and we have created enough doubt concerning our intentions that prudence requires a deployment of Safeguard.

In the age of deterrence, nuclear weapons are manipulative symbols of power. If they must ever be used, deterrence has failed and catastrophe looms. An ABM defense lends itself superbly to bluffing and blackmail. In the next decade, the mere existence of Soviet ABM defenses, if the United States has none, could exert psychological influence on both sides. Especially in view of the selective "re-Stalinization" of the Soviet Union and its recent unpredictable behavior, it is easy to imagine a suddenly belligerent turn in Soviet policy. The President could face an ultimatum aimed at Western Europe or even the United States itself. In the absence of an ABM defense, the range of his options would be greatly reduced. He would face, in John Kennedy's phrase, the grim choice between humiliation or holocaust.

A limited deployment of Safeguard would serve many important purposes: It would not only help restore the strategic balance, but would strengthen the hand of those within the Soviet system who oppose the new policy and counsel restraint. Safeguard could cope with the accidental firing of a missile; in its absence, and if the Soviet threat continues to grow, our deterrent must be on a nervous hair-trigger. Safeguard could counter the threat expected from Red China until well in the late 1970s.

Moreover, Safeguard would check the recent estrangement of our European and Asian allies by enhancing the credibility of our promise to protect them in a time of crisis. If the United States is determined to disengage from certain overseas commitments, and to shift some of the burdens of defense to allies such as Japan, which are fully capable of assuming them, then Safeguard may prove essential to an orderly transfer of responsibilities. We would prefer to see the world order dominated by America replaced by another, in which free nations form regional defense arrangements which weigh more heavily in the overall balance. The only way to achieve this may be to maintain the

foundation of the old order in good repair while the new one is being built.

Having said all that, I must say this: neither Safeguard nor any other weapon by itself will ensure the security of the United States, the preservation of peace, and a world in which men are free. The strength and security of our nation ultimately rests on the *character* of our people and our leaders. If we lack will, determination, and courage, if we prefer immediate satisfactions to the pursuit of demanding, long-term goals, we are already self-defeated. If we are paralyzed by fear of war, we will shrink from the risks necessary to maintain peace. Finally, if we do not believe that our survival is at stake, and bear ourselves as men under a mortal test and the judgment of history, we shall not survive. The final safeguard lies within each of us.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY REFORM

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our attention has been riveted on the campus disturbances which have rocked the land for the past few months. One of the real difficulties in trying to understand these situations is that after the initial explosion we usually hear very little about what happens when relative calm returns to a campus. The strident denouncing of the disturbances often obscures the substance of student grievances or improvements in conditions which facilitate recovery. For these reasons, it was refreshing to see a recent article by David Holmstrom in the *Christian Science Monitor*. Mr. Holmstrom has gone back to Columbia University, which just 1 year ago was in the midst of one of the most massive of the student-administration confrontations of recent years, to see what has happened in the intervening year. He found that procedural reforms have done much to cool the tensions there. This report merits the attention of my colleagues and I include it in the RECORD at this time:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY REFORM COOLS STUDENT REVOLT

(By David Holmstrom)

NEW YORK.—Reform, the nemesis of revolution, has instituted itself at Columbia University. With the first meeting of the new 101-member universitywide senate, Columbia has progressed in one troubled year from the image of a powderkeg to a firecracker.

While many universities and colleges across the country were faced with violence and consistent disruption during the academic year, Columbia has managed to meet the continuing campus ferment with a mixture of toughness and a new receptivity to change.

Symbolic of Columbia's new confidence is the fact that graduation ceremonies this year were held at Low Plaza in the heart of the campus. Last year they were guarded by hundreds of uniformed policemen at nearby St. Johns Cathedral.

Even though in some respects student discontent at Columbia is as great as it was in the past, the improvements in administrative receptivity, the initial efforts at educational reform the creation of the senate, and a more thoughtful approach to community relations have helped to defuse the atmosphere.

The most significant change—with the potential to affect all future university poli-

cies—is the establishment of the university senate. With its creation, two university organizations will dissolve: the Student Council, which for 22 years was an ineffectual body, and the University Council—created in 1890—which was an advisory body to the president.

The new senate will be composed of 42 tenured faculty members, 15 nontenured faculty, 21 students, nine administrators, two alumni, six staff members, and six representatives from affiliated institutions.

It will have broad powers ranging from educational policy to making decisions affecting community relations. The structuring of the senate was primarily the work of the executive committee of the faculty in conjunction with the work of such student groups as Students for a Restructured University (SRU).

Prof. Michael Sovern, chairman of the executive committee of the faculty, said in April he felt that Columbia would have had a senate within the next five years, but that "the disruptions [here] affected the pace of change and the content" of a senate. At the first meeting of the senate Professor Sovern addressed the body and said, "We greet you with relief," and was given an ovation for his tireless work.

CORDIER GIVEN CREDIT

Columbia observers also give much credit to acting president Andrew W. Cordier for creating the new mood at Columbia. The former executive assistant to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and dean of Columbia's School of International Affairs, Dr. Cordier often works from 14 to 18 hours a day.

He keeps an "open-door" policy and has said publicly several times, "I've found that if you listen to anyone long enough, they will eventually say something that you can agree with." But early in the year he made it clear that the "university could not accommodate those students" whose aims were to destroy the university.

While SDS activity continued all year, including several occupations of buildings, Dr. Cordier never called in the police and kept a steady flow of information from his office concerning the university's response to most of the issues involved.

This coolness, mixed with genuine university reform on several of the specific issues which triggered last spring's disruption, kept SDS from any kind of instant radicalization of moderate students. On several occasions Dr. Cordier was one step ahead of the student revolutionaries.

A STRONG MOVE

The day before there was to be a strike by students demanding the end of the campus Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps, an announcement was made that the university trustees had decided to phase out the military program by 1972. Dr. Cordier said, "This type of program is not appropriate for the university."

It represented the strongest move taken by a major university against a military program. It also reflected the sentiment of many students and faculty members, who had urged the end of the program for years.

At the same time the administration worked toward changing its own inadequacies, a growing number of students rejected the confrontation tactics of SDS while still supporting the general thrust of SDS demands as they reflected the larger issues in society.

Also, an ideological split in SDS ranks hindered their effectiveness throughout the year despite declarations to the contrary. And the black students, pressing for the right to select the head of a black studies center, would not align themselves with SDS as they, too, occupied a building in protest. This further negated SDS strength because

the major plank in the "spring offensive" had been support of the black movement as well as high-school rebellions.

In short, while many Columbia students continue to "rebel" against the injustices of society and capitalism, SDS proved incapable of gaining wide support. "I suspect they'll have just as much trouble next year," said a student member of the new senate. "We don't want to run the place or destroy it," he said, "we just want to be listened to and respected."

During the first meeting of the senate, an exchange occurred which isolated one of the continuing problems at Columbia or any large university.

The students of the senate asked for a 10-minute caucus to discuss the various faculty candidates for chairman of the executive committee of the senate. A faculty member stood and said it would be detrimental to the new spirit of the senate if separate groups began caucusing.

He stressed the importance of setting the wrong traditions. A bearded, bushy-headed student stood next and said, "The problem for us is that we simply don't know the faculty members and would like just a few moments to compare notes on what we might know." With a slight air of embarrassment the senate "recessed."

Earlier a student had said that he thought the most promising result of the troubles at Columbia was the breakdown of formality. "We are all being forced to get to know one another," he said.

FOGGY BOTTOM'S COMMUNICATION HAZE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the continually pressing problems of American foreign policy is our relationship to Communist China. As seen in the Taiwan military buildup of 1962, the lack of diplomatic channels results in gross misreadings of each other's intentions. I believe these situations can be avoided only if we initiate formal communication lines with the People's Republic of China.

In the following Washington Monthly article, James C. Thomson, Jr., of Harvard University, uses his witty insights to explore our "communication gap" with China. Mr. Thomson has worked at both the White House and the State Department.

THE CULTURE OF BUREAUCRACY: THE MISSING AMBASSADOR

(By James C. Thomson, Jr.)

Three years ago Dean Rusk is said to have complained to a staff aide that "some young men around here think we're going to change our China policy. I can tell you," he added with a flash of anger, "they're dead wrong."

As it turned out, Secretary Rusk was proved right at the time. What is more, his words may well hold true for the future, despite his retirement.

The reason is not, as many would expect, the bureaucratic monolith. Quite the opposite. The reason—or at least one reason—is the large variety of views within the federal establishment as to what China is.

Consider this list, by no means complete, of some of the casts of mind one finds among the policy-makers and analysts in the various echelons of bureaucracy:

1. The dead-telephone approach: China viewed as a switchboard that simply won't take our calls. "The difficulty," as Mr. Rusk put it on April 11, 1966, "is that the other side keeps hanging up the phone." To be sure, we do talk to them at Warsaw, and they do talk back. But what they say is so outlandish as to be undeserving of the ear. (The dead-telephone approach is often a cover for the deaf-ear approach.)

2. The exotica approach: China viewed as Tierra del Fuego. "Tell me," one used to be asked, "about the newest bizarre development in that Cultural Revolution of theirs." "Incredible! They really closed down their whole educational system?" The questions are not foolish, but the tone becomes troubling: amused and benign disbelief bordering contempt. ("What will they think of next!") Here China is viewed as quaintness re-visited, recalling those questions of yesterday about pigtales, birdsnests and puppy-dogs. More ominously, the China-watchers themselves become tagged with quaintness—as purveyors of exotica, collectors of curios, not serious policy men. In the process, China again fails to surface as a serious policy problem.

3. The behemoth approach: China viewed as a Frankenstein monster, a bad and dangerous thing, not at all quaint. This approach stresses China's vastness, belligerence, irrationality, and—most emphatically—its nuclear capability. Mr. Rusk's nightmare of "a billion Chinese on the mainland, armed with nuclear weapons" is widely unsettling (tapping, one assumes, our collective unconscious about the Golden Horde, if not the Yellow Peril). A first response among behemoth-type planners is to "take out their nukes"—a thought one heard sometimes in the Pentagon during the mid-60's. Fortunately, wiser heads have prevailed, and the behemoths appear to be out of fashion—though a China-oriented ABM might yet give them a new grip on the defense budget.

4. The trees-but-never-the-forest approach: China viewed as raw data. This is the affliction of specialists long resigned to detachment from the policy process. Their talents are increasingly focused on the mastery of occult knowledge, to be exchanged within the fraternity of China-watchers—questions, say, of the development of Red Guard factions within factions in the suburbs of Canton between January and February 1967—or questions of fertilizer production in Southeast Szechuan. The questions are not unimportant; but they tend to narrow and even deaden minds that deserve wider scope. (One is reminded of Ambassador Galbraith's famous comment, at one stage in the Laos negotiations, that the State Department's secret weapon in the struggle against communism is apparently the microscope.)

5. The friendly beast approach: China viewed as a large shaggy dog. If you pat it and feed it and let it run around the house, things will surely get better. Such humane optimists were seen around the government in the early 1960's when China seemed to face a severe food crisis; some thought, at the time, that Maoism might be tranquilized by massive offerings of wheat. Flickerings of the same approach are said to have characterized, surprisingly, President Johnson's view of the Chinese as decent people in need of shoes, schools, roads, and hospitals—a cast of mind perhaps more accurately described as "the indigent Mexican approach."

6. The psychiatric approach: China viewed as psychotic—or at least as a very disorderly neurotic. "China has gone mad"—one heard the words quite frequently (hardly surprising when even such a veteran observer as Theodore White regrettably entitled his great documentary film "China: The Roots of Madness"). The diagnosis of insanity produces at least two prescriptions for treatment: try forms of therapy, say the dovish psychia-

trists; no, tighten the straitjacket of containment, say their hawkish opponents.

7. The terra incognita approach: China viewed as a blank space on the map. Most characteristic of Assistant Secretaries of State, this approach conceives of Asia as the chain of nations on China's periphery—the Great Arc of Free Asia. It lauds their stability and commitment to the Free World; it stresses their growth rates and political development; it boasts their progress toward regionalism. Those who would interrupt the confident official rhetoric by posing questions about China are dismissed as "Sino-centric"—a term of bureaucratic opprobrium. (Sino-centrists should go away and teach at small colleges.)

8. The wait-for-China-to-shape-up approach: China viewed as a juvenile delinquent. The Chinese have been bad, we are told, but sooner or later they will repent. To Mr. Rusk, they must change their "behavior"; and now, to Mr. Nixon, they must change their "attitude." Those who wait for China to shape up seldom ponder some puzzling questions: why the Chinese behave the way they do, why they hold such attitudes—and whether there might just be something we might do to help change both behavior and attitudes.

9. The now-is-not-the-time approach: China viewed as a problem to do something about, but not now. Now is not the time because Mao Tse-tung is alive, or because he is dead, or because we don't know whether he is alive or dead; now is not the time because Chou En-lai is up, or Lin Biao is down, or Mrs. Mao is sick, etc. Prior to 1966, now was not the time to change our stance on China's admission to the United Nations because China was fierce and confident and strong. In 1966 and since then, now was not the time to change our stance because China was preoccupied and convulsed and weak. (Now is, of course, never the time.)

10. The don't-rock-the-boat approach: China viewed as the creator of waves. The view here is that you don't shift China policy because it will rock the boat. What boat? Actually, several. The oldest though smallest boat is Taiwan (Taiwan's helmsmen tell us that if we move on China policy, they will, in effect, hold their breaths until they are blue in the face; and the threat usually works). A more recent boat is Russia—or more specifically, the Soviet-American détente. If we move on China, say our gifted Soviet specialists, it will alarm the Russians. Other potential boats are the Thais, the Indians, and even the Japanese. (The antiboat-rockers assume that we have no skill at persuasion, reassurance, maneuver, and preventive diplomacy; and they may well be right.)

All of these views co-exist in a kind of negative equilibrium. Over the years each has become dreadfully familiar in Foggy Bottom. When China is discussed, everyone knows what everyone else will say. And everyone knows that each discussion will adjourn without agreement.

Why so? Because a fundamental rule of bureaucracy is that no action flows when no action is required. The missing element in our intramural discussions is that time-honored State Department prod, the incoming cablegram from our embassy overseas. An incoming cable usually requires a reply. And it is in the drafting and clearing of replies that policy is made.

But on China these days—and over the past two decades—where are the incoming cables? From Embassy Taipei, where our man, afflicted with the inevitable case of localitis, argues staunchly for the interests of his clients. From Embassy Warsaw, where our man requests instructions as to how to keep his footing in those spasmodic forensic contests with his Chinese counterpart. And from Consulate General Hong Kong, where our skilled physicians squat outside the patient's door, peering through the keyhole.

But from Embassy Peking? Alas, no. Why alas? Because in the absence of a steady stream of messages from that vital center of the China problem—from our ambassador speaking as a lawyer for those clients—Washington need not reply, hence it need not act, hence policy need not move.

It is useful to recall that even in the darkest days of our relations with Stalin's Russia, our man in Moscow kept us on our toes—not merely by reporting, but by urging, protesting, provoking, pleading. Those incoming cablegrams forced the bureaucrats to think, to fight, and sometimes even to innovate, on the subject of Soviet-American relations.

Not so with China—in the past, in the present, or, one glumly concludes, in the foreseeable future.

TEENS AGAINST CANCER

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening demonstrations of good work on the part of high school students that I have noted is at Rutherford High School in Panama City, Fla. For 6 years, Rutherford High School students have participated in the Bay County April Cancer Crusade, and they have raised over \$35,000 during these years. Significantly, they are No. 1 in the Nation for "Teens Against Cancer." It was my pleasure to address the Rutherford High School classes through the helpfulness of the telephone company from my office on today, and I feel that my congratulatory statement to the Rutherford students may be of interest to my colleagues. These students deserve commendation for providing an example which would be worthy of any group anywhere. My remarks follow:

Good morning to Rutherford and to all of those who are present as your guests. This is Congressman Bob Sikes speaking to you from my office in the Capitol at Washington. I am happy to extend my congratulations to the seniors on Senior Recognition Day and to all students at Rutherford for their great accomplishment in the fight against cancer.

This is a welcome opportunity for me. I have always known that Florida high school students represent the quintessence of enthusiasm. However, the recent accomplishment of Rutherford in raising more money for cancer research than any other high school in the country is certain proof of how inexhaustible that enthusiasm really is and how important it is when applied in the right places.

There is a very important lesson for all of us in your endeavor. It is this: an enthusiastic group of people, sharing a common goal, can be a tremendous force for good. And because you have taken top honors over your contemporaries, many other people have witnessed an important clue to the real character and attitude of high school students.

I can't imagine a more worthwhile project than the one you selected and carried out so well. You can be proud of what you have done; I know I am proud of you. And let's not forget the fine help of your teachers and the local sponsors of the Cancer Crusade.

Cancer is an insidious disease, causing the death and disability of thousands of Americans every year. Through the generosity and concern of young students like you, the medical profession will be able to make additional

progress toward finding cancer cures. Your unstinting demonstration of fellowship and mutual helpfulness is greatly needed. The spirit which you demonstrated in your support of cancer research is an important ingredient in the success of any endeavor.

What a lonely, hazardous place this world would become if everyone adopted the attitude that he is not his brother's keeper. Your wonderful accomplishment—and it is a wonderful accomplishment—proves without a doubt that you have recognized your duty to succor those who are in need of help.

In any community, through a network of organizations, we all have the privilege and the responsibility to help conduct the affairs of a free people. Volunteers, like yourselves, can help so much to make our communities a better place in which to live.

You have done a superlative job, and in the process you have strengthened America a little more and you have proved yourselves worthy.

I commend you most heartily on your efforts.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION RESOURCES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with the Memorial Day weekend just over I wonder how many American families had leisured uncrowded weekends. I think it is far more likely that most felt the pinch of insufficient national recreational resources in a nation with ever-growing leisure time for its citizens. How many had to share beaches almost elbow to elbow with the others who were there, how many had to wait in long lines of cars to enter national parks, national forests, wildlife refuges and other national recreational areas?

With this memory still fresh in our minds I would like to draw attention to H.R. 11072, cosponsored by Congressman JOHN DINGELL, me, and seven other Members of the House. This is a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to increase from \$200 million to \$400 million the funds paid into the land and water conservation fund. The purposes for which moneys in the fund are used include: First, the acquisition of land, waters, or other interests within the national park system for recreation uses; second, the acquisition of holdings within national forest system; third, the acquisition of lands for areas needed for the preservation of species of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction; fourth, the acquisition of lands for incidental recreational purposes for inclusion in wildlife refuges; and fifth, matching grants to States for programs of land acquisition and development of outdoor recreation facilities, both rural and urban.

Under the present law moneys derived from sales of certain surplus property, the unreclaimed tax on motorboat fuels, and various entrance and user fees charged by national parks and Federal recreation areas are put into the land and water conservation fund. Under H.R. 11072 the difference between the revenues derived from the resources un-

der the present law and \$400 million could be paid into the fund out of income from oil and gas leasing activities under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

The moneys now available to the fund at this time have not proved adequate to the very worthy purpose for which it was established. To provide adequate funding would certainly be in the national interest. We need to act now in order to preserve our natural recreational resources for future generations.

LINO M. LOPEZ

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen of my district is being honored for his work in the Santa Clara Valley in improving the condition of his people and in furthering the cause of peaceful and happy relations between all who live in the valley. Lino M. Lopez, executive director of the Mexican-American Community Service Agency, has devoted his life to aiding his fellows of all races.

Mr. Lopez is retiring from his job as executive director of the Mexican-American Community Services Agency, Inc., to undertake a new role as a teacher at the University of Redlands. Those of us who have known and worked with Mr. Lopez over the years in San Jose recognize the great contribution he can and will make at that fine university. I am sorry to see Mr. Lopez leave San Jose, but I congratulate Redlands on its choice, he will be a real addition to its staff.

The list of Mr. Lopez's memberships in San Jose shows his devotion to this city and its people. It ranges from the Commission on Social Justice of the Archdiocese of San Francisco to the Central Coast Counties Area Planning Committee of the State Department of Rehabilitation. From the start of his career, Mr. Lopez has worked directly with youth and has concentrated on helping us overcome the great social problems of the day. His work before he came to San Jose illustrates his devotion to his fellow man. While in Pueblo, Colo., he was instrumental in starting the Annual Colorado Latin American Conference, now the Colorado Federation of Latin American Groups.

In 1953, Mr. Lopez was honored by the Anti-Defamation League with its America's democratic legacy citation for intergroup understanding. In 1958, he received the valuable citizen award of the Colorado Federation of Latin American Groups, and in 1961, the outstanding citizen award of the Latin American Educational Foundation. In 1962, he was appointed to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission Colorado Advisory Committee.

For the last 5 years he has served us well here. I welcome this opportunity to join in honoring Mr. Lino M. Lopez and I extend my greetings to all of the San Jose citizens who will honor Mr. Lopez on June 6. He has served all of us well.

LACK OF PHILOSOPHER-JURISTS HAS LED TO COURTS' DECLINE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an extremely interesting commentary on the controversy evolving around the Supreme Court was carried in the Friday, May 30, New World, the official newspaper of the archdiocese of Chicago, in a column contributed by Mr. Frank Morriss. His commentary certainly contains a timely and interesting analysis of the courts.

I submit the article as follows:

[From the New World, Chicago, Ill., May 30, 1969]

LACK OF PHILOSOPHER-JURISTS HAS LED TO COURTS' DECLINE

(By Frank Morriss)

The low estate of our courts, including the highest federal one, is more the result of our changed appreciation of what law is and what jurists should be than anything else.

When law becomes an instrument of political or even sociological policy and jurists become parade marshals for such policy, then debasement of the courts is inevitable.

On the other hand, when law is respected as the application to eternal principles, then the integrity of both judge and petitioner is upheld.

Every judge, but especially those on the Supreme Court, should be a philosopher. He will be honest to the degree that he is a philosopher—that is, a "lover of wisdom"—for it is impossible truly to love wisdom and put material gain ahead of it.

Unfortunately, modern understanding of law militates directly against a judge being a philosopher.

In fact, so does modern understanding of philosophy, which now is considered not to be the probing of ultimate reality, but, rather, the truth about man, which becomes the measure of either law or philosophy.

In this, you invite the triumph of the idea of self service. It is self service in which the dishonest man is expert.

In at least the past three decades, law gradually has become simply the lever to work such changes and experiments as the people are willing to tolerate. In such a situation not only is the philosopher unneeded, he becomes definitely an undesirable and an embarrassment.

For the philosopher does not judge legality by what an administration wants or the people will accept, but on what the truth is.

Ironically, it was the Supreme Court justice with the reputation of being a greater philosopher than any who sat on that bench before or since who most contributed to this state of things.

Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. was a philosopher, but unfortunately of the school that had ended in philosophy being merely a kind of science of what man desires and how he reacts.

The idea that rights are outside the practical realm and completely unrelated to man's own desires or abilities was nonsense to Holmes.

It was only one short step in the course of a few years after Holmes' death to the point where the laws were being judged on how well they fulfilled man's desires.

Law, then, of course, begins to operate completely apart from morality or metaphysical truth. It is not necessarily immoral or untruthful—it simply isn't concerned.

Man's responsibility—once presumed by the law—begins to be denied, for when you speak of responsibility you speak of morality.

Now there is almost the unwritten pre-

sumption to the contrary—that is, a presumption that man is not responsible for his acts, at least for his acts against authority, regulation, or order.

Law is seen as a sociological norm only, and the lawbreaker is some sort of a sociological deviant. He doesn't fit in with what the majority views as useful and workable.

The minority, under such a system, quite rightly begin to ask why the majority desire in regards to society should govern simply because it is useful and workable.

And the new jurists find logic in such questioning because they are legally logical enough to appreciate the argument, and philosophically impoverished enough not to see that society should be truthful and not pragmatic.

Because a thing works is no guarantee that it is good. Mere sociological order is not necessarily of benefit to man's nature. Nazism and Communism imposed a quite workable sociological order. Unfortunately, both represent moral and metaphysical disorder and do damage to the spirit of man.

The men who wrote our Constitution were deeply imbued with appreciation for the natural law, and the Constitution is a natural law constitution.

Its concept of authority is that it is an absolute coming from God and His creation, and its concept of the limitation of authority is that man has rights beyond the touch of any human legislator or judge.

These rights are fulfilling for man's nature; they do not impose themselves on any other; they protect individual integrity, but not at the expense of any other man's rights or integrity.

We have come a long way from that noble vision. Rights more and more are being interpreted as freedom for man to do as he pleases. Rights are related by modern jurists to conduct, not to man's nature.

They are related to man's sociological or economic fulfillment, but not at all to his integrity as a man.

The Constitution began to be stretched by politicians and lawyers who became jurists. The stretching was done so that certain social experiments could be allowed, experiments that the men who wrote the Constitution would have said could only erode man's independence.

From an understanding that citizens need help when they cannot succeed in the basics of life, our jurists have moved us to accept the idea that society should not even ask citizens to try to succeed.

This is the idea of the easy way. And, of course, dishonesty, double dealing, soft ethics are the easiest ways of all.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE TRUMAN WARD, MAJORITY CLERK

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our long-time and faithful friend, Truman Ward.

We are privileged for having had the services which Truman Ward rendered as majority clerk of the House. His advice on printing and prompt efficiency in handling our massive volume of printed matter were gladly given; his advice and friendly counsel were always worth hearing.

His feeling for all people and willingness to help any who came to him were genuine attributes which few have, and even fewer take time to exercise. New-

comers seeking employment and many of those displaced by political winds owe their jobs to the efforts of Truman Ward.

There are now few who are part of the operation of Congress, as Members or employees, who can remember a time, 48 years ago, before Truman Ward came to work for the House of Representatives. We will miss him. His death makes an indelible imprint on our hearts. His friendship, integrity, unselfish dedication, and tireless service will not be forgotten.

Mrs. Flynt and my staff join me in extending our condolences and heartfelt sympathy to his family and the staff of his office.

THE MYTHICAL "GENERATION GAP"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the problem of today's youth in becoming oriented to our society and surroundings has been explained away by fanatical professors as a "generation gap."

However, Gen. Thomas A. Lane in his Public Affairs bulletin for June 7 returns the problem to its proper perspective by showing that any "generation gap" is a mere figment of the socialist professors' creative imaginations and a convenient cliché for obscuring their own culpability.

I include General Lane's comment in the RECORD:

UNIVERSITIES BETRAY ACADEMIC RESPONSIBILITY

WASHINGTON.—In a series of reports called "Generations Apart", CBS television has been exploring the generation gap. Interviewing was done on campus by John Lawrence, a recently graduated college newspaper editor.

The first two parts of the series covered the domestic scene. They reported general statistics and gave contrasting views of youths and their parents, of youths at work and youths in college. Unfortunately the interviews were shallow and fleeting. What seemed to be the logical questions were not asked. There was conflict, but why?

The survey reported some general conclusions which confirmed other polls and agreed with observed conditions. Traditional loyalty to our political institutions and readiness to fight for our country are stronger in young people who have gone to work from high school than in those who are in college. Traditional concepts of family and individual morality are stronger in young working people than in college students. The most obvious lesson of the survey is that the colleges are alienating our youth from the basic precepts of our society. Of course these alienated students are also at odds with their parents.

Eighteen years ago, Regnery published William F. Buckley's "God and Man at Yale". Buckley reported the cynical exploitation of student innocence by liberal professors who derided traditional concepts of morality and condemned our political organization of society. He reported the obtuse indifference of the university administration and trustees to this shocking abuse of academic responsibility.

Perhaps the book warned a few parents to send their sons and daughters to better colleges but it had little effect on the climate of higher education. The domination of university policy by the socialist intellectuals was formidable.

This CBS report reveals the inroads which

a sustained betrayal of youth has made in our society. Instead of being introduced to the great minds and great ideas of history which found a happy confluence in our American political experience, American students are getting on too many campuses the shallow rationalizations of nineteenth century materialism. The discredited prophecies of Marx and the perversion of history contained in his dialectical theory are presented not as morbid error but as valid criticism of our political order. The role of teacher is debased by men of shallow intellect and narrow vision who posture before youth as seers.

This condition of our colleges and universities is cause for grave concern. No honest society can pass off such a condition as a mere generation gap. Some differences of age and outlook are natural and ineradicable but they are not to be confused with the ravages of a corrupt educational system. The extent of the corruption is still limited. Its progress is measured by the campus disorders. It is nevertheless a pernicious condition which demands correction.

The first question is whether the trustees of our institutions have the mind and the heart for the task. Can they restore high standards of academic responsibility and clean out the pollution of recent decades? Surely this is where the responsibility rests. Governmental intrusion on the campus can be terminated by ending subsidies to education and making all higher education dependent upon the approval of its patrons.

It is symbolic of this age that young people, heirs to the world's finest political order, with all the treasures of human wisdom open to them, are enticed by the cheap and gaudy pretensions of marxist revolution. They are betrayed by elders who would substitute the hedonism of a permissive society for the discipline of truth. Public comprehension of the event is obscured by the mindless debate about a generation gap.

UNITED MINE WORKERS' LEADERSHIP

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette reprinted the complete text of a letter to John L. Lewis written by Ralph Nader, which contains information of concern and interest to all Members. Accordingly, under unanimous consent I submit the letter for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

MAY 22, 1969.

JOHN L. LEWIS,
President Emeritus, United Mine Workers of America, Alexandria, Va.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: The health, safety and well-being of the coal miners of this country depend on how vigorous and competent the United Mine Workers' leadership is in the defense and advancements of miners' interests. To say that the UMW's present leadership has failed in this mission is to constitute an understatement. Incompetence, sinecurism, waste, remoteness from the rank and file, misuse of Union funds and violations of democratic electoral procedures in an epidemic manner have become a way of life for W. A. Boyle's administration. Without a strong, efficient, democratic Union, the mine workers are left without defenders, without representatives who will fight for their health, their safety and their dignity in labor-management relations. Your his-

toric struggle for the coal miners decades ago informed the country of the hazards and cruelties of coal mining and the callousness of coal corporations. In recent years, the Union that you built has deteriorated into a state of sycophancy toward the coal operators on such crucial matters of health and safety. Old and new miners are embittered with their Union's leaders; several thousand miners in Charleston, West Virginia booed the name of Tony Boyle and hurled their anger and contempt at Union headquarters as they marched by it on the way to the state Capitol earlier this year. Mr. Boyle had to receive a resolution by these miners before he went to West Virginia. The gradual destruction of the Union's strength and stature by Mr. Boyle's administration is reaching crisis proportions. In the interests of the coal miners and the hope for a reformed Union leadership, the following information is brought to your attention as a partially representative sample of the Union's malaise under the present administration:

1. Union leadership has been derelict in not pushing for health and safety laws at the state and federal levels and in ignoring the need for more comprehensive workmen's compensation laws, particularly to cover black lung disease. The Bituminous Coal Operators Association has set the pace on these issues for the Union's leaders and the pace has been to do nothing. Black lung became a major issue in 1968 in spite of Mr. Boyle and his Union bureaucracy, not because of them. People outside the Union—especially three West Virginia physicians—organized and informed the miners about the need for legislation. The Union leadership stood on the sidelines and hurled epithets at the reformers. Even now, while giving lip service to safety and compensation laws, the Union leadership avoid getting on the ramparts and out of their Executive suites. Coal operator muscle is what is being felt in Congress not UMW muscle for stronger health and safety laws. Meanwhile, black lung disease remains massive in coal country.

2. The perpetuation of Mr. Boyle and his colleagues in office is secured by the use of at least 550 bogus locals (not having the 10 active miners minimally required by the UMW Constitution—Article 14, sec. 1) controlled by pensioned, retired miners whose impoverished state is exploited in the direction of automatic voting for the present leadership. These locals are illegal by the UMW's own Constitution. Other electoral irregularities or illegalities include the practice of "electing" leaders of the Districts on the Executive Board by shouting them in at the Convention. This was done in 1968 for a majority of the Districts who were nominated and "elected" by resolution instead of being elected by the membership from the District they represent.

3. The level and nature of UMW leadership expenditures at Conventions are shocking. Over a million dollars was spent at the 1964 Convention (and preparations for) to insure certain changes in the Union Constitution that would serve to perpetuate the incumbent leadership and secure a \$50,000 a year pension for the Union's present President. Moreover, \$390,000 were spent at the 1964 Convention ostensibly on 5 bands which played at the Convention. Tens of thousands of dollars are spent on souvenirs, Zippo lighters and the like at these Conventions by a Union that claims it cannot afford but one full time safety man at its national headquarters in Washington. The UMW's Safety Division is composed of one man—Lewis Evans.

4. Mr. Boyle has encouraged and demanded a saturation campaign of hero-worship and adulation that is characterized by an intensity comparable only to authoritarian or totalitarian rulers of various foreign nations. At the 1968 Convention, an expensive to produce, professional rendition of the Ballad of Tony Boyle was sung. Massively expensive

bands are brought in to engage in 100 minute long hooplas for the leader. His flats, clothed in the guise of resolutions proffered for delegate approval, do not tolerate dissent. Those who have been known to dissent at Conventions are thrown out or stomped on by "White Hats" brought in for the occasion. The United Mine Workers Journal—the only communication link with the miners—brooks no dissent, no letters to the editor column. Rather it is filled with long, redundant praises of Mr. Boyle. In one recent issue of 24 pages, his picture appeared 28 times. Among the Executive Board and other top Union officials, the kinds of discussions which were carried on before Mr. Boyle's ascension are no longer carried on. Conformity and rigid acquiescence are the norms.

5. Probably in no other unionized industry are workers discharged with such frequency, without cause and without indignant defense by the Union for its men. The Union does not stand by its men and the men are saying this with greater openness and forcefulness. They accuse Union officials of informing on them to management, of using management to get men fired who question Union operations and of tolerating inadequate grievance procedures.

6. While Mr. Boyle blasts forth at Conventions against non-union coal operators, he endorses just the opposite by his actions—actions that are not generally known to the rank and file. For example, Mr. Boyle is on the Board of Directors of the National Bank of Washington which the UMW decisively controls by its ownership of approximately 75% of the Bank's stocks. Mr. Boyle votes this stock on behalf of electing Stephen R. Woodzell, President of Potomac Electric Power Co., to the Bank's Board of Directors. PEPCO buys coal from Solar Fuel of Somerset County, Pennsylvania and P.B. & S. Co. of West Virginia and Pennsylvania. These companies are non-union coal operators. What Mr. Boyle says for the record is quite different from what he does in the Bank's Board Room. The Bank does not benefit the coal miners; in fact, it milks the Welfare and Retirement Fund by virtue of the fact that the Fund does not receive interest on millions of dollars deposited in the Bank. The UMW leadership—some of whom reap substantial fees from the Bank—countenance this \$3 or \$4 million deprivation of the Fund. There are also reports from reliable sources that UMW has a part interest in a company that has been selling coal rights to land in West Virginia to a non-union operator.

7. Perhaps the most dismaying behavior of Mr. Boyle and his colleagues has been towards you. At the present time, with the growing criticism of the incumbent UMW President, Mr. Boyle and his group have commenced praising you. They know that only John L. Lewis remains as the hope of the coal miners who desire a reformed, responsive, fighting Union leadership. Fearing you, they have performed in recent years some interesting acts, overt and covert, to freeze you out. Incredible as it may sound to you, Mr. Boyle for several years has made it clear that he does not smile on those who seek counsel from you or who show that their old loyalties to you cannot be displaced by abject fealty to Mr. Boyle. Mr. Boyle wants to displace you as Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund. Boilerplate resolutions began to come to Union headquarters as if they were spontaneous. Here is one such boilerplate resolution from Local Union No. 8126, Whitwell, Tenn.:

"Whereas, The most Honorable John L. Lewis, President Emeritus and father of the United Mine Workers of America, has been a servant and a very great and good leader for the United Mine Workers of America and all laboring people for approximately three decades, and . . . Therefore, be it Resolved, That

the Most Honorable President W. A. (Tony) Boyle be elected to serve in the capacity of our President Emeritus John L. Lewis, who is Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund. (1968)"

Last summer, Mr. Boyle maneuvered through his National Policy Committee a resolution backing him for your position on the Fund and leaving out any reference to the fact that this would double Mr. Boyle's salary unless he refused to take it. The resolution never surfaced at the negotiations with the coal operators, probably because Mr. Boyle realized what an uproar there would be from the rank and file which he could not perhaps control with the knee-jerk efficiency that he controls the Policy Committee. The older workers who remember their struggles and your leadership would not stand for this powergrab.

It is clear that you should resist any attempts to displace you and that, more, you should reject any effort to obtain your approval or acquiescence regarding the deplorable and self-serving leadership of the UMW and their disgraceful policies or non-policies. What is needed is a strong, competent Union serving its members with dedication and propriety and rejecting the electoral violations and the rigged elections with bogus locals. Your assistance in these directions can be invaluable and crucial in recovering the dreams that you worked for during many decades of difficulties. The industry is reaping record sales and record profits; its profitable future is being recognized by all economic analysts. Consequently, the coal industry should share such returns with the men who make them all possible and provide these men with a safe and dust-free environment.

Thank you for whatever consideration you may extend to these pleas.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH NADER.

MORMON CHURCH AUXILIARY OBSERVES CENTENNIAL

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an event in my State this month; that is, the world conference of the Young Women's Mutual Improvement Association, an auxiliary organization of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The YWMA, as we know it at home, was organized November 28, 1869. This organization has touched the lives of hundreds of thousands of young women from the age of 12 to 24 in promoting patriotism, obedience to law, health, education, and morality. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution regarding this centennial which calls on the Members of the House of Representatives to take note of this milestone in Mormon Church history and commends this organization for its fine work.

The resolution follows:

H. Res. 432

Whereas the young women's auxiliary of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—the Young Women's Mutual Improvement Association (YWMA)—was organized November 28, 1869, and is therefore observing its centennial this year with a series of activities in all local congrega-

tions of the Church throughout the world, and

Whereas the YWMA has contributed to the betterment of hundreds of thousands of young girls and women over the past century through organized programs of dance, drama, music, speech, sports, camping, homemaking and spiritual counsel, and

Whereas the YWMA has made an invaluable contribution to preparing young girls for their futures and helping them to make meaningful contributions to their families, their church and to their communities, and

Whereas the highlight of the YWMA centennial will be the annual MIA World Conference on June 27, 28, and 29, at Salt Lake City, Utah; be it

Resolved, That the U.S. House of Representatives pays tribute to this fine organization and commends it for the contributions it makes to the youth of its sponsoring organization and to the nation itself, by helping to develop wholesome, well adjusted, talented young women with high personal ideals and devotion to God and country.

FIELD MARSHALS IN THE SENATE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Union is known for its forthright editorial policy. This fact was evident in its editorial Saturday, May 24, commenting on the criticism of military activities in Vietnam by widely quoted Members of the other body.

I submit the article as follows:

[From the San Diego Union, May 24, 1969]

FIELD MARSHALS IN THE SENATE

In a major position statement May 14 President Richard M. Nixon said he does not consider it necessary, or in the national interest, to surrender in Vietnam.

To the contrary, Mr. Nixon said the integrity and security of the United States more than ever demand a peace with honor in Southeast Asia.

At a minimum this peace requires self determination for South Vietnam, removal of the North Vietnamese invaders and a tranquility that brings American men home.

Six days after the President's outline of the minimum conditions for honorable peace, Sen. J. William Fulbright, in an act which can bring only comfort to the enemy, said the United States will have to get out of Vietnam even if it has to settle for less than a standoff with the Communists. This is defeat.

And this week Sen. Edward M. Kennedy castigated the President for the nature and scope of our military operations in Vietnam, in effect seeking to direct tactics from the Senate floor.

Questioning the wisdom of the President and the performance of the military forces he commands, Senator Kennedy declared: "I feel it is senseless and irresponsible to continue to send our young men to their deaths to capture hills and positions that have no relation to ending this conflict."

Senators Fulbright and Kennedy are not the first politicians who have sought to criticize military operations from the sanctuary of a political rostrum or seek to direct the tactics of a war from afar.

The total unoriginality of the two critical senators is best illustrated by the comments of the Roman general, Lucius Paulus, in 229 B.C. when he was faced with a precisely similar circumstance:

"Commanders," he said, "should be counseled chiefly by persons of known talent, by those who have made the art of war their particular study and whose knowledge is derived from experience; by those who are present at the scene of action, who see the enemy, who see the advantages that occasions offer and who, like people embarked on the same ship, are sharers of the danger.

"If, therefore, anyone thinks himself qualified to give advice respecting the war which I am to conduct, let him not refuse assistance to the state, but let him come with me into Macedonia.

"He shall be furnished with a ship, a tent, and even his traveling charges will be defrayed. But if he is thinking that this is too much trouble, and prefers the repose of the city life to the toils of war, let him not on land assume the office of a pilot."

Well, senators?

DR. CHARLES A. CANNON

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding leaders in the Nation's textile industry, Charles A. Cannon, chairman of the board of Cannon Mills Co., was recently awarded an honorary doctor of business administration degree by Catawba College in Salisbury, N.C.

The citation, read by Dr. Johnny L. Young, chairman of the Catawba faculty senate, praised Mr. Cannon for his "leadership in a dynamic industry, his service as champion of youth and for his devotion to improving the opportunities of his fellow citizens."

In the presence of Dr. Martin L. Shotzberger, 16th president of Catawba College, the degree was conferred by Adrian L. Shuford, of Conover, president of the Catawba board of trustees.

The honorary degree to Mr. Cannon was the fourth of his career. He had previously received degrees of doctor of laws from Duke University and Presbyterian College, Clinton, S.C., and doctor of textile science from North Carolina State University.

Mr. Speaker, this news item from the Kannapolis, N.C., Daily Independent reminds us again that America is a land of opportunity:

DR. CHARLES A. CANNON

The citation read by Dr. Young said:

"President Shotzberger, I have the honor to present for the degree, Doctor of Business Administration, Charles A. Cannon of Kannapolis, N.C.

"Born in Concord, Cabarrus County, North Carolina and educated in the public schools of that city, at Fishburne Military Academy, and at Davidson College, Charles A. Cannon entered the textile industry a half century ago. He quickly rose to prominence in leading his industry to its present state of robust vigor.

"He served through two world wars by coordinating the efforts of manufacturers to meet the staggering needs of our country when she was fighting for her life.

"Early in his career, he became known as a tenacious fighter for equitably priced cotton, reasonable trade laws and enlightened labor relations.

"He has been untiringly devoted to rais-

ing the level of public health and making the best hospital facilities available to Cabarrus and surrounding counties. The Boys Clubs of America, the YMCA, schools and colleges have found in him a sustaining force in promoting developed minds, healthy bodies and strong character.

"In a time of national depression and again in World War II, Charles Cannon demonstrated how strong men react to adversity. When the state of North Carolina faced the possibility of being unable to meet the payroll obligations to its teachers and other employees, it was he who influenced loan sources in the metropolitan centers to come to the aid of a destitute state.

"When in World War II, wage ceilings failed to rise with the needs of laboring families, he pressed successfully for their relief.

"His judgment has been recognized by numerous national honors from banking, the textile industry, and from humanitarian organizations.

"With his gracious wife, he encouraged restoration of historic shrines and the elevation of the cultural level of the entire region.

"For his leadership in a dynamic industry, his service as a champion of youth, and for his devotion to improving the opportunities of his fellow citizens, Catawba College is honored to confer the degree of Doctor of Business Administration upon Charles A. Cannon."

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the executive council of the Textile Workers of America has recently approved a resolution calling for action by both the Congress and the executive branch with regard to the severe industrial health hazards faced by workers in the textile industry. In the 90th Congress, lengthy hearings were held by the Select Subcommittee on Labor on legislation to establish Federal standards for industrial health and safety, and I can assure the House, as an active participant in those hearings that the resolution of the textile workers is a conservative estimate of the health hazards faced by workers in this industry.

The resolution speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION ON OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH HAZARDS IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The health and welfare of textile workers are being threatened by the failure of management to take adequate measures to protect employees from occupational hazards on the job.

Recent scientific investigations have indicated alarmingly high incidence rates of lung disease among certain cotton textile workers resulting from inhaling cotton dust. A study of 2 cotton textile mills in the United States revealed that 25% of the carders and 12% of the spinners were suffering from byssinosis, a lung disease which eventually causes permanent disability. If this and other studies prove representative of the industry as a whole, it means that about 8,000 card room workers and 9,000 spinning room workers are currently suffering from this disease.

Disability awards by the Social Security

Administration indicate that textile workers have been disabled by certain respiratory conditions at rates from 40 to 122% higher than the average for all workers. Population studies are urgently needed to determine the full extent of disabling respiratory disease among retired cotton textile workers.

Asbestos fibers represent an especially dangerous hazard to textile workers. The danger of asbestosis—a disabling lung disease caused by asbestos fiber—has long been known. However, the measures taken by management to reduce the concentrations of asbestos fiber in the air have not been adequate to eliminate the incidence of asbestosis. Moreover, in recent years, cancer of the lung has frequently been associated with asbestosis. A rare type of cancer associated with asbestos dust has been afflicting large numbers of asbestos workers.

Another health hazard which textile workers have been exposed to for years is the excessive level of noise prevalent in many parts of the mill. Recent scientific studies have shown that significant hearing loss results from steady exposure to noise levels in excess of 80 decibels. The level of noise in various sections of a textile mill run as high as 125-130 decibels, with typical measures of 110 for broad looms, 95 for knitting machines, 115 for braiding machines, 105 for winding machines.

It is the responsibility of management to safeguard workers against occupational hazards in the plant. Standards set by the respective state governments have been grossly inadequate. Moreover, the resources applied by the states to enforce these standards have been pitifully small. An average of 40 cents a year per worker is spent by the states for development and enforcement of safety standards.

The efforts to enact a federal Occupational Safety and Health Law last year were frustrated by the powerful business lobby. According to *America's Textile Reporter*, "industry witnesses oppose the bill objectionable because it provides for the establishment of mandatory Federal standards."

The latest attempt to achieve a specific measure of protection for the health of workers has been stalled by the action of Secretary of Labor Shultz in postponing the implementation of an amended regulation issued by former Secretary Wirtz in January. This regulation would have required firms engaged on federal government contracts to limit the exposure of their workers to noise to 85 decibels, with the proviso that a 92-decibel level would be permitted until January 1, 1971. Secretary Shultz has stayed the implementation of this regulation until May 17, 1969. Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Executive Council of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, CLC, that:

1. We call upon the textile industry to take immediate and effective measures to insure that the dust and noise exposure faced by textile workers is reduced to the absolute minimum.

2. We invite all employers to join with us in sponsoring an industrial hygiene program in which the resources of medical science and industrial engineering may be enlisted to find the most effective means of eliminating all on-the-job health hazards.

3. We urge the United States Public Health Service to undertake a study of the incidence of byssinosis among cotton textile workers and of prevalence of disabling respiratory disease among retired cotton textile workers.

4. We reaffirm our support of the Occupational Safety and Health Bill and urge the Nixon Administration to support Federal standards.

5. We request Secretary of Labor Shultz to implement the amended regulations under the Public Contracts Act setting a maximum noise standard of 85 decibels.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, education of our youth is the primary concern of every parent in this country. They want and deserve the best education that is possible.

A few years ago a progressive system of education was developed known as freedom of choice. Under this plan, any youngster was entitled to go to any school in his community. He might prefer the school because of subjects offered, because of teachers, because of facilities, because of better racial balance, or for whatever reason he or his parents chose. This is complete democracy as it gives a full freedom of choice to every individual.

The courts prefer to keep the school system in constant turmoil. With court reversals and new rulings there is no opportunity to build educational stability. The eventual aim of the courts is apparently to have every child spend from 1 to 2 hours on a bus every day.

Every thinking citizen will be interested in reading the excellent editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star on May 31, 1969:

FREEDOM OF CHOICE

Federal judges, whose incompetence to dictate policy to a public school system has been rather convincingly demonstrated here in Washington, are moving on a broad front to strike down "freedom of choice" plans in school attendance.

If the judges were saying that these plans are "free" in name only, that in fact they do not afford a free choice to both black and white children, there could be no quarrel with their position. But this is not what they are saying. Their position is that freedom of choice plans, no matter how free the choice may be, are not producing a degree of integration that is satisfactory to the judges, and that therefore they are unlawful. This without any clue or hint from the judges as to what degree of integration would be satisfactory to them.

Earlier this month a three-judge federal court in Jackson, Mississippi, rejected a request from the Department of Justice and civil rights attorneys that they outlaw freedom of choice plans in 20 to 30 south Mississippi school districts. The three-judge court said: "The freedom of choice plan in all of these cases is universally acclaimed by both races in all schools as being most desirable, most workable and acceptable by everybody. No one testified to anything to the contrary or to anything better. . . . No parent or child in any school has complained to anybody of any discriminatory treatment . . . or any failure of the freedom of choice plan to operate effectively."

The Department of Justice and the civil rights lawyers have taken an appeal from this ruling to the Fifth Federal Circuit Court, and that tribunal probably will reverse the three-judge court.

One may anticipate a reversal because the judges of the Fifth Circuit Court, in their infinite wisdom, have just overturned a ruling by federal district judges in Louisiana which had approved freedom of choice plans in 37 cases. The appellate court said the Louisiana plan had not resulted in enough integration, and this again without saying how much integration is enough.

What this means is that local school officials in the affected districts must compel, or try to compel, an unspecified number of white children to attend predominantly Negro schools, and an unspecified number of black children to attend predominantly white schools.

The Louisiana superintendent of schools says this will have "a very, very bad effect on public schools." If there are those who doubt this, they might take a hard look at what pressure for integration has produced in the public schools of our own city. The result has been, not integration in any meaningful sense, but a form of resegregation which to say the very least, has not improved the quality of public school education for children of either race.

SALUTE THE AIR FORCE ON ARMED FORCES DAY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the headlines are filled with charges and countercharges involving our military forces, when suspicion is being cast upon the motives or the capability of some of our leaders, when discord generally racks our Nation—it is refreshing to read what the editorial writers of the Playground Daily News in Fort Walton Beach, Fla., think of the men who wear the uniform. It is a gratifying change, and I am confident what is said in the editorial is an expression of the feelings of most of us toward our "neighbors in blue."

The editorial which appeared in the Playground Daily News on May 14, 1969, follows:

SALUTE THE AIR FORCE ON ARMED FORCES DAY
Saturday is Armed Forces Day, and in the Playground area 'Armed Forces' means Air Force.

Sure, we count among our citizens members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard, and we are proud to have them among us. But Fort Walton Beach is an Air Force town—the Sonic Boom City. And Valparaiso is the official 'home' of Eglin Air Force Base, the world's largest Air Force installation.

Air Force men are often fond of calling themselves civilians in blue suits, modestly discounting their role as military strategists and leaders. But to the Playground area, just what is an Air Force man?

We would answer the question this way—based on recent, typical news accounts.

An Air Force man is the guy who lives next door to you. He's the fellow who borrows your lawn mower—or maybe you borrow his.

He's the man whose training has made him alert and resourceful enough so he can save the life of a tourist (given up for dead) at the beach.

He's the man who buys his magazine from your son in junior high school. Maybe he's the owner of the big dog who chased your cat up a tall pine tree.

He's the man whose widow will put aside some of her inheritance to provide leadership awards for Choctawhatchee's ROTC unit in his memory.

He's the man whose daughter will babysit with your youngsters and whose wife will swap recipes with yours over the hedge in the back yard.

He's the man whose son has been in eight schools in the past eleven years, but who still is named 'STAR' Student for the county.

He might be the man who wakes you up gunning his Mustang down the street at three o'clock in the morning.

But he's the same guy who is quietly gone one day and turns up in news reports of heroic action over North Viet Nam.

He's the man who decides to retire here and make this his home, too. He's the man who becomes part of the backbone of the business and professional community. He's the biggest booster of the Chamber of Commerce, or he puts his talents to work and takes a job teaching your children.

He's the president of the local Service Club, or maybe you see him on Sundays in church with his family.

He's the guy who invites you over for barbecue (and burns it on his new grill.)

He's the man who arranges a fishing trip for handicapped children just for the fun of seeing the joy in their faces.

He's the man who keeps the peace in a dozen European countries or watches the jittery borders of Korea, for the kind of pay that would make most men smile in disbelief.

He's the man whose family manages without him while he is on solitary, isolated assignment somewhere where he can't take them.

He's just an ordinary guy—the man next door. A good neighbor, a dependable friend; a man who cares about the country and the community.

A civilian in a blue suit. You know him because he stands a little taller because he wears it.

In other words, an Air Force man. We salute him.

ESSAY WINNER IRENE LEE PRESENTS CASE OF THE HANDICAPPED

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, our present domestic crisis has led many Americans to reassess many of their longstanding notions of the American dream, or vision of equal opportunity.

A recent essay written by a young Hawaiian citizen, Miss Irene Lee, has underscored the need for recognizing the 22 million handicapped Americans for whom the gates of opportunity have often been closed as the result of a misunderstanding of their physical potentials. Rehabilitated handicapped persons, as Miss Lee has forcefully emphasized, ought to be viewed not as "business risks, but rather investments."

Miss Lee's essay took first place in the "Ability Counts" Survey Contest sponsored locally in Hawaii by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in cooperation with the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Hawaii, and the Hawaii State Federation of Labor AFL-CIO. The essay also received an honorable mention rating from the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

I believe my colleagues will find it of great interest to read Miss Lee's prize-winning essay, which I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the RECORD:

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Irene Lee, W. R. Farrington High School, Honolulu, Hawaii)

Is the American dream, the vision of equal opportunity, still alive? Are all Amer-

icans given the change to pursue happiness and promote their general welfare? No, the American dream is not alive for all Americans. Equal opportunity does not knock at every door, nor does every door open for the twenty-two million handicapped Americans. Often, persons are deprived the privilege of proving themselves, for doors of employment are blindly shut to those who are not in full physical capacity. Employers often pass up the opportunity to hire good workers because they have not been made aware of handicapped persons' potentials.

The average employer seeks a worker with skill, experience, some background training, and education. He seeks a worker who can adjust emotionally to the job situation, a person who is dependable, safe, and productive. The employer knows what sort of person he wants, but does he know he can find the qualities of a top-notch employee in a handicapped person?

Not all employers know that during the period of rehabilitation, handicapped persons receive individual vocational and guidance counseling. They do not know that the handicapped individual has been aided by experts to fit his abilities to suit the particular job he is capable of doing. After a person has been fitted for a job, he is trained. Expert consideration, advice, and training make for personalized job fitting. This in turn makes for efficient, qualified workers, who are able to perform as well as any other employee.

When handicapped persons are given the opportunity to prove themselves, they perform diligently and dependably. A recent six month survey of one hundred workers compares the dependability of the handicapped employee to the unimpaired employee. Three handicapped workers as compared to four unimpaired employees left their jobs in the same span of time. Not only are handicapped workers stable employees, but also they are regularly punctual. Of the same hundred workers, 3.4 days were missed by handicapped persons as compared to 3.8 days missed by unimpaired workers over a period of one hundred days.

Possibly because the handicapped worker knows the seriousness of injury and the torturous trials of recuperation, he is a cautious, safe employee. Handicapped persons across the nation have accumulated an admirable safety record. They take added safety precautions for they realize that a little extra time and a little extra care make for a lot safer working situation. Safety saves the employer undue worry and added business expenses.

Patience and extra care also make for quality production. One who has known personal trials and has overcome obstacles through perseverance and patience can confront working situations with a calmer, more analytical approach. Handicapped workers have proven that they can produce as much as any other average worker. They can meet situations squarely and thoughtfully.

Handicapped workers are not business risks, but rather investments. They are trained and educated; their skills have been developed with expert guidance. Not only are the handicapped dependable, punctual, and safe, but also they are productive and emotionally stable. Cumulative records have shown such results and so do personal case histories.

Jobs, such as mat weaving, painting, and commercial design, which require patience, artistic creativity, and manual dexterity, are excellent jobs for some handicapped persons. In Hawaii, the mat industry relies heavily on handicapped workers for production of intricately woven lauhala products. Artistic creativity can also be combined with managerial know-how. For example, one of the partners in a prominent commercial design firm in Honolulu is a crippled man. Government agencies hire engineering draftsmen and programmers who are physi-

cally hindered. Physical impairments do not handicap the creative mind. The handicapped do perform just as capably as any other workers. Handicaps do not interfere with job performance if a person is placed in the right job.

Not all workers will fit well in all jobs, but when a worker has the needed capabilities and he has been expertly trained, he has within him the potential for success. Given a chance to prove his worth, such a worker can become a valuable, productive individual utilizing his human resources. By giving handicapped persons a fair chance, employers across the nation will be working toward the reality of opportunity for the twenty-two million handicapped Americans. They will be striving to keep the American dream alive.

PAY TV—THE FCC CREATES A LEGAL THICKET

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently many people have expressed grave concern over the FCC's determination to authorize pay TV beginning June 12. I believe their concern is warranted on several points—but primarily because the FCC is creating a legal thicket with this proposed area of broadcasting.

If the Commission is allowed to proceed unchecked by Congress it will be the Congress, the Members of this House, who will be called upon at some later date to unsnarl the communications systems which will be tangled in this issue.

The FCC has ignored the views of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and has set itself up as totally independent of the legislative branch. The FCC has indirectly ignored the views of the Congress and of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this system of pay TV which is projected by the Commission. Congress, I believe, should assume the initiative; first, in halting FCC actions to license stations; and second, by thoroughly investigating to determine whether the Federal Communications Commission even has the authority to regulate in this area.

Regardless of the conditions imposed now and the regulations on the books, if pay TV is established on a nationwide basis, I feel it will only be a matter of time until the public will have to pay for many of the major sports events which now are viewed on conventional TV at no cost. This is the camel's nose under the tent. Pay TV should be summarily rejected. Television licenses are very valuable and there is no evidence that there is an economic hardship on those who have these licenses. The public should not be gouged in a system of charges for movies, athletic events, and other special features which could be eventually shifted from conventional TV to pay TV.

Although in deciding to accept applications for pay TV broadcasting, the Commission established regulations which are supposed to protect the viewer, I do not believe they will succeed, and this is a basic reason for my opposition.

The FCC has attempted to prevent siphoning of programs from conventional to pay TV. I do not believe they will be able to do this. On the other hand, there is nothing compulsory about the FCC's decision. No one will have to pay for anything, unless, of course, he chooses to subscribe to a pay TV system. The Commission has also attempted to provide protection by requiring that no pay TV operation may be established unless there are four or more conventional stations already serving the area.

It is interesting to note the degree to which the FCC will go in circumventing the wishes of Congress. A resolution directed specifically at the FCC and its proposals for pay TV by the House Commerce Committee is abundantly clear:

Be it resolved that . . . it is the sense of the Committee that the Federal Communications Commission should further refrain from acting upon its order until the end of the first session of the 91st Congress or completion of action upon legislation.

An earlier resolution was even more to the point:

It has not been established to the satisfaction of this Committee that authority to license Subscription Television operations comes within the power of the Commission.

It makes little difference to the Commission that it has acted over the direct objections of the Congress—objections expressed by the Commerce Committees of both House and Senate. In fact, in the report prepared and published in the Federal Register, the Commission notes on the second page:

The Commerce Committees of both houses of Congress have expressed their views either questioning the jurisdiction of the Commission to license STV (subscription TV) operations or stating that such operations should not be authorized by the Commission without specific authorization by law.

In a classic example of the growing self-sufficiency of the administrative bureaucracy, FCC Chairman Rosel H. Hyde replied September 3, 1968, that additional delay "would constitute, in effect, a failure of the administrative process."

What he is saying is that the Commission is going to have its way regardless of what the Congress might want or think best.

There is serious question that the Commission has the authority to regulate in this new area. Yet it goes its merry way and worries only about its flutulent "administrative process" rather than abuse of delegated power.

The Commission has the preliminaries worked out in this way. They will begin accepting applications to establish pay TV as of June 12. Unfortunately, in some areas a scare campaign has misled many people into thinking that after this date they will be forced to pay to watch their television. This is totally false. There is nothing compulsory about the program.

After being granted a license, a pay TV station would transmit a garbled signal. Either the audio portion or the video portion—or both in some instances—would be unintelligible. Any TV set could receive the signals but only a set which has a decoder would be able to unscramble this signal. The subscriber

would pay a charge to have this decoder installed on this set. When the station transmits a program he wants to see, all he would have to do is activate the decoder and then pay the prescribed charge for this service.

Such a system has been operated on a trial basis. The FCC authorized an experiment in pay TV in Hartford, Conn. The test began in June 1962, and through a series of 3-year extensions continues today. Statistics gathered from this trial run indicate that during one period about 85 percent of the programming was of feature films; about 5 percent was sports and 5 percent special entertainment. Remaining time was devoted to educational programming. Feature films consisted primarily of movies which had been recently released to movie houses and which—because of the cost—could not have been purchased and run by conventional networks. Sports included programs such as those generally blacked out in the area, or ones usually shown on closed-circuit TV in theatres. A heavy-weight fight between Sonny Liston and Cassius Clay was one of these. Special entertainment included plays, opera, ballet, concerts, and recitals, variety, and nightclub programs. The cost of viewing these programs varied from \$3 for the title fight to a minimum of 50 cents. The average cost of the feature films was just over \$1. In Hartford, the installation cost of the decoder was \$10 and there was an additional monthly rental cost of \$3.25. The operators of the Hartford station said that the average weekly expenditure for the service was \$1.22. You can easily see how the charges would mount in such a system. This is the "gouging" to which the public would be exposed.

My primary opposition to pay TV is based on my concern that it, like so many other Government-controlled operations, will get out of hand. Then the viewer stands to lose. He would be faced with an additional cost; an added bill where there once was a free service.

This is a legitimate concern but there is more involved. There is the question of a Federal agency operating beyond the scope of its delegated authority; there is the question of congressional inaction and condescension; and there is the concern that with this decision the Commission is creating a tangle of legal questions involving public utility requirements, copyright laws, broadcasting rights, networks, satellites, CATV, radio, and commercial interests.

There is already confusion between pay TV and cable TV or CATV. Cable TV systems have operated for several years and in several areas of the 17th Congressional District. Generally they service areas which regular commercial stations do not reach, or reach with weak signals. Subscribers hook directly into a cable which transmits the television picture and sound. CATV subscribers pay an installation charge and a flat monthly fee.

Cable TV is relatively new. The FCC and the Congress are still studying its particular problems and effects on the broadcasting industry. Yet, before these problems are satisfactorily answered the Commission complicates the issue with

its authorization of a pay TV system. Even now proponents of pay TV are busily studying the possibilities of cable-pay TV.

It is obvious to me that Congress must begin to exert its legitimate control.

In addition to the problems inherent in the Commission's decision, a recent advertising campaign has substantially contributed to the problem by inflaming this already critical issue.

I have asked the Federal Trade Commission to investigate an ad published recently in TV Guide which misrepresents the impact of pay TV and charges that viewers will be compelled to pay to watch their sets. This is outright misrepresentation of fact and I believe the clear intent was to arouse readers. This is a very carefully worded statement and it was done either through gross ignorance and irresponsibility or much more likely, through deliberate intent.

I have asked the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the circumstances surrounding the ad and I have also suggested that the FTC request from TV Guide its reason for accepting for publication such blatantly false advertising.

While I totally oppose the authorization grant for pay TV, the issue should be decided on the facts, not on smear statements and scare tactics.

PROFESSOR GARDNER URGES FREE
USE OF INTELSAT BY UNITED
NATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the advent of communication satellites provides an unparalleled opportunity to draw the nations of the world together for the interchange of ideas and information for peaceful purposes. Satellite television has immeasurable advantages over short-wave radio. Not only does television have a greater impact than voice broadcasts, but the quality of satellite television is far better and it has a much broader range of coverage than shortwave radio.

One of the limiting factors on the use of communication satellites is the cost of renting channels from the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium—Intelsat. Free use of satellites by the United Nations would help bring the story of United Nations activities to the people of the world as well as to help meet the U.N.'s need for better communications to manage its worldwide operations.

The problems associated with satellite television have been recently explored at hearings held by the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I commend to your reading a most comprehensive statement presented at the subcommittee hearings on May 14, 1969, by Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses, professor of law and international organization, Columbia Univer-

sity, and formerly Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. His statement contains a number of recommendations including the free use of communication satellites by the United Nations. Mr. Gardner's statement, entitled "International Political and Legal Ramifications of Satellite Broadcasting," follows:

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL AND LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS OF SATELLITE BROADCASTING

"Wars," in the words of UNESCO's constitution, "begin in the minds of men." To eliminate war, we must somehow change the attitude of national groups toward one another and move toward cooperation instead of conflict.

Dramatic new techniques of communication are now becoming available to help us do this. Foremost among these is the communications satellite, which offers us an unprecedented instrument to promote world understanding. Future historians may judge the communications satellite to be as important a scientific breakthrough as the atomic bomb.

One might even say that the world is witnessing a fateful race between two types of scientific development. On the one hand, there are the terrible new weapons that can destroy mankind—intercontinental ballistic missiles, orbital bombs, and chemical and bacteriological warfare. On the other hand, there are developments like communication satellites that could unite all of mankind into one radio or television listening audience. Through a strange coincidence of scientific development, the period in the late 1970s or early 1980s when the Chinese are likely to be able to deliver sophisticated nuclear warheads around the world in large quantities could also be the time when the Chinese people might be reached with radio and TV programs sent directly from communication satellites to home receivers.

The world is already well into the age of the communication satellite. The satellites now stationed over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by the International Telecommunication Satellite Consortium (Intelsat) not only represent a massive addition to intercontinental telephone capacity, but they also make possible the simultaneous transmission of television programs.

However, this is only the beginning. We are on the verge of a breakthrough to a new kind of communication satellite that will represent a change perhaps even more revolutionary in its political and economic implications than that represented by existing communication satellites.

The present satellites are *point-to-point* satellites, which will relay communications from one ground station to many stations simultaneously, thus bypassing the necessity of distribution through the conventional ground communications network. Within a year or two such satellites could be available to transmit FM radio or TV to specially equipped community or village receivers. Within five or 10 years such satellites could also be available to broadcast directly into home radio or TV sets over an area of a million square miles.

The difference between broadcast satellites and point-to-point satellites is both economic and political. Because they bypass the need for expensive ground relay systems, broadcast satellites may be cheaper and more effective than alternative means of communication for reaching large areas, particularly in less developed countries like India, Pakistan, Indonesia and Brazil.

Broadcast satellites also raise the possibility of broadcasting to the citizens of a country without the consent and perhaps even over the opposition of its government. The prospect of bypassing national broadcasting networks has alarmed some people.

In the corridors of the United Nations, one delegate from a less developed country has remarked: "The heads of foreign states will soon be able to address my people, but our own president will not be able to do so. What is the U.N. going to do to help us?"

Of course, it can be argued that space broadcasting is merely an extension of the broadcasting on shortwave now carried on by such agencies as the Voice of America, the British Broadcasting Corporation, and Radio Moscow. It is, however, a significant extension. Unlike shortwave broadcasting, radio programs broadcast from space will be indistinguishable, so far as quality of reception is concerned, from radio programs broadcast locally. And television programs sent from space will have a substantially greater psychological impact than shortwave radio broadcasts.

The heart of the political problem can be summed up thus: Countries with no immediate prospect of carrying on space broadcasting fear that the United States, the Soviet Union or possibly a joint European satellite authority may use this technology to send their people political or commercial messages that the governments do not like. Unless it is possible to allay the fears of such countries about uncontrolled communication with their populations and give them an interest in the use of this technology for their own benefit, the enormous potential of broadcast satellites may never be realized.

Indeed, some influential voices have already urged crippling restraints on space broadcasting. A French official of the International Telecommunication Union went so far as to propose that, in the absence of general agreement among all countries, space broadcasting should be prohibited. A Swedish professor has urged that we should "set aside, with respect to outer space, the old terrestrial principles of unlimited information and opinion" in favor of exclusive control by a world agency that would have to "refrain from the dissemination of programs against which objections are raised even by a minority."

Acceptance of this view would mean no space broadcasting at all, since no agreement is likely to be achieved with the communist countries in the foreseeable future on the ground rules for joint management of such a system and on the type of programs that should be transmitted. Communist countries have been urging a ban on the use of space for "war propaganda," which could embrace any ideas which communist leaders conceived to be harmful to their own interests. It is difficult to see why the Soviet Union should be given a veto over a joint U.S.-Indian venture to provide India with a broadcast satellite system, or a similar undertaking in Europe resulting from agreement among the North Atlantic nations.

The legitimacy of space broadcasting has already been debated in the International Telecommunication Union. Under the I.T.U.'s Convention and Radio Regulations, the airwaves cannot be used for any purpose unless frequencies are set aside for that purpose. When frequencies are allocated, and the regulations of the I.T.U. are otherwise complied with, all members are obligated by Article 47 of the Convention to avoid harmful interference. The question raised in the I.T.U. is whether space broadcasting is a legitimate use of the airwaves for which frequencies should be allocated, thus affording space broadcasting legal protection from jamming and other harmful interference.

In 1959 the Radio Regulations were amended at the initiative of the Nordic countries to prohibit so-called "pirate broadcasts" from ships at sea. As a result, paragraph 422 of the Radio Regulations now reads:

The establishment or use of broadcasting stations (sound broadcasting and television broadcasting stations) on board ships, air-

crafts or any other floating or airborne objects outside national territories is prohibited.

If broadcast satellites are included in this definition, their broadcasts would also be prohibited and would not be afforded protection from harmful interference under the I.T.U. Convention and Radio Regulations.

This question was raised directly in 1963, when Working Group 4B of the I.T.U.'s Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference considered broadcasting from satellites. The French delegation proposed that paragraph 422 of the Radio Regulations be amended to prohibit the establishment and use of sound broadcasting and television broadcasting stations on any space object. The United States urged the conference to recommend that, until such time as bands were allocated for broadcast satellites, experimental programs for the development of a broadcast satellite service should be carried on in technically suitable bands now allocated to the broadcast service—on condition that there be no interference with established broadcasting services operating in such bands.

After some discussion, it was agreed that experimental space broadcasting could be conducted in accordance with the present Radio Regulations. Whether broadcast satellite operations, as opposed to mere experiments, could be undertaken in accord with the Radio Regulations was not determined.

The question of space broadcasting is now under study by Group 4 of the I.T.U.'s International Consultative Committee. It is certain to come up when new frequency allocations are proposed for space communications at the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference expected to be held in 1970 or 1971.

The time has come to develop a program for the cooperative use of space broadcasting in the service of human needs. Unless such a program is developed soon by those who believe in an open world society broadcast satellites may be blocked or impeded by one or more of the following possibilities:

- (1) Failure of the I.T.U. to allocate the necessary frequencies for space broadcasting;
- (2) A decision in the I.T.U. or the United Nations denying the legality of space broadcasting; or
- (3) A decision giving exclusive control of space broadcasting to an international agency operating on the basis of unanimous agreement.

To avoid these possibilities, we need a program that will emphasize, not the competitive penetration of populations for propaganda or commercial advantage, but cooperative ways of using broadcast and point-to-point satellites for world understanding and development. The following are some possible elements in such a program:

First, we should proceed as rapidly as possible with the development of broadcast satellites.

The U.S. Communication Satellite Corporation (Comsat), which is already studying space broadcasting, should be encouraged to finance some of the research and development itself. The U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Agency should maintain a supplementary program to the extent necessary to get the job done.

The development of a network of broadcast satellites should be the number one outer space objective of the United States and its partners in the 1970s. In terms of its consequences for the future of humanity, this could be at least as important as landing a man on the moon and sending instruments to gather data on Mars or Venus.

Comsat and its partners in Intelsat should be encouraged to provide broadcast satellite service as well as point-to-point satellite service. These services involve the same technology. Where direct broadcasting is serving an essentially public purpose, such

as the establishment of a national TV network, the governments concerned—let us say India or a group of Latin American countries—could build the ground stations and pay Intelsat to put up the satellites, with financial assistance for the purpose from national or international aid agencies.

Second, we should promote international understanding of the benefits which space broadcasting can bring to mankind, particularly to the less developed countries, by encouraging studies in appropriate international organizations, including the United Nations, UNESCO, and the I.T.U. It is gratifying that the General Assembly has asked its Outer Space Committee to study satellite communications, including broadcast satellites, and that a subcommittee will meet this summer to consider the political, economic and social aspects of the problem.

Third, we should help organize pilot projects, under the auspices of the U.N. and UNESCO if possible, to demonstrate the use of space broadcasting for political and economic development. Such projects, which initially would involve broadcasting from satellites to community receivers, could assist national efforts in the eradication of illiteracy, the introduction of new agricultural techniques, or the encouragement of family planning.

India would be an excellent place in which to start. It is the perfect case of a less developed country with large areas not covered by adequate terrestrial facilities, where space broadcasting offers a cheaper and more effective means of communication than microwave and cables.

Fourth, we should encourage national aid agencies and international lending agencies such as the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the International Development Association to finance the establishment of communication satellite systems in less developed countries, not only for point-to-point satellite communications, but for space broadcasting as well. National and international technical assistance agencies should help train local nationals in the use of satellite communications.

Fifth, the U.S. and other countries with a potential capability for space broadcasting should reassure friendly governments that broadcast satellites will not be used to send political or commercial messages to their populations against their will.

It would be difficult to do this in any case. In the early stages, the government concerned would prohibit the special equipment (community receivers, special antennae for home receivers) needed to receive broadcasts. Jamming of such broadcasts, though more difficult and expensive than the jamming of shortwave broadcasts, is nonetheless possible. If a less developed country lack the resources to jam by itself, it might get foreign assistance in doing so.

Quite apart from the technical difficulties involved in trying to impose space broadcasting, political considerations would preclude it in countries where the United States or another space broadcaster wished to maintain good relations. And the broadcasting of commercial messages would be futile in a country whose government was not prepared to permit importation of the commodities.

A satellite broadcasting system for India should be programmed by the Indians themselves. Satellite broadcasting covering many countries, as would be the case with Latin America, should be programmed on a cooperative and regional basis by the countries of the region themselves. Assistance in programming could, of course, be provided upon request by foreign governments or international agencies. But in each case the receiving countries, through their appropriate broadcasting entities, should control what programs are broadcast to their people.

To this general rule of broadcasting by consent there should be but one limited though important exception: we should not foreclose the possibility of communicating with the populations of hostile states in a critical period of international relations.

Sixth, we should initiate discussions and resolutions in the United Nations and UNESCO that will encourage the cooperative development of space broadcasting. Initiatives in the international forums endorsing cooperative activities provide the best way of avoiding decisions restricting use of the new technology.

Seventh, we should seek a decision in the I.T.U. allocating radio frequencies for space broadcasting operations (frequencies have so far only been allocated for experiments). If we engage an adequate number of developed and less developed countries in cooperative studies and pilot projects, a sufficient majority in the I.T.U. will have been of self-interest to vote for the frequency allocation.

Eighth, we should use communication satellites to bring the story of U.N. activities, including U.N. proceedings, to the people of the world.

Such use is now very limited, partly because of the cost of renting channels from Intelsat. I believe it would be in the interest of Intelsat, as well as in the interest of the entire world, that channels be made available to the U.N. without charge.

Free use of satellites would also help meet the U.N.'s urgent need for better communications to manage its world-wide operations. During the Middle East crisis of June, 1967 the U.N. was seriously handicapped by its inadequate communications arrangements—the Secretary-General and his staff did not know what was going on in the area until many hours later. The U.N. will never be an adequate peacekeeping agency until it has better communications facilities at its disposal.

Satellites are becoming so big and small additions to capacity so inexpensive that channels could be made freely available to the U.N. without impairing the economic basis of the Intelsat system. This would be a good "public relations" investment for Intelsat: It would broaden international support for the Intelsat arrangements as well as encourage U.N. use of point-to-point and broadcast satellites.

I hope, therefore, in the negotiations now underway in Washington, the U.S. delegation will propose, and other delegations will agree, that Intelsat facilities be made available without charge to the United Nations—for radio and TV programs produced by the U.N. and also for the U.N.'s own internal communications needs.

In December, 1961, the U.N. General Assembly noted "the potential importance of communication satellites for use by the United Nations and its principal organizations and specialized agencies for both operational and informational requirements." In the spirit of this resolution, U Thant has set in motion within the Secretariat a study of how the U.N. might use new communication techniques like satellites to help accomplish its objectives.

When the Secretary-General's study is completed, I hope he will propose, and I hope the General Assembly will approve, a substantial expansion of the work of the U.N.'s Radio and Visual Services Department now budgeted at the totally inadequate figure of \$2 million.

Equally important, the Assembly should adopt a resolution:

(1) Providing for an annual "State of the World" TV and radio address by the Secretary-General which U.N. members would be asked to carry on their TV and radio networks, and

(2) Urging U.N. members to devote at least one hour a week of prime TV time (or radio time where TV does not exist) to programs produced at U.N. headquarters.

The Radio and Visual Services Department of the U.N. Office of Public Information has already demonstrated its capacity to produce such programs—some showing the executive activities of the U.N. at headquarters and in the field, others giving representative and balanced highlights of U.N. debates.

Many U.N. members provide no radio or TV reporting to their populations on U.N. activities. Many allow their people to hear only those parts of U.N. debates that represent their national point of view. One hour a week of U.N.-produced programs, including highlights of debates, could be a useful corrective. It would surely be a great step toward peace if the people of Egypt and Israel, for example, could have even a few minutes exposure per week to another view of the Middle East problem.

We should have no illusions that those U.N. members with tightly closed national societies would immediately implement such a resolution. But a resolution of this kind might well mobilize international and domestic opinion upon them to implement it after a number of years. At the very least, it would reveal very clearly which countries are really prepared to take practical steps toward international understanding and a more effective United Nations—and which are not prepared to do so.

The United States should take the lead in demonstrating the possibilities of promoting international understanding through communication satellites. We should give the Soviet leaders the opportunity to talk directly to the American people at regular intervals on TV in return for the same privilege for our leaders in the Soviet Union.

The possibilities opened up by communication satellites for world development and understanding are truly exciting. They provide an opportunity to create more open national societies, which are not merely desirable for their own sake, but are essential ingredients of a peaceful international community. To make use of this opportunity, however, we will need to display the same ingenuity in political and social arrangements that we have already demonstrated in the technical sphere.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE TRUMAN WARD, MAJORITY CLERK

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this House, regardless of whether we sit on one side of the aisle or the other, lost a great and good friend this week. For 48 years Truman Ward served the Members of this House with great distinction, impartiality, and devotion. His place will be hard to fill.

Mr. Speaker, our late friend came to this House in 1921 at the age of 29 and served as majority or minority clerk from that time until his passing last Sunday at the age of 76.

Born in Enterprise, Clarke County, Miss., where his early years were spent, Truman exemplified the finest traditions of the Deep South he loved so well. Kindly and thoughtful, his life was spent in the service of others.

Mrs. Daniels joins with me in extending our deepest sympathy to Truman's widow and his three fine sons.

SPEECH BEFORE NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL'S HOME SAFETY SPRING WORKSHOP

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in today's technological world, the phrase, "survival of the fittest" is almost irrelevant. Mr. Charles C. Johnson, the Administrator of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service summed up the situation very adequately when he said:

We live in troubled times, and they show all too clearly the terrible interplay of forces between man and the whole bio-community of which he is part. We find ourselves today catapulted into a new kind of world which we approach as strangers in a strange land.

The wonders of science, electronics, medicine have allowed even the most unfit to compete with the fittest so that their chances for survival are nearly equal. But nearly equal does not assume that these chances are all that good, they are merely different. Where man need not worry as much about the effects of disease, weather, or sudden attacks from wild animals, he must now worry about the dangers that may arise from those very things which are protecting him from his past fears.

An invention is defined as the combination of old things to create something new. It is unfortunate, however, that with many inventions, too many new things are created, not all of which are desirable. The introduction of the birth control pill has gone a long way toward solving our population problems but in its wake has created new health hazards. The color television has brought the movies into our homes but has also brought the dangers of harmful exposure to radiation. The new trend in music with electronically amplified instruments, Ralph Nader warns us, creates a volume of noise that impairs our hearing. Man can no longer possibly expect to understand and control his environment in all its complexity and this loss of understanding and control leaves him wide open for accidents which he can neither predict nor prevent. What better reason could explain the appalling statistics which reveal that each year over 100,000 deaths and 50 million injuries occur as a result of accidents.

Mr. Thomas F. Williams, Director of Public Affairs for the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare spoke last week before the National Safety Council's Annual Home Safety Spring Workshop. His insightful analysis of our Nation's tremendous responsibility for anticipating and preventing accidents is both a warning and an urgent call for a reevaluation of man's relation to his environment. He summarizes the Government's past contributions to accident prevention as significant and substantial, but nonetheless inadequate and asserts that it is time to discard outmoded concepts and obsolete thinking. Just as our Government

has sworn to protect those rights it guarantees us in the Bill of Rights, Mr. Williams believes that the Government must protect our most newly recognized right, the right "to be protected against unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market." He urges Government not to rest on its past laurels. "To do so," he warns, "would be to turn our backs on the future—and the future, judging by the past, is not to be trusted that far." It is men such as this, with the foresight and concern to plan for tomorrow that will ultimately enable us to trust that future and I include Mr. Williams' speech in the RECORD and commend it for most careful consideration by the Members of Congress:

It is a pleasure to be here and to have this opportunity to participate in the National Safety Council's Annual Home Safety Spring Workshop. I have been asked to speak on the Accident Prevention program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I will do that. But I trust you will accept, in addition, a few remarks that range beyond my assigned topic; for it is the view of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, a new agency of Health, Education, and Welfare, for which I work, that our Department's accident prevention efforts can be of little avail unless everyone concerned with the problem in both the public and private sectors of society, begin to abandon some of our most cherished ancient convictions about the problem and try to find contemporary reality instead.

At their polar extremes, the two most hotly defended emotional convictions about accident prevention run from the one end where it is asserted that virtually any attempt to tamper with man's environment toward the end of making it a less dangerous place is a waste of time and money and maybe psychologically damaging to the proper development of a species which, after all, must face enough challenge to remain alert, lean and reasonably aggressive. At the other end it is asserted that virtually all potential hazards to life and limb can and should be eliminated by society. All the square corners should be rounded off the tables, kitchen knives properly labelled, dulled and locked away and the whole world made in the disparaging words of the opposition—perfectly idiot proof.

Every person in this room takes a personal view of man's capacity to deal with the accident prevention and other social problems at some point on the line that runs between these two extremes. The particular point of view selected, psychiatry has by now made very clear, has little to do with the problems themselves but depends instead on forces, mainly unconscious, deriving from the total experience of each individual's life. The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service is not under the illusion that it can do very much about the emotional proclivities of individuals but it does believe that constructive action toward cutting the toll of accidental injuries will be greatly enhanced when most of us share a common view of the fundamental nature of the physical environment in which we live.

The first piece of reality which all of us must face is that over 100,000 deaths and over 50 million serious injuries occur in the United States each year as the result of accidents. We can all agree there should be fewer of each. This being so, perhaps we can move on to another area of agreement on the nature of reality, despite the broad spectrum of views on the nature of man which we represent.

A salient characteristic of our time is that the impact of urbanization, scientific dis-

covery and the rapid translation of scientific knowledge into applied technology has drastically altered the human environment. But the human being has not been drastically altered. We still have the same physical and psychological proclivities and needs that our cave-man ancestors had. The question we must answer, then, is "To what extent may the individual be realistically expected to protect himself from environmental hazards today?"

As for the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, we cannot agree with anyone who thinks that a human being, evolved through many millennia to survive in the natural hazards of primeval forests and plains is necessarily equipped to protect himself in the technological jungle of 1969, nor can we agree with those who would want the government to issue each citizen a steel helmet because there is a possibility that someone may be struck by a falling meteorite.

The problem of accident prevention and injury control permeates the entire fabric of society. Every Federal agency has responsibilities for portions of it and, of course, every component of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has peripheral or direct concern.

Precisely because this is true, we think it was quite appropriate indeed to place the injury control responsibilities of the Public Health Service within the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service at the time the Public Health Service was reorganized last summer. Accident prevention is fundamentally an environmental and consumer problem. It is noteworthy in this regard that virtually every one of the several categorical programs now consolidated in the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service has a concern for one or more of the many aspects of the problem of accident control. We regard the problem as a major—and surely as one of the most urgent—of our environmental concerns. We are attempting to mount an effective attack on all the causes of preventable injuries, and we are seeking, and will continue to seek, the best ways to accomplish this. But for this assertion to be meaningful, I must tell you something about our new organization and its mission.

The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service was established by Presidential Order on July 1, 1968, to provide a new impetus and direction to the National effort to improve the environment and protect the consumer, and to provide a focus on man—on his total health and well-being—as the center of all our environmental concerns.

It includes the Food and Drug Administration, headed by Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr.; the National Air Pollution Control Administration, headed by Dr. John T. Middleton; and the Environmental Control Administration, headed by Assistant Surgeon General Chris A. Hansen. For the first time in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have brought all these organizations, dealing with protecting human beings from environmental hazards, together in a situation where they can be mutually supportive.

We have come to recognize that the human environment consists not only of the land, air, and water that give us life but includes also the food we eat, the drugs we ingest, and all the thousands of products which we consume or use in this complicated world. Our mission is to advance understanding of the impact of environmental change on man, to develop criteria and standards on permissible levels of human exposure to environmental impacts, to exercise fully the several regulatory authorities we have, to assist industry and government at all levels by promoting the application of techniques to control or prevent environmental hazards, and to help State and local governments develop effective environmental and consumer protection programs.

Our Administrator, Mr. Charles C. Johnson, Jr., has made it very clear that he expects the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service to provide a sound, coordinated program in the accident prevention field at the Federal level. Since our accident prevention efforts will be carried out within the context of an organization so broadly concerned with environmental and consumer problems, we hope to avoid some of the parochial pitfalls which have marred the full effectiveness of injury control activities in the past.

For example, the Bureau of Occupational Safety and Health within the Environmental Control Administration is concerned with on-the-job hazards. The Bureau of Radiological Health has responsibility for administering the new Electronic Products Act—protecting the public from radiation hazards associated with television sets, microwave ovens, and other products of our new technology. Other bureaus in that Administration are concerned with such hazards as improper housing, noise, rodents and other home and community conditions that clearly relate to the incidence of accidental injury. Our growing mountains of garbage and trash offer a safety hazard, particularly in our crowded cities, so our Solid Waste Management program has a bearing on accident prevention.

The activities of the National Air Pollution Control Administration are inevitably linked to the problems of both air and ground traffic safety.

The basic commitment of the Food and Drug Administration is, and has always been, to protect the American consumer from product hazards. It has specific authority under the law to regulate foods, drugs, medical devices, cosmetics, and hazardous substances. It is, as you probably know, concerned with all aspects of pesticide use—from the controls necessary to prevent accidental ingestion or misuse of these products to the prevention of hazardous residues on food products. It is concerned with safety closures on bottles, with adequate labelling, and with other controls to prevent accidental ingestion of drugs, poisons, and other hazardous substances.

We have established an Office of Product Safety within the Food and Drug's Bureau of Medicine. A number of different programs relating to hazardous products which had been dispersed throughout the Public Health Service were brought together in this office, including the product safety aspects of the Public Health Service Injury Control Program. We in the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service feel that, because of the Food and Drug Administration's specific responsibility for consumer protection and because of its long experience in dealing with industry in the control of hazardous products, this Administration brings a special commitment and competence to this highly important part of the injury control problem.

On the other hand, the Injury Control program in the Environmental Control Administration retains its special responsibility for environmental hazards in the home and community—which are so integral a part of the Environmental Control Administration's basic commitment—and for the behavioral aspects of this complicated problem of accident prevention.

At the time of this reorganization, guidelines for coordination between the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Control Administration were provided. Moreover, mechanisms were established for common surveillance of accidental injuries and deaths, for we believe that the paucity of epidemiological data in this field has been an obstacle to effective control action by all levels of government, industry and private organizations.

A national surveillance network is now being established. This will include the epidemiological studies which have been under-

way for some years—in Denver, Boston, and Cincinnati. In addition, however, a new hospital reporting system is scheduled to go into effect July 1, 1969. We believe this expanded surveillance system will give us much better answers on the nature and extent of injuries. The goal for the first year's operation of this new system is 150,000 reports.

When an analysis of these reports reveals that the cause of injury was primarily behavioral or environmental, the Environmental Control Administration will take action.

When the cause is deemed to be in product design or manufacture, the Food and Drug Administration will act to eliminate or minimize the product hazard. The Food and Drug Administration plans to conduct in-depth investigations during the next year of approximately 1,300 injuries associated with mechanical, electrical, and thermal properties of products and to analyze, wherever possible, the products themselves.

As the Food and Drug Administration has moved along in its product safety program, it has found, to no one's surprise, I am sure, that the very concept of what constitutes "product safety" has never been entirely clear. Product safety is a problem whose scope and magnitude are only now emerging, and which has only recently begun to command the public attention it merits. Work done to date in the Office of Product Safety of the Food and Drug Administration has shown clearly that behavioral and environmental patterns, can create hazards in product use which should be anticipated in product design. It is clear that the full solution to even the most apparently simple and obvious product hazard will seldom be simple or one-dimensional.

As we look back over the past decade or two, it seems to me that the injury control efforts of the Public Health Service, of the National Safety Council, and of the many other governmental and private organizations directly concerned have made some very substantial contributions. The National Safety Council has, for many years, provided a forum for safety advocates from all facets of our society. Members of the Council have shown that adequate attention to safety pays off in sharply reduced on-the-job injury rates. A joint effort by the Council, the Public Health Service, and the American Medical Association spelled success in establishing the value of auto safety belts and winning public acceptance for this life-saving device. You have led the way in public education in traffic and home safety. Passage of the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1967, and the safety features now on late model cars show that our Nation is making progress toward a safer environment.

However, as we look to the future, I don't think there is any question that the pattern of past efforts will be judged inadequate. The Nation is beginning to recognize that over 100,000 accidental deaths and over 50 million injuries every year constitute not only a national catastrophe but a national scandal. This concern is a part of the growing interest in all aspects of consumerism and environmental health and reflects an understanding that it is time to discard outmoded concepts and obsolete thinking, and to take a brand new look at what is happening to man in the world of the 20th Century.

The Congress, in 1967, recognized a new human "right"—the right "to be protected against unreasonable risk of bodily harm from products purchased on the open market," and it established the National Commission on Product Safety to study the problems associated with maintaining this "right." The Commission has already made a major contribution to our recognition and understanding of these problems. It has not only shown us the scope and magnitude of the risks associated with the thousands of consumer products we use, but even more importantly, has made it abundantly clear

that some of our Nation's most hallowed concepts about the workings of its system will have to be updated if we are to adequately protect our citizens. It has shown us the folly of assuming that self-interest and business competition can necessarily be relied upon to motivate all manufacturers to produce safer products. It has shown us that we cannot be complacent about the "voluntary standards" system which have seemed in the past the very hallmark of enlightened industrialism. The Commission has already done much to help us all discard some of our outmoded concepts and obsolete thinking. When its final report is made in 1970, I am sure it will mark a milestone in our progress toward a safer environment.

The Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service does not believe that our current accident prevention and product safety efforts are adequate for the task that lie ahead. We will strive to make them so, you may be assured. We do believe that we are moving in the right direction—in the direction of differentiating realistically among the many complex facets of the injury control problem and of considering all opportunities for corrective action, no matter where they may appear—in our own Department, in any other Federal agency, or in with industry.

Until recently, it seems to me, our goal—the very target of the National effort in this field—has been unclear. We were like the fellow who shoots first, then draws circles around the bullet hole and claims a bullseye. I do not think it unfair to suggest that this has been a characteristic of the efforts of many concerned with the complex problem of accident prevention in the past. I can recall that only a decade ago many people who were much in favor of placing "Speed Kills" signs on every telephone post in sight seemed absolutely convinced that nothing was to be gained by attempting to modify in any way for reasons of safety the motor vehicle in which the driver was reminded that he might be killed. I am sure we can all think of many other examples.

I spoke earlier of the broad diversity of views any group of people will bring to the question of how safe our environment must be to be safe enough. I suggested that we could nevertheless make great strides toward curtailing accidental deaths and injuries, provided we could agree on the reality of our contemporary environment.

With each year that passes our world becomes more certainly a place where our senses cannot be relied upon to perceive hazards we are exposed to. In our homes, the color TV set in the living room, the microwave oven in the kitchen may produce X-radiation, but we cannot feel it. The food in the refrigerator contains pesticides and other residues or additives but we cannot taste or smell them. Dozens of modern appliances contribute to our comfort but, if they are poorly designed or defective, they can produce shocks, burns, or lacerations we have no reason to be prepared for. When we travel, the poorly designed or defective automobile, train, bus or plane gives no adequate warning of disaster ahead.

These hazards and many more are by-product problems of our tremendous advances in science and technology. In our pursuit of the undeniable benefits of technological progress, we failed to consider all the consequences. We failed to accurately perceive and agree on the nature of reality. We must fail no longer. Each year the rush of science and technology toward an uncharted future accelerates, and the penalties for failure to consider consequences will grow more severe.

Last November at a symposium on human ecology, Mr. Charles C. Johnson, the Administrator of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service had this to say about our contemporary environment. "We

live in troubled times, and they show all too clearly the terrible interplay of forces between man and the whole bio-community of which he is part. We find ourselves today catapulted into a new kind of world which we approach as strangers in a strange land. At times, the very structure of society seems in danger of being overwhelmed by a torrent of technological change which man has set in motion but sometimes seems incapable of controlling. Urbanization, a soaring population, and inequities nurtured in the darkness of the past and long ignored have released a slumbering discontent which jars the very foundations of the American dream. In our cities, this discontent has shown itself in attempts to destroy what no longer seems tolerable. Among our young people, there is a kindred frustration—and they would turn their back on a society which they find 'irrelevant.'"

If this description strikes you as relevant to the reality of our time and place, then I think you will agree that your organization and mine and all the others intended to promote the health and welfare of people cannot rest on their laurels. To do so would be to turn our backs on the future—and the future, judging by the past, is not to be trusted that far.

THE TELEGRAPH AND HUMAN PROGRESS

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a very timely and instructive article on the history and development of the telegraph, by Mr. Walter J. O'Leary, that appeared in the May 24, 1969, issue of the Boston Catholic Diocese newspaper, the Pilot.

Mr. O'Leary is a widely recognized writer and lecturer, from personal experience and research, on the fascinating subject of the telegraph, its initiation and expansion, and I am sure that all RECORD readers will find his article, that follows, most interesting and informative:

INVENTION OF TELEGRAPH MARKED MILESTONE IN HUMAN PROGRESS

(By Walter J. O'Leary)

Communication history was made 125 years ago this month. It was on May 24, 1844, that Samuel Finley Morse, inventor of the magnetic telegraph, transmitted his historic message: "What hath God wrought" from Washington to Baltimore. It marked the first practical means of unifying the nation in the dispensation of news and the elimination of the distances. The Telegraph is the forerunner of all the marvelous inventions of the past century and a quarter to benefit mankind in the field of communications.

Samuel Finley Breese Morse was born in Charlestown, Mass., on April 27, 1791, the son of Jedediah Morse, D.D., and Elizabeth Ann Breese. His father was born in Woodstock, Conn., on August 23, 1761; went to Yale, studied theology and was finally settled as Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Charlestown, on April 30, 1789. His mother was the daughter of Samuel Breese and Rebecca Finley. She was born in New York City, September 29, 1766. Rebecca's father, who was born in Ireland, came to America as a youth; distinguished himself as a preacher and a divine. He afterwards became President of Princeton College in New Jersey.

Samuel, the eldest of three brothers, prepared himself for college at Phillips-Andover

Academy, and at the age of 14 entered Yale College, graduating in 1810. His tastes during his youth led him strongly towards art rather than science. In 1811 he became a pupil of Washington Allston and went to England to study art. He remained there four years. Upon his return to America, he enjoyed considerable success as a portrait painter along the Atlantic seaboard. Not financially to be sure. Many of his paintings are displayed prominently in museums here and abroad. When LaFayette came to this country after the War for Independence, he was commissioned by the city of New York to paint his picture. In 1825 he became one of the founders of the National Academy of Design.

1827 marked the year of his interest in electricity. He learned from J. F. Dana of Columbia College the elementary facts of electromagnetism. He also learned from two other Americans: first, from that illustrious philosopher Benjamin Franklin, whose experiments in a very crude way proved the identity of lightning and electricity; secondly, from Joseph Henry, Professor of Physics at the Albany Academy, later a Professor at Princeton and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution who made the highly important discovery that by winding a plain iron core with many layers of insulated wire through which the electric current was passed, he could at will, charge and discharge the iron core with magnetic power.

Thus Henry produced the electro-magnet which was the beginning of the ingenious fluid. The discoveries of Henry are of great importance in the progress of electric science and form the basis upon which all subsequent inventions have been made in the electrical field.

The possibility of using Professor Henry's electro-magnet was the concern of Professor Morse on board the packet ship "Sully" from Havre to New York in the winter of 1832. Between this date and 1836 when he perfected his apparatus it has been said that he lived in poverty. He interested Alfred Vail, of Morristown, New Jersey with his invention and he became a collaborator of Morse in helping to perfect it.

Shortly thereafter Morse moved his apparatus to Washington and demonstrated it before President Van Buren and his Cabinet. A Bill was presented to Congress to finance construction of a telegraph line from Washington to Baltimore. It was finally approved in 1843 and Congress appropriated \$30,000 to build the line.

Many persons were engaged in the construction of the first telegraph line. One of these was the Honorable Francis Ormond Johnathan Smith, a member of Congress from the Portland, Maine district; Editor of the Maine Farmer, an agricultural paper of considerable influence. Smith was awarded the contract to construct the line. The work entailed digging a ditch two feet deep along the right of way of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, into which was to be placed lead pipes containing two conductors covered with cotton yarn, saturated in a bath of hot gum shellac. The estimated cost of construction was \$100.00 per mile. The man hired to do this work was Ezra Cornell who eventually became a millionaire and Cornell University's greatest benefactor.

Cornell was a man of little formal education. He worked as a Carpenter, Machinist, a Miller and also operated a pottery. In 1841 he purchased the patent rights to market a plough from Messrs Barnaby and Mooers in the states of Maine and Georgia.

He went to Maine in 1842 to introduce the plough to the farmers. There he met F.O.J. Smith who immediately became interested when he demonstrated it to him on his farm in Westbrook in August 1843. It was just the thing Smith needed to dig his trench. Both men became fast friends and Cornell was contracted to lay the pipe line.

When only 10 miles of pipe had been laid and \$23,000 expended, it was found that

water got into the pipe, grounding the conductors and the labors of all went for naught.

Learning that pole line construction had proved satisfactory in England, this method was pursued and the line finally completed early in May, 1844. All the world knows now that history was made on the 24th of that month when Morse tapped out his memorable message from the Capitol building in Washington to Alfred Vail at the Railroad depot in Baltimore.

It was the good fortune of this writer to serve in the U.S. Signal Corps 25 years ago when the Centennial of this event took place. Here is what I wrote in my diary:

"May 24, 1944. Wednesday. Up early. Released from duty today for Sunday work. After breakfast went to the Pentagon to be photographed for compulsory change of building passes. Photographer not in sight. Decided not to linger. Want to attend commemorative ceremonies at the Capitol. Reached there before 11 a.m. when the program began.

"The U.S. Marine Band was assembled on the Rotunda floor and played numerous pieces to suit the occasion. The Hon. Alfred L. Bulwinkle, Vice Chairman of the Committee, opened the proceedings and introduced the Hon. Burton K. Wheeler, the Massachusetts born Senator from Montana, and Chairman. Rev. James S. Montgomery, D.D. gave the Invocation and Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D. the Benediction.

"Senator Wheeler spoke on the history of communications and their necessity to the Nation, particularly during the time of War. He remarked that Morse was in Washington when his wife died in New Haven, Conn., it was seven days before he received the news.

"The second part of the program was held on the ground floor of the original Capitol building beneath the small rotunda. Here, the Hon. Warren R. Austin, Senator from Vermont had additional remarks to say about the occasion, and then Miss Mary Livingston Morse, a great granddaughter of the inventor unveiled the Flag from a Bronze plaque containing words of the Centennial in recognition of what took place 100 years earlier.

"The third and final part of the program took place in the original Supreme Court Room now used as a reference library by Representatives. Admittance to this room was by pass only due to its small area. After a while I too was admitted, due principally to the uniform I wore. "Here, Mr. Ernest E. Norris, President of the Southern Railway Company, a former Telegrapher himself, reenacted the sending of the famous message on the instrument Morse invented to Mr. Roy B. White, President of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, who was at the Depot in Baltimore. Reporters and Moving Picture cameras were on hand to record the historic proceedings. The maximum speed of Morse's machine is not over five or six words per minute."

Progress and expansion followed quite rapidly after the 1844 event. Mr. Henry O'Reilly, an Albany N.Y. journalist and his associates built a line from Baltimore to Philadelphia, west through Pennsylvania to Louisville, St. Louis and to New Orleans.

Ezra Cornell built a line from Philadelphia to the west side of the Hudson River. No method of insulation had yet been perfected to operate a telegraph circuit under water.

From high masts erected on the Palisades near Fort Lee and on the heights at Fort Washington on the New York side, a line was put across the Hudson River that was used for ten years. Cornell built the line to Albany and across New York State to the middle west. He was in Boston late in 1845 soliciting support to finance the building of a line into this City.

In the short space of ten years there were so many separate telegraph companies that separately their owners realized very little

profit from their investments. It was in 1856 that many of them consolidated to form the present Western Union Telegraph Co. at Rochester, N.Y. Hiram Sibley became its first President. He and the newly formed company had ambitions of extending their lines to Europe by way of Bering Strait and across Siberia after Cyrus W. Field experienced two disasters trying to lay a cable across the Atlantic.

Mr. Sibley's western venture was quickly abandoned when the Great Eastern steamed into Hearts Content, Newfoundland in 1866 after playing out 2500 miles of cable from her three massive holds.

The hardships encountered by Cyrus Field in accomplishing his feat is a story in itself. In fact when one looks over the long lists of scientists, inventors and contributors to the progress of communication, they too were giants in their work of accomplishment. Wheatstone, Volta, Amuere, Faraday, Thomson, Carty, Bell, DeForest, Marconi, Edison, Hertz and MacKay.

Perhaps it is just as well that Morse and all the others were not born at an earlier date. We would never have known of Gilpin's Ride; the tales of the Pony Express or have a chance to observe the annual April 19th Marathon Classic in memory of that famous Athenian runner Pheidippides if they were.

ENDING THE VIETNAM WAR

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the country's impatience for an end to the war in Vietnam is rising again. After an election year whose theme was frustration and bitterness because of our tragic involvement in that war, the Nation granted the new administration a decent interlude for policy decisions. That period has ended.

The administration's desire for time to negotiate its predecessor's dilemma must now face the country's desire to end that involvement even if the disengagement is awkward. This administration's dilemma is clear: either end the war rapidly or inherit a new responsibility for its continuation.

While saving face is an old problem for a nation's leaders, it must not be allowed to obscure the primary need to save lives and to start the reconstruction of both the political and economic life of all Vietnam. American lives will be saved only when American troops withdraw.

Let us begin that withdrawal now, without delay or diplomatic dance or a prolonged search for proper formulas. Let us discuss the political accommodations which the Saigon regime must make by showing that regime that it must assume alone its political responsibilities which our presence has so long delayed.

When Saigon sees that our support has ended for its political repression, imprisonment of dissenters and denial of representative government, the South Vietnamese can get on with their problems of building a workable and responsive government.

Richard Falk, a distinguished critic of our Vietnam role and professor of international law, has outlined the stages of

our withdrawal and the corresponding events in Vietnam in the following address he gave recently at Portland State-Reed College ceremonies. The version below has been revised and clarified and represents Professor Falk's latest views:

A PLAN TO END THE VIETNAM WAR

(By Richard A. Falk, Milbank professor of International Law Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences and Princeton University)

I. Peace for Vietnam depends on the acceptance of three propositions:

1. The Saigon regime headed by Nguyen Van Thieu does not want to end the Vietnam War by reaching a political compromise; therefore, so long as progress in Paris depends on the assent of Saigon the prospects for a negotiated end of the war are virtually non-existent;

II. The United States should not seek to end its involvement in Vietnam without simultaneously seeking peace and rehabilitation for that devastated country; the policy of gradual "de-Americanization" of the war at this late stage results in arming the Saigon government with heavy modern weaponry so that it can carry on the fight indefinitely, not only against the NLF, but against many moderate non-Communist groups in South Vietnam.

III. The United States, North Vietnam, and the NLF all would benefit from a negotiated compromise ending of the war such as is the proclaimed objective of these three parties in Paris, but such a compromise cannot be brought to pass until the Saigon regime can be induced to make changes in its leadership and policies with respect to ending the war; these changes cannot be brought about so long as moderate third force political leaders are imprisoned rather than invited and encouraged to participate openly in the political and governing process of South Vietnam.

2. In light of this analysis the key focus for American policymakers is how to bring about changes in the Saigon regime such that it would work toward rather than against a negotiated compromise of the war. At present, it is evident that the United States possesses little leverage on the Saigon regime. The only way for the United States to obtain leverage in this situation is to initiate a process of phased withdrawal of the armed forces. The effects of withdrawal are difficult to anticipate, but almost anything is preferable to either a continuation of the present stalemate with the destructive effects or some kind of plan to "de-Americanize" the war by further training and equipping the armies of Saigon to fight on for a long period of time after the departure of American troops.

The emphasis on these issues also represents a criticism of the policies of President Nixon's Administration that have appeared to look toward "de-Americanization" to end the war in the likely event that neither progress toward a four-party negotiated settlement is made in Paris, nor a unilateral de-escalation of NLF-DRV combat operations occurs. If this is a correct reading of prevailing thinking in Washington, then it will add one more disastrous phase to the series of disasters that have accompanied American involvement in the affairs of Vietnam since its inception in the early years of the 1950's. President Nixon's approach to peace in Vietnam seems more designed to secure a thinly disguised political victory than a negotiated compromise in Vietnam. My proposal of phased withdrawal, followed by a genuine political compromise, is developed as an alternative to either stalemated diplomacy in Paris or de-Americanization in Vietnam.

3. By now it should be evident to all that the United States military mission in Vietnam has been able to prevent victory by the National Liberation Movement. This mission has been accomplished at great cost in blood,

treasure, and prestige. Even in the United States important sectors of our society have lost confidence in the integrity and wisdom of the government. In Vietnam the damage and devastation is awesome, and it is continuing; more tonnage of bombs is dropped per month on the tiny agricultural country of South Vietnam than on the whole of Europe during the height of World War II.

4. To incur such high costs to accomplish such a meager political mission requires an explanation. To prevent, in reality to delay, an NLF victory is very different than securing on behalf of the Saigon regime. Not long before he became a presidential adviser, Henry Kissinger wrote: "the guerrilla wins if he does not lose. The conventional army loses if it does not win." (*Foreign Affairs*, Jan. 1969, p. 214). Why, then, have more than 585,000 American troops, supported by the greatest arsenal of counter-insurgency weaponry ever assembled (the helicopter support has been estimated as alone worth more than 1,000,000 combat troops) been unable to achieve victory, especially when fighting alongside more than 1,000,000 troops of the Saigon armies? The armed forces of the United States have been able to destroy but not to succeed in Vietnam, because in a war of revolutionary nationalism it is the allegiance of the people that finally and decisively counts. The Saigon regime is isolated to such an extent that the most prominent leaders of non-Communist political groups are in jail for advocating some kind of political compromise to end the war. To advocate in Saigon what is official South Vietnamese policy in Paris continues to be a serious crime. Anti-Communist newspapers in South Vietnam are censored or closed repeatedly for criticizing the Thieu regime. As recently as March 15, Thich Tien Minh, one of the few Buddhist student leaders not yet imprisoned, was arrested with fifty student followers and sentenced to 10 years of hard labor. His crime: the advocacy of peaceful settlement through negotiations and a coalition government.

5. The Saigon regime knows that it cannot survive peace. If the present rulers are lucky they will physically escape the wrath of their countrymen. When the Americans leave the government of Thieu and Ky is almost certain to collapse or be displaced. The leaders in Saigon have demonstrated that they understand that their fate is linked to the continuation of the war and to the maintenance of the massive American presence: they opposed President Johnson's original limited bombing halt as of March 31, 1968, and they opposed the complete halt of bombing North Vietnam as of October 31, 1968 and often have advocated the resumption of bombing in the North; they opposed the Paris negotiations and have done all in their power to obstruct the continuation of peace talks; they imprison all moderate anti-Communist political leadership in South Vietnam; they spread all sorts of groundless rumors about NLF plans for mass reprisals.

6. Why, then, does the Saigon regime propose to meet directly and secretly with the NLF to discuss a settlement? The proposal is a tactic designed to confuse the American government and to undermine criticism. It is not a serious offer of a political compromise. In fact, the probable objective of the Saigon government is to demonstrate that no settlement can be reached by non-military means. The central conclusion, then, follows: it is impossible to settle the war in Vietnam by negotiations if a condition is that the terms of settlement should be acceptable to the present government of South Vietnam.

7. If this analysis is correct, then what should the United States do about it? If it does nothing, then the prospects are for a continuation of the military stalemate, with high casualties, periodic bursts of official optimism (never gloom), and a renewed and rising cycle of protest and repression here at home. The welcome

speeches by Senators Aiken and Scott at the beginning of May have given the signal that President Nixon's 100 days of domestic grace are over. At present, there is little leverage that the United States possesses. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird recently returned from South Vietnam in March with the startling discovery that no Americans should be withdrawn until all North Vietnamese troops have left South Vietnam and the armies of the Saigon regime have received training and modern equipment such as to provide "an indigenous capability." Only then can they avoid defeat, prevent political collapse, and hope to hold their own against the NLF. The military and political balance remains highly unfavorable and the glimmer of light all but disappears from the end of the tunnel. The failure of the South Vietnamese Armed Forces has been primarily a matter of its unwillingness to fight against the NLF. One never hears about the inabilities of the DRV or NLF to fight the American forces, despite their vulnerability to American bombing patterns and their markedly inferior equipment and firepower. The lop-sided kill ratios in Vietnam are characteristic of all colonial wars in which different levels of military technology meet in combat. The bitter irony is that the Vietnamese on our side are a conscript, mercenary army that, by and large, lacks political will; it is remarkable that despite the remoteness and unpopularity of the war, American military units engage in more combat with far greater motivation than do their ARVN counterparts. Never throughout the war have the armies of Saigon given the slightest indication that the issue of the war involved a defense of the homeland against a foreign invader (i.e., North Vietnam), but this has been until very recently our account of the war. Although the war cannot be won by those on the American side, defeat can be prevented indefinitely at high costs; in such circumstances Saigon has virtually no incentive at all to seek a political compromise.

8. What should be done? The United States should begin at once to withdraw its armed forces at the rate of between 50,000 and 100,000 per two months at least so long as (1) Saigon keeps non-Communist third force political leaders in prison and discourages third force politics; (2) Saigon fails to broaden its regime to include moderates, including several of the prominent figures who have in the past been punished for advocating a political compromise; (3) Hanoi reciprocates at least to the extent of avoiding major initiations of military combat. The American withdrawal should take place in a certain context of ambiguity so as to enable maximum leverage over both the Saigon regime and over the NLF and Hanoi, that is, by providing the former with incentives to terminate the withdrawal process and the latter with incentives to continue it. The United States would finally recover some initiative and be in a position to exert some leverage. In any event, the stalemate would be broken, a way down and out would have been created, and some alternative found to the present cruel and destructive war of attrition. Almost anything is better than what we are doing now. Either the Saigon regime cooperates in the search for a compromise or it collapses or it abdicates or it demonstrates, most unexpectedly, its capacity to fight on or negotiate alone. As withdrawal proceeds American policy should be under constant review in terms of attaining as soon as possible peace and political compromise for Vietnam.

9. We need to have some idea about the character of such a political compromise. In essence, there would need to be three main groups represented in a coalition national government; the NLF, the third force constituencies, and the army and civil service. It would be essential to appoint a strong,

moderate as Minister of the Interior, that is, as the person in charge of police functions in post-war South Vietnam and to suspend those portions of the Constitution based on civil war conditions. A provisional coalition government can most effectively be established by negotiations among the principal interest and ethnic groups of South Vietnam rather than through elections. The completion of the process of withdrawing foreign forces should be scheduled to occur during a transitional period no longer than 18 months, and possibly much shorter. Several distinct international observations teams (without enforcement functions) could be gradually built up during this period staffed by neutral and probably by non-Asian countries and supported by neutral financing. Our observation team would observe elections on a village and province level that would take place six and twelve months after a cease-fire can be established. Another observation team would investigate and report on allegations of reprisal. National elections open to all parties and all platforms (including planks on reunification) would be scheduled to occur within two years of the cease-fire. The elected government would have a mandate to convene a convention to draft a post-war constitution for South Vietnam.

A Vietnam Reconstruction Agency, staffed by international civil servants and funded from American and possibly other sources, would give aid to the governments in Saigon and Hanoi for purposes of reconstruction. Reunification, if it occurs, would be the result of negotiations between the elected governments of North and South Vietnam. Within three months of a cease-fire, however, normal economic, cultural, and social relations between the two parts of Vietnam would begin to be re-established. Serious consideration should also be given to encouraging the formation of a free trade area among all parts of what was formerly Indochina. A separate conference of principal world states should be convened before national elections are scheduled so as to ratify the Vietnam settlement, re-examine the prospects for reinvigorating the neutralization plan for Laos, and explore the possibility of securing some kind of endorsement of principles of peace for Asia by China, the United States, and the Soviet Union. The phasing of the proposal is designed, above all, to facilitate rapid and assured progress toward peace in Vietnam; therefore, obligations have been left vague, conditions have been omitted, and the process of war-termination has been designed to discourage its disruption or reversal by all sides to the Vietnam conflict.

The proposal, in summary, is conceived of comprising three phases and having the following constituent parts:

Phase I: immediate incremental withdrawal of U.S. forces, at the rate 50,000-100,000 per two months, terminable by major DRV-NLF escalation of war and/or by GVN release of political prisoners, broadening of its regime, and permitting its third force politics to occur (the ambiguity as to termination is intentional).

Phase II: negotiated settlement—

Immediate termination of offensive operations developing as soon as possible into a cease-fire, complete withdrawal of foreign forces and elimination of foreign bases; and substantial disarmament of domestic armed forces of NLF and ARVN within 3-6 months after withdrawal of foreign forces completed.

Coalition government (NLF, army-civil service, third force groups) (strong control of police by third force Minister of Interior) (suspension of those constitutional provisions prohibiting certain forms of political advocacy or based on civil war conditions).

Observed elections in stages (local, province, national) to be completed within two years of cease-fire. National elections will not be held in the event that the observer group

director recommends their postponement. If elections are held, then the government will convene a convention to draft a new constitution for South Vietnam.

Gradual build-up to 10,000 of international observer group with distinct teams having investigative and reporting functions and independent funding in relation to political activity and complaints of reprisal.

Reunification, if at all, by free inter-government negotiations following national elections in South Vietnam or, in the event elections are postponed no sooner than five years from the date of formal cease-fire; normalization of relations between North and South Vietnam within three months after total cease-fire.

Economic reconstruction planned according to the priorities of the two governments, funded by the United States at \$1-2 billion per year for a minimum of three years, and administered by a small agency staffed by international civil servants.

Guarantees and pledges by all parties on reprisals and an offer of political asylum by the United States to as many as 10,000 Vietnamese.

Conference of guaranty to ratify the settlement in Vietnam, scheduled to occur after the cease-fire and before the national elections; China, the Soviet Union, and the United States are essential participants and would seek to agree on a code of behavior to maintain peace in the area. India, Japan, and possibly France, Australia, and Pakistan would also be invited to participate.

Phase III: sustaining peace—

Partial or total withdrawal of observer groups within 30 days at the discretion of the head of the elected national governments in South Vietnam or, in the event elections are not held, by the provisional government at any time after three years from the date of cease-fire.

Annual meeting of the conference of guaranty to review progress toward peace in Asia and examine opportunities for neutralization of countries vulnerable to intervention.

Normal diplomatic and economic relations between the United States and all Asian countries, including North Vietnam and China.

HERMAN KENIN

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the remarks of Mr. Herman Kenin, president of the American Federation of Musicians, to the 21st convention of the International Association of Concert Managers. Mr. Kenin is a vice president of the AFL-CIO and is a former member of the National Council on the Arts. For many years he has been a prominent leader in the effort to establish and maintain a constructive relationship between government and the arts in our country. As president of one of the oldest and most effective organizations working in behalf of music and the musician in the United States and Canada, he is an outstanding spokesman for the many men and women who do so much to bring joy and beauty to our lives and to enrich the society we are defending and developing.

Mr. Kenin speaks of the need to broaden the opportunities in our land for our people to partake of the arts. He speaks, also, of the work which organized labor,

through the AFL-CIO, is now engaged in to help bring this about.

Within the coming months this body will again be asked to extend the programs of the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities. Mr. Kenin tells of what labor is doing in this field and why. The reasons motivating labor are the reasons that should move all of us in this Chamber to do more in support of these very worthwhile programs.

Mr. Kenin's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY MR. HERMAN KENIN

In the mid-nineteen fifties, the Pittsburgh Symphony embarked on a tour of the Pennsylvania steel towns. It was an historic event. For the towns involved, it was the first time they were visited by a major symphony orchestra. For a great orchestra that had traveled to all corners of the world, this was the first time that it had ventured into its own neighborhoods. The concerts were sponsored and promoted by the Steelworkers Union and in most cases the audiences were the union's members and their families. For both the union and its members this was a new experience.

Your president, Mr. McKelvey Martin, planned and organized that tour. It was a tour that took note of a growing revolution and tried to do something about it. Like an approaching band, this revolution appeared small on the horizon but in the past decade—as it has come closer to all of us—its cadence has quickened and its volume has increased so that today even the hard of hearing are marching to its beat . . . this is the revolution of rising expectations.

It comes from the ghettos accompanied by a now strident shout for homes, for jobs, for schools. And it also comes from the new suburbia. There the revolution is not marked by shouts and slogans but by a quiet desperate search by working men and women and their children for beauty, for grace, for involvement, for meaning in their lives. Thoreau, writing of America, once remarked, "The mass of men lead lives of quiet desperation. . . . A stereotyped but unconscious despair is concealed even under what are called the games and amusements of mankind". This, unfortunately, is America today and the situation is not only culturally, but politically dangerous.

Life for too many Americans, has been reduced to what Arthur Schlesinger has called "a series of shared clichés." This situation coming at a time when the average working man is experiencing more free time and increasing expendable income is the dynamite in the smoldering tinder box that is our society. Those who seek to break out to do something new and unique either feel guilty because they are different, or else feel a sense of frustration and despair. This leads to indiscriminate rejection and hippy-type revolt.

Never before has there been a nation such as ours possessed of the wealth necessary to fulfill the promise of a rich, full life for all its citizens. Never before has the gap between the promise and the performance been so nakedly exposed. The revolution of our day . . . in the ghetto and in suburbia . . . is meant to close the gap, use this wealth, and fulfill that promise.

While some in our society still strive to win the basic necessities of existence, others, in growing numbers, grope to satisfy new needs in the arts, humanities, and education. We must satisfy the goals of both people because they are, in truth, interdependent goals.

I believe there will be no end to material poverty until there is an end to spiritual poverty. I believe we will not clear and cleanse our congested filthy slum cities until we have corrected the astigmatism that prevents so many from seeing and understanding the values of color and light and

form. I believe we will never remove prejudice and injustice from our lives; we will not write fins to what Churchill calls "this age of clatter and buzz, of gape and gloat" until more minds are opened by the power of the book and the theater, more eyes are filled with the grace of the dance and more ears are attuned to the mysteries of music.

American organized labor has had extensive experience with helping men and women to realize their fondest goals and, after considering all sides, I am confident that history will note that thus far labor in this country has been quite successful. Because organized labor helped many millions achieve a greater share of the wealth they produce in the form not only of money, but leisure time, these many millions have had new opportunities opened to them.

At the turn of the century, Samuel Gompers predicted rather ingenuously, I think, that "Leisure cultivates tastes for art, music, concerts, operas, the theater"; but then he went on to make a most valid observation, "these new opportunities once availed of are no longer luxuries", he said, "the luxuries of the past become the necessities of today and all mankind agrees that in order that the workers may be counted upon to continue their labor, the necessities of life must be assured them. . . . To make the luxuries of today the necessities for tomorrow—to continually raise the standard of life of the worker is in the highest degree sound economy."

This process of unfolding opportunities, only to find new ones, is becoming very well known to the man who holds office in a union today. Each new gain won by his union brings new opportunities for the member and with them new desires. Because of this, the union representative is a man on a treadmill; the faster he goes, the faster he goes.

The evolution of the mass of Americans from opportunity to opportunity, from desire to desire was noted by the AFL-CIO Council of Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees in a policy statement announcing the Council's participation in AFL-CIO programs to involve union members in the arts. In part, this is what this Council said:

"We know that today the American worker's historical preoccupation—working for a livelihood—is increasingly involving a diminishing portion of his time and energy.

"Many societies in the past have supported leisure classes of varying sizes possessing varying amounts of time free from the demands of working for a living. Today, leisure is no longer the privilege of the few, but the right of many. Free from the necessity of working for a 'living' the major part of his life, the modern worker is slowly measuring and defining new freedoms which sixty years ago he hardly thought possible. To the worker at the turn of the century, freedom meant freedom from—freedom from exploitation, freedom from the irrational authority of a boss or foreman. It came to mean, also, freedom from drudgery, monotony, and the dehumanizing effects of manual work. Today, however, with his new found time, freedom from no longer suffices. Today's worker is increasingly looking upon freedom as freedom to—make his voice heard in the civic life of his community, freedom to travel, to learn, to enter the creative world of the arts and to participate in all the benefits our culture has to offer.

"At one time the limit of a working man's dreams (beyond a decent job at decent pay) was to see his children assured of a basic education. When labor called for universal free public schools it was fighting to help him reach his goals. Today, with free time increasing steadily, the worker wants more than a basic education. He wants those enriching experiences which in other times were available only to the wealthy leisure class. He may want these for himself or, as

is mostly the case, for his children, because art, theater, music, good books, travel are part of a continuing educational or 'growth' process, and today they are part of the common man's search for happiness."

The Council did not only describe an historical process, it set forth a challenge to itself, the labor movement and to you. We are all, now, part of this revolution of rising expectations, and it is a good thing, I think, that we attempt to define our roles in it. With regard to the arts, it seems useful to step back and consider both the limits and the potentialities of organized labor's involvement.

The first point for all of us to remember is that the source of all art is the artist. This sounds obvious enough yet there are patrons who in their concern for the arts place the artist at the low end of the scale of priorities and real estate people, foundations, schools, building contractors, and the mass media distributors of art at the top. Along with these others, the labor union cannot create art. But the artists who belong to unions do create and through their unions, they work to achieve some of the recognition and a share of the attention now given the hosts of middle men. Labor cannot and should not be expected to join in misguided and self-defeating efforts to advance the arts while ignoring the artist. McNeill Lowry has deplored such occurrences in the area of financial giving to the arts. "Some of us," he has said, "have long hoped that the sources of money in the United States, private, public, individual or corporate would find a greater share for the professional arts. A greater share is actually becoming visible . . . but a paradoxical development is also emerging. We are beginning to see an enlargement in the funds available to the arts without too much prospect of channeling the new resources into the places where they are most imperatively needed, places which traditionally have been subsidized by the artist himself."

To those who host a pre-concert cocktail party, sit in the audience and then enjoy a fine mid-night dinner, art is an event. To the artist, however, it is a process that may have had its beginnings in his childhood. It is, therefore, the artist's needs that must always remain in the forefront of our consideration.

Just as a labor union cannot create art, neither can it be an audience. But its members can. Today, there are more than 14 million members of the AFL-CIO. They are working and retired people. They are young and they are old. They are craftsmen such as carpenters, machinists, and plumbers and they are professionals such as engineers, teachers, social workers, and librarians. They are office workers and retail clerks and, according to statistics, the vast majority of them and their families have no contact with you or the organizations with which you are associated. As their life becomes a bit easier they have been encouraged by their unions to participate in welfare activities and politics and they have responded.

The AFL-CIO has said it will use its resources to encourage them to participate in the arts as well. But, after all, this is *your* job and the job of *your* institutions. The labor union can only assist you. It may distribute some promotional material. It may publicize your concerts in its journals, but you must write the material and you must present something worth reading about.

Union staffs and officers who know their people pretty well may help you if you are willing to listen to them in return. And if you do listen, you may find yourself faced with some challenging questions. You may be asked, for example, why matinees are held on weekday afternoons when it is impossible for working people to attend. You may be asked why events are not scheduled earlier in the evening so that people who

must work the next day can get home earlier and relieve an expensive baby sitter. You may be told that receptions for the craftsmen who build a new concert hall or culture center are marvelous but why are they invited to such "open houses" only after the hall is finished and then never again?

The dialogue will grow. Representatives of a large, significant, but to most of you, unknown area of society will begin to know you and what you are doing and you will learn a bit more about them. Then, perhaps you will discover how to reach your "great untapped audience."

And you will be discovering something else—a new constituency for fund raising and for political support.

I have told you that a labor union cannot create art and that it cannot fill a hall; it can only help the artist and assist you in building audiences. There is another thing a labor union cannot do. It cannot disburse large sums of money. It does not have money of its own. As a membership organization it does not produce goods or dispense services for a profit. It has only the money its members give to it in the form of dues. And dues are to a union what taxes are to government. They are the lifeblood of the institution but the bane of those who pay. Before a union can become a patron, its members must want it to be a patron. For this to happen you must enlist the individual member as a ticket buyer, subscriber, and eventually a financial contributor to cultural activities.

Again, the AFL-CIO will help you. But, mark you, this new customer and patron is not an object. He is a person seeking fulfillment. It is not enough that you invite him to purchase your seats and give to a fund raising campaign, he must be given a voice in planning your subscription drives and fund raisers. He must be given a place on the Boards of our concert halls and his wife must be enlisted in the lady's committees.

I truly think we will fail if all we can do is sell more tickets and fill more seats. This is important, I am very much aware of its importance, but there is something far more important and that is giving new elements of the population a chance to participate in a meaningful enterprise. Give these people a stake in your activities and you will be building a growing, lasting relationship.

At times, it seems, the end of technology and the goal of modern management is to so arrange the world that no one need experience it. Your success lies in the other direction. Art must again become a community affair. If you want the help and the support and the commitment of a wider audience then you cannot expect that the care and guidance of the arts can forever remain the province of the few. Open the doors and, believe me, the new breed of union member will be not only your audience but eventually your salesman and fund raiser and lobbyist for city, state and federal attention.

I know this is all easier said than done. I am enthusiastic but I am not naive. It would have been a much more pleasant task for me if I could have come here this morning to tell you the great American labor movement, 14 million strong, is committed to filling your halls and your coffers. But as we learn in the "Three Penny Opera", "Victorious Messenger" does not come riding often . . . if at all.

I have told you all of the things a labor union cannot do for you and for the arts. The AFL-CIO cannot create art. The AFL-CIO cannot sit in your seats. The AFL-CIO cannot provide your institutions with large financial grants. Only AFL-CIO members can do these things. But what we in the AFL-CIO are telling you is that we will help you to reach these many millions and their families. As it has in politics and in welfare, in the plant, and shop and office, the AFL-CIO and its affiliated unions can be the vehicle for involving people in building a better life for themselves and their community. If

this is your interest then we will work with you—and I do believe we can make beautiful music together.

As we work, we will meet with many obstacles and numerous frustrations. But the rewards will be well worth it. In this regard, the thoughtful words of actor Robert Morley come to my mind:

"... What does the public really know of the despair of those who try to paint its pictures, or compose its music or write its books and plays. It seldom hangs the picture or listens to the music or reads the books, it walks out on the plays . . .

"It tells itself that it is mystified, or bored, or affronted, it drags along like a child who has been taken for a walk and cries to turn back.

"And then, suddenly, it catches up and takes the hand of the one who has gone on ahead and these two stand together to glimpse a view or pick a flower or drink at a fountain which one of them knew was there all the time."

ADA'ERS URGE NATIONAL SOCIALISM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the intellectual advisers to the thoroughly repudiated Johnson-Humphrey axis, apparently unable to tolerate anything American, are now urging Congress to nationalize defense industries.

Only recently the same Socialist thinkers—who can find no threat from either Soviet or Chinese communism—were attacking the "military-industrial complex" of our Nation as being the greatest threat to the American people.

The only logical conclusion from their new progressive position must be that the American people need have no fear of this "military-industrial complex" if it were completely nationalized and put under the ironclad rule of their Socialist dictatorship. This is called national socialism—"Nazi" for short. Perhaps some of the brave gossip columnists fighting imaginary "neo-Nazis" might want to look again at their ADA leaders.

Is it probably only another coincidence that the most recent international Communist line sets up a program to create "preconditions" for absorption of countries by the shifting of capital to strengthen state controlled capitalism rather than private ownership. The current Red doctrine is that transformation from state-controlled capitalism—national socialism—to Soviet-style socialism—communism—will then follow as a matter of routine.

Furthermore, the Soviet theory advances that new engineers and technicians trained to run State-owned enterprise will unwittingly prepare their nation for socialism, because they will feel involved with a vested interest in pushing toward a State-managed, rather than a free enterprise economy—capitalism. The anti-capitalism move can mean but one thing—the open advocacy of national socialism—Nazism—by the intellectual socialists of the ADA.

More and more Americans are noticing the ultimate goals of these organiza-

tions. I have confidence that they will not be conned into support of Nazism under any name.

I submit a recent news article in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1969]

GALBRAITH ASKS TAKEOVER OF DEFENSE FIRMS BY UNITED STATES

(By Frank C. Porter)

John Kenneth Galbraith suggested yesterday that defense industries be nationalized as he urged Congress and the public to recapture the power over military spending that he said has been lost to the Pentagon and its suppliers.

The Harvard professor and former U.S. Ambassador to India said Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird uses fear to get the military what it wants and Under Secretary David M. Packard uses the pretext of secrecy to discount criticism.

The danger to American democracy lies not in the Soviet Union or China, Galbraith told a Joint Economic subcommittee: "It is from the starvation of our public services, particularly in our big cities here at home."

Former Budget Director Charles L. Schultze provided a variant on Galbraith's theme when he said, under questioning, that only an aroused public opinion can strengthen the President's hand in curbing military spending.

He differed with Galbraith, however, by absolving the so-called military-industrial complex of major blame for large military budgets. Instead, Schultze attributed them to the permissiveness of an American people "pretty much willing to buy anything carrying the label 'Needed for National Security.'"

However, "in the last six to eight months there has been a major change in the country," he observed.

Schultze offered a "highly tentative" projection of a \$20-billion increase in annual non-Vietnam defense spending over the next five years, wiping out almost all the expected saving from a cease-fire in Southeast Asia.

A third of this increase would come in the next fiscal year according to the 1970 defense budget, he said. He pointed out that the projection doesn't take into account a continuation of the present rate of inflation, more than a modest cost increase in defense items, the adoption of large new weapons systems or a further round of strategic arms escalation.

These contingencies could eat further into a new "fiscal dividend" of \$35 billion available for new public programs or tax cuts, Schultze said. This figure was derived by subtracting the rise in non-Vietnam military spending and built-in growth in civilian expenditures from a gross increase in annual revenues of \$70 billion over the next five years.

In describing big defense contractors such as General Dynamics, Lockheed and North American Rockwell as extensions of the military bureaucracy, Galbraith said, "only the remarkable flexibility of the English language allows us to call it private enterprise," and yet they are largely exempt from the political and other constraints of the bureaucracy, he said.

Hence it would not be an assault on private enterprise to nationalize any firm that does over 75 per cent of its business with the Defense Department over a five-year period, Galbraith said. "Perhaps to press this reform now would direct energies from more needed tasks," he explained. "Let us, however, put it on the agenda."

Galbraith said that "the services and the weapons manufacturers decide what they want or need. Then they instruct the Congress. The Congress, led by the military housecarls (household retainers) and sycophants among its members, hastens to comply. The citizen plays no role except to pay the bill."

He proposed a Military Audit Commission made up of scientists—"and not necessarily including Edward Teller"—to advise the Congress on military needs and "non-needs."

Schultze similarly proposed a committee drawn from both houses that could review the military budget in the context of national priorities.

CONGLOMERATES

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the interest being displayed by the members of the Committee on Ways and Means and of the membership of the House of Representatives, generally, in conglomerates is such that I include in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD the article appearing in the May 15, 1969, edition of Fortune magazine, entitled "Ten Conglomerates and How They Grew":

TEN CONGLOMERATES AND HOW THEY GREW
(By Arthur M. Louis)

Gulf & Western Industries, which ranks sixty-ninth on this year's list of the 500 largest industrial corporations, is one of the most famous, most acquisitive, and fastest growing of the conglomerates. Not long ago, Gulf & Western ran some remarkable full-page advertisements in the *Wall Street Journal* and several business magazines, defending its management. The company rattled off some of its accomplishments in automotive-traffic control, aerospace, and motion pictures—a mere handful of its more than twenty lines—and closed with a flourish: "You just don't get that kind of growth without good management."

Gulf & Western's earnings per share have grown at an average annual rate of more than 50 percent, compounded, in the past five years. Ordinarily, companies with such records do not feel obliged to defend their management. But just about all the conglomerates are defensive these days; much of the comment about them—in Congress, on Wall Street, and in the news media—has implied that their earnings are being buoyed by financial chicanery and legerdemain. Quite a few Americans seem to believe that growth in earnings per share doesn't mean for conglomerates what it does for other companies. They also believe that the artificial earnings growth has led to absurd and inflated stock prices. And, finally, they believe that the inflated stock prices enable many conglomerates to pick up still more artificial earnings—i.e., through mergers arranged on favorable terms.

FORTUNE has examined these contentions by looking, as closely as the public record will allow, at the results of ten companies that are well known and widely identified as conglomerates. In general, the record suggests that the public's increasingly dark suspicions about conglomerates' earnings are unwarranted.

Any discussion of the conglomerates' book-keeping is apt to come down to their use of convertible securities to finance acquisitions. By using convertibles, they can increase earnings while not increasing the number of common shares—at least, not immediately—thus boosting earnings per share. For some reason, the critics of conglomerates do not object when other companies issue convertible securities in efforts to boost their earning power. Most of the airlines, for example, have been using convertibles for years to finance new equipment.

This particular criticism of conglomerates, it happens, has lost much of its sting now that publicly held companies are reporting

what their per-share earnings would be if all convertible securities were actually converted into common stock. This practice, recommended by the Accounting Principles Board of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and reinforced by an edict of the Securities and Exchange Commission, was reflected in some 1967 annual reports and became almost universal with the latest reports; in many of them, restated figures show that, even after full dilution, conglomerates have been able to report impressive long-term growth in their earnings per share. Since 1964, for example, Textron's earnings per share have grown by an average of more than 17 percent a year, compounded, Ling-Temco-Vought's about 26 percent a year.

GROWTH AT INTERNATIONAL EVERYTHING

But perhaps the main source of suspicion about conglomerate earnings has to do with the boosts they may receive in mergers—i.e., when they acquire or merge with companies whose price-earnings ratio are lower than their own. It has been explained many times in the press that companies with high p/e's may, in theory, create earnings growth just by merging. Last July the *Wall Street Journal* offered one example of the way this technique could work. It described a hypothetical merger between two fictitious companies, one a conglomerate called "International Everything," the other a one-product company called, appropriately, "One Product." In the *Journal's* example, International Everything has one million shares outstanding and net income of \$1 million, or \$1 per share. Because it is "a glamorous growth company," it is selling for thirty times earnings—i.e., \$30. One Product also has a million shares outstanding and \$1 million in earnings, but it isn't growing, so its price-earnings ratio is only ten, giving it a stock price of \$10. In the merger, International Everything offers half a share of new common stock for each share of One Product; the package is worth \$15 per share of One Product, and adds 500,000 shares to International's capitalization. After the merger, International has 1,500,000 shares outstanding and \$2 million in earnings; the deal has boosted its earnings per share from \$1 to \$1.33. If investors continue to evaluate International at thirty times earnings, the price will immediately rise from \$30 to \$40. International could inflate its earnings per share indefinitely by acquiring still more companies that have lower price-earnings ratios. And unwary investors, observing only that International's earnings per share are growing at an extremely rapid pace, might even bid the company's multiple well above thirty.

Many people assume that some such scenario is commonplace in the affairs of conglomerates—that they have unusually high price-earnings ratios, and that they do in fact continually pick up "free earnings" by acquiring companies with lower multiples. *FORTUNE's* study of conglomerates related these assumptions to ten companies on this year's 500 list. The companies considered were Gulf & Western, International Telephone & Telegraph, Ogden, Indian Head, Walter Kilde, Textron, Litton Industries, Ling-Temco-Vought, Bangor Punta, and City Investing. The definition of "conglomerate" is debatable, but *FORTUNE* settled upon these companies because they have expanded aggressively through acquisitions, often across industry lines. Eight of the ten conglomerates examined showed exceptional growth in earnings per share during the decade. One of the exceptions was Bangor Punta, which had its properties confiscated by the Castro regime in 1959; its growth rate was less than 2 percent. Among the other companies, the poorest showing was made by Indian Head, which had an annual growth rate of 8.7 percent. By contrast, the median performance for all 500 companies was 8.8 percent.

MULTIPLE HANDICAPS

One immediate and rather surprising finding is that most conglomerates do not have,

and indeed have never had, particularly high price-earnings ratios (Bangor Punta and City Investing were omitted because earnings data for some quarters in the period covered were unavailable.) That wouldn't matter, of course, if they could always find and acquire companies with price-earnings ratios that were even lower than their own; this would still artificially inflate their per-share earnings. In fact, however—and this finding seems more surprising still—*FORTUNE* found that the conglomerates often *handicapped* themselves by acquiring companies with higher, sometimes much higher, multiples. Such acquisitions work to reduce earnings per share; and the management must raise those new earnings in a hurry to justify the acquisition.

Unfortunately, not all the acquisitions made by the conglomerates could be thoroughly scrutinized. Under SEC regulations, a buyer does not have to report the terms of an acquisition if the company being bought has either sales or assets amounting to less than 15 percent of the buyer's. And unless the cost of the transaction is known, it is of course impossible to determine what multiple the conglomerate paid for the new earnings. Perhaps a majority of the acquisitions made by the ten conglomerates in the study were of small companies. However, it appears that these companies accounted for only a minority of the new earnings added by the conglomerates over the decade. Details of practically all the big acquisitions during the period were available for study.

Using available figures, *FORTUNE* attempted to estimate how much of the per-share earnings growth shown by the ten conglomerates during the decade could fairly be attributed to a difference between their multiples and those of the companies they bought. During the 1968 fiscal year, for example, Litton issued 965,000 new shares of common stock, then worth about \$96 million, to buy Stouffer Foods; the price was thirty-three times Stouffer's earnings of \$2,900,000. Litton's own price-earnings ratio at the time was thirty-eight, which means its earnings per share got an automatic boost from the deal. If Stouffer had been earning \$365,000 less per year and the cost of the deal had remained the same, Litton would have been paying about thirty-eight times earnings—i.e., Litton's own multiple. Litton can thus be said to have acquired \$365,000 in "free" earnings from the acquisition.

Textron's acquisition of Spencer Kellogg & Sons in 1961 produced a radically different result; Spencer Kellogg's multiple was higher than Textron's. At the time, Textron was selling for thirteen times earnings but the transaction cost the company more than twenty-two times Spencer Kellogg's earnings of \$1,165,000. If Spencer Kellogg had been earning another \$915,000, the price-earnings ratios would have been even. Textron therefore was handicapped in the deal to the extent of \$915,000. That total might be viewed as "negative free earnings."

After determining the amount of free earnings in each transaction, *FORTUNE* adjusted the figures to reflect the time elapsed since the transactions took place. It was assumed that during these periods the resources of the acquired companies could have been invested more or less risklessly in bonds, and that any earnings growth not exceeding the returns available on AAA corporates should also be considered "free." The free earnings from each acquisition were therefore compounded through 1968 at the AAA rate prevailing when the acquisition was made. Positive free earnings were then offset against negative free earnings, and an overall total was derived for each conglomerate.

UP FROM BUMPERS

Of the ten conglomerates studied, two—Gulf & Western and I.T.T.—actually appear to have handicapped themselves on balance;

each had a negative free-earnings total, in Gulf & Western's case a very large one, in I.T.T.'s case a very small one. While the other conglomerates had positive free earnings on balance, in only two cases—Bangor Punta and Indian Head—did the free earnings account for most of the growth in earnings per share over the decade; in no other case did free earnings represent as much as 30 percent of the growth. Taking them one at a time, this is how the ten conglomerates made out in the free-earnings market. First, the two with negative free earnings:

Gulf & Western began the decade as a manufacturer of automobile bumpers, with sales of \$8,400,000 and a slight deficit. Last year, after more than eighty acquisitions, the company had sales of \$1.3 billion and net income of \$69,800,000. Among the bigger acquisitions were New Jersey Zinc Co., Paramount Pictures, South Puerto Rico Sugar, Consolidated Cigar, and Universal American. In the Paramount deal, consummated in 1966, Gulf & Western handicapped itself badly, paying more than seventy times the movie company's earnings (before special credits), which were in a sinking spell at the time; Gulf & Western's own multiple then was less than eight.

The company was also hurt by several other transactions in which it paid more than its own multiple. Gulf & Western's earnings per share increased by more than \$4 during the decade, even though it saddled itself, by *FORTUNE's* reckoning, with negative free earnings amounting to \$1.46 a share.

I.T.T. was already a large company at the start of the decade. In 1958 it had sales of \$687 million and net income of \$26,600,000, mainly from communications. Since then, it has merged with or acquired more than fifty companies, among them Avis, the car-rental firm, Levitt & Sons, the builder, and Sheraton. In the Sheraton deal, I.T.T. paid well over thirty times earnings, while its own multiple at the time was only twenty-one. I.T.T.'s earnings per share grew from 90 cents to \$2.79 during the decade. *FORTUNE* estimates that its free-earnings handicap was only about one cent.

Six others had free earnings representing from 12 to 26 percent of their growth:

Ogden had already begun diversifying through acquisition a decade ago. It was in the scrap-iron, electronics, and pollution-control industries, and had revenues of \$299 million and net income of \$23,000,000. During the decade it made more than thirty acquisitions, and now is in shipbuilding, food processing and servicing, and shipping. Sales last year were more than \$1 billion, and net income was \$25 million, or \$2.18 per share, up from 51 cents in 1958. Of the \$1.67 difference, about 25 cents represent free earnings.

Walter Kilde was a manufacturer of fire alarms, fire extinguishers, and minor defense products in 1958, when sales amounted to \$31 million and net was only \$110,000. Today, after more than fifty acquisitions, it makes industrial and agricultural equipment, furniture, and lighting equipment. Sales last year were \$566 million, and net was \$25 million, or \$3.39 per share, up from 15 cents in 1958. About 54 cents of that gain was from free earnings.

Textron was already a conglomerate in 1958, but in the ensuing decade it bought or merged with around sixty companies, among them Spidel, W. A. Sheaffer Pen, Fafnir Bearing, and Gorham, the silverware maker. Sales last year reached \$1.7 billion, and net was \$74 million, or \$2.26 per share, up from \$10,800,000, or 57 cents per share, in 1958. About 25 cents of that gain could be attributed to free earnings.

Litton had sales of \$83 million in 1958, and a net income of \$3,700,000. While it had begun to diversify in 1958, its activities were still heavily concentrated in electronics and business machines. Last year, more than sixty acquisitions later, it was building ships,

publishing books, and producing paper, among other things; revenues came to \$1.9 billion, and net income was \$58,500,000, or \$1.80 a share, up from 21 cents in 1958. About 27 cents of the gain in earnings per share came from free earnings.

City Investing was a real-estate holding company in 1958, with revenues of \$5,400,000 and net income of \$1 million. It became an active conglomerate in 1967, and altogether has made about a dozen acquisitions in construction, aerospace, graphic arts, and insurance. Revenues last year came to \$207 million, and net income was \$12,127,000, or \$2.22 a share, up from 34 cents in 1958. About 22 cents of that gain was attributable to free earnings.

Ling-Temco-Vought in 1958 was a small company called Ling Electronics, with sales of \$6,900,000 and a net of \$227,000. In the decade since, it acquired or merged with Temco Aircraft, Chance Vought, Okonite, Wilson & Co., Greatamerica Corp., and about two dozen other companies. Revenues last year came to \$2.8 billion, and net income was \$36,300,000, or \$8.90 a share. About \$2.25 of the \$8.76 per-share gain—26 percent—came from free earnings.

EARNING BY MERGING

Finally, there were the two companies for which free earnings represented a substantial part of growth:

Indian Head was confined to the textile business in 1958, when sales were \$43 million and net income was \$2,300,000. Today it is a major producer of glass products and auto parts and is also engaged in data-processing services. Among its three dozen acquisitions during the decade were Obear-Nester Glass, Northwestern Glass, Detroit Engineering & Machine Co., and Detroit Gasket & Manufacturing. Sales last year were \$369,500,000, and net income was \$12,100,000, or \$2.60 a share, up from \$1.13 in 1958. About 85 cents of that gain was attributable to free earnings.

Bangor Punta, in 1958, was a holding company whose subsidiaries ran three sugar mills in Cuba. The company, which was then named Punta Alegre Sugar Corp., had revenues of \$18,300,000 and net income of \$2 million. The next year the Castro regime confiscated virtually all its property. The company merged in 1964 with Bangor & Aroostook, a railroad holding company, and during the decade also made about twenty acquisitions, including Smith & Wesson, Waukesha Motor, and lesser-known companies in textiles, boatbuilding, and other industries. The Waukesha deal cost Bangor Punta almost twenty times earnings, although the conglomerate itself was selling for just thirteen times earnings. Revenues last year were \$257 million, and net was \$8,200,000, or \$2.80 a share, up from \$2.40 in 1958. About 29 cents of the growth in earnings per share could be attributed to free earnings.

SEVENTH VIRGINIA DISTRICT
OPINION SAMPLE

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a newsletter distribution in the Seventh Virginia Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, I invited citizen expressions on a few of the significant policy questions with which we are being required to deal in the Congress and which, of course, are of continuing responsibility in the executive branch.

I contracted for the responses to be

tabulated by an independent private organization, Capitol Computer Research.

While a relatively small number of responses still is coming into my office, the computation was based on a sample of 10,416 returns.

As of possible interest to other Members of the House, I include the tabulation of these returns, as follows:

Tabulation of 10,416 responses to a mail questionnaire conducted by Representative John O. Marsh, Jr., of Virginia

[In percent]

1. Despite anticipated budget cuts, Federal financial experts state the operating Federal budget for the next fiscal year will remain dangerously out of balance, unless the present surtax is extended. Assuming a maximum economy effort, do you favor keeping the surtax as an alternate to more Federal borrowing?

Yes ----- 67.1
No ----- 29.4

2. Based on what you have read or heard about it, do you favor the President's proposal for a limited anti-ballistic-missile system (ABM)?

Yes ----- 62.5
No ----- 31.6

3. Federal judges, including Justices of the Supreme Court, are appointed for life. Would you favor limiting their terms, such as 10 or 15 years?

Yes ----- 85.0
No ----- 13.2

4. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would reduce the voting age to 18 for President, Vice President, and Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate?

Yes ----- 37.1
No ----- 61.2

5. In general, are you satisfied with our present national policy in Vietnam?

Yes ----- 13.5
No ----- 81.5

6. If not, would you favor:
More vigorous military action and economic and diplomatic pressure against Soviet Russia and others supplying North Vietnamese?----- 38.1

Gradual withdrawal of U.S. military forces as South Vietnamese forces are found ready to replace them—irrespective of Paris talks?----- 32.4

Early and complete withdrawal of U.S. military forces, without regard to Paris peace talks?----- 18.0

Tabulation of 10,416 responses to a mail questionnaire conducted by Representative John O. Marsh, Jr., of Virginia—Continued

[In percent]

7. With respect to Federal firearms laws, do you favor:

Stricter Federal controls, with licensing and registration?----- 28.2

Retention of present laws and regulations?----- 18.1

Modification of the most recent Federal law and regulations to ease restrictions on sportsmen and other legitimate purchasers of firearms?----- 50.6

8. In electing the President of the United States, do you favor:

Retention of present electoral college system?----- 9.3

Election by direct national popular vote?----- 62.6

Modifying electoral college to divide each State's electoral votes in proportion to majority or plurality received by each presidential candidate in each State and congressional district?----- 25.9

9. In the selection by political parties of their candidates for President, do you favor: Retention of present convention system?----- 20.0

National primary elections to choose party candidates?----- 48.6

State primaries with results binding on State delegates to party conventions?----- 26.6

(NOTE.—Where totals do not add to 100 percent, deficiency may be regarded as "no response.")

ISLAND STATE HEARS PLEA FOR INTERNATIONAL WAR ON POVERTY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in one important sense our recent scientific achievements in space have served only to accentuate the widening gap between the more affluent and impoverished nations of the world. Talks delivered in Honolulu during the last month, including several before the International Rotary Convention held last week, reflected a rising current of opinion "around the world and in the United States that the next world war must be an international war on poverty."

One of the voices heard was that of the Ambassador from Indonesia, who said:

International stability and security at the subnuclear level will largely depend on . . . a major redirection of world resources toward effectively coping with the problem of international poverty. Manifest in all of the talks delivered in the Island State was more than a broad awareness of the scope of international poverty. Clearly expressed was the feeling that the battle must be undertaken and can be won.

I believe that my colleagues will find it of great interest to read more about the voices recently heard in Hawaii stressing the urgent need for an international war on poverty. For this reason I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the RECORD an excellent account written by A. A. Smyser, the distinguished editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, which appeared in the May 28, 1969, issue of the Star-Bulletin:

URGENT—THE INTERNATIONAL WAR ON POVERTY (By A. A. Smyser)

The member of the Japanese Diet put it this way: "The political stability of the Pacific area directly affects Japan's security. The economic well-being of this area is an integral part of Japan's prosperity."

Said the Australian editor: "The essence of security lies in an expansion of the economic opportunities for those whose present horizons are bounded by crushing poverty and unremitting despair."

The ambassador from Indonesia saw it in these terms: "International stability and security at the subnuclear level will largely depend on . . . a major redirection of world resources toward effectively coping with the problem of international poverty."

The secretary general of the Organization of American States used these words: "Today Latin America and Asia share what Gunnar Myrdal has called 'a craving for development.' The masses are becoming more and more aware that there is a better life, and they understandably want to enjoy it."

The assistant secretary general of the United Nations, a man from Taiwan, thinks the emerging battle between the developed Northern nations of the world and the undeveloped Southern nations poses a threat that is just as dangerous as the East-West rivalry. Investment to help bridge this gap is in the highest interest of the donor countries, he holds.

All of these quotations come from talks made in Honolulu in the past month, several of them before the International Rotary convention being held here this week.

The voices are from Japan, Australia, Indonesia, Ecuador and Taiwan.

But they represent a rising unity of belief in leadership circles around the world and in the U.S. that the next world war must be an international war on poverty.

They summon President Nixon of the United States in effect to a two-front war, a war on poverty abroad at the same time he also carries on the war on poverty at home.

In his acceptance speech at Miami last August after he was made the Republican nominee, Mr. Nixon promised to win the poverty war at home by July 4, 1976, the 200th birthday of the nation.

No one is setting any dates for winning the international poverty war but the call to fight it has gained the support of intellectuals around the globe.

Until this century it was simply not possible to think of winning such a war, says Mortimer Adler, the historian-scholar.

But today the only question about winning it is whether we have the spiritual quality and the political processes to use the great technology now available, says Najeeb Halaby, aviator-politician-business leader.

That is, of course, a gigantic question.

Here, in fact, lies the crucial challenge of the 1970's.

The goals are simple enough—to relieve international tensions in an age of rising expectations; to avoid nuclear extinction; to enrich life by avoiding depersonalization and destruction of the environment.

No one thinks attainment will be simple.

The surprising thing is how many enlightened people now think attainment is possible.

There are gloomy people like Gunnar Myrdal who contends that one of the great poverty areas, Southeast Asia, has social and institutional structures that hinder economic development, that won't yield to Western-oriented solutions either socialist or democratic, and that may have to be changed before there can be economic progress.

But even Myrdal doesn't see the task as impossible—only as immensely difficult and requiring much re-study and re-thinking in the target nations.

There is indeed evidence of change throughout Asia. Younger, more pragmatic leaders are moving into power . . . men like Lee Kuan Yew in Singapore and Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines. India seems likely to choose an untouchable as president.

Against Myrdal, there are people like the economists of Harvard University's Development Advisory Service who are convinced after field research that a system of incentives can be found that will produce growth in almost any environment.

The Harvard group also holds another conviction that is gaining wider acceptance but is against the conventional wisdom of the 1950s. Then it was believed that underdeveloped nations should industrialize at any cost. Today there is more emphasis on agriculture as the economic base to produce the surpluses from which business and industry can then be financed.

As a consensus develops on the need for the international war on poverty and as faith develops that it can be won, the available strategies, weapons and tactics also are coming more into view.

Since many of these will have to lean on dollars and know-how from the world's richest nation, it behooves us as American taxpayers to have at least a general knowledge of them.

It will even be heartening to discover that in many instances the drain on the U.S. need not be excessive—and should be amply repaid in new markets for our goods and in increased security.

The security exhortations at the beginning of this article were all quoted from non-Americans but they come on even stronger from people like Robert McNamara, the former U.S. secretary of defense who now heads the World Bank. McNamara feels he may be doing more to defend the developed world in his present capacity than he did in his former one.

Even more, McNamara is persuaded that the enlightened, self-interested search for security for the developed nations by closing the gap with the underdeveloped can be in many instances sound, profitable business.

Among the strategic goals of the international war on poverty will be these:

Enriched agriculture—Already a green revolution is sweeping lands like the Philippines, India, and Indonesia relieving problems of starvation and currency depletion, putting governments in a better position to cope with other problems.

Education—With the stress at the secondary and technical levels as well as at college levels.

Industrialization.

Population control—One of the most effective, least expensive ways for a country to earn greater economic dividends.

Regionalism—In Southeast Asia in particular nations will be urged to pool their fortunes and plan collectively for more effective development.

Institutional and leadership changes—Myrdal sees these as essential in Southeast Asia, others see them as less elemental.

The weapons in the arsenal are numerous and growing. Perhaps there will be weapons standardization at some later date. For the present there seems to be only proliferation.

Examples:

The World Bank—With 107 member countries, it now loans nearly \$1 billion a year and showed a 1968 profit of \$169 million.

The Asian Development Bank—Less than three years old it is an Asian-run bank handling Asian projects. The U.S. has provided 20 per cent of its \$1 billion in paid-in capital, has a 16 per cent vote on its board.

The Private Investment Company for Asia (PICA)—Funded by private businesses in Japan, the U.S. and other free world nations it will pump the know-how and resources of the developed nations into qualified private businesses in developing countries. It will work via equity investment loans, technical and managerial advice.

The Overseas Development Council (ODC)—A new non-profit research group headed by Eugene Black, former World Bank president, to increase the understanding of Americans of the problems of developing countries.

Agency for International Development (AID)—The U.S. government's agency for sending funds abroad.

International Development Association (IDA)—The World Bank's agency for making "soft loans" with easy terms and little or no interest to serve as seed money in countries and for essential projects that can't meet the high interest and terms of conventional hard loans.

The Peace Corps.

The U.S. Executive Corps.

International Rice Research Institute—A private research foundation located in the Philippines and funded by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations. It developed the miracle rice that has increased production by 400 to 800 per cent.

Committee for the Coordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin—A

United Nations group bringing international know-how and regional cooperation to bear to develop the Mekong River in TVA fashion for the benefit of four nations; Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam.

The Southeast Asian Ministerial Conference on Economic Development—This group was originated by Japan, its only non-regional member. After an April meeting, the New York Times reported that the delegates "surprised themselves by a collective will to set their political differences aside and concentrate on establishing a climate and machinery for economic cooperation."

The Pacific Area Travel Association (PATA)—A group with strong Hawaii backing that seeks to spur Pacific travel and promises Asian nations one of their greatest future sources of outside income.

The Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE)—A United Nations agency which has as subgroups the Mekong project (see above) and the Asian Highway Coordinating Committee which is working on a regional road network. ECAFE is also endorsing a 10,000-mile railroad from Singapore to Istanbul along the rim of Asia—and sponsored the Asian Development Bank (above).

The Pacific Basin Economic Cooperation Committee (PBEC)—A private group of business leaders from the five developed nations of the Pacific, namely the U.S., Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Annual steering committee meetings are held in Hawaii.

The proliferation of agencies partly reflects a need to work out combinations that can circumvent or minimize national rivalries to achieve particular objectives.

Regional education centers, improved communications, trade expansion projects, travel and education exchanges also rate as weapons in the international poverty war.

Tactics and tactical options again are a varied lot that could come to a better focus with more progress, know-how and unity.

There are, however, a number of discernible trends:

1. Multi-lateral aid is becoming far more popular than bi-lateral aid. Both are used but the political acceptability of the former seems to be rising with both donor and recipient countries.

2. An increasing emphasis on the export of know-how and a diminished emphasis on the export of money.

3. Increasing encouragement of private investment programs.

4. More selectivity about recipients and recipient projects.

5. More authority for the recipient to control use of the aid subject to donor veto.

6. A growing stress on the importance of regional arrangements and regional cooperation.

7. The emphasis mentioned previously on agriculture as the desirable base for launching an industrial take-off. Taiwan is the prime example.

The Asian Development Bank illustrates a number of the above trends. It is an Asian bank to serve Asia. Over 60 per cent of its capital is subscribed by 19 countries within the region. Its president and seven of its 10 directors come from within the region, but it seeks capital and talented staff worldwide.

Its early loans (the largest \$10 million) have supported an industrial project in Thailand, factory modernization in Ceylon, an expressway in Korea, a water project in Malaysia and aid to small industries in Pakistan.

Further it is providing technical assistance on banking and air transport in Nepal, on agricultural development in Indonesia, Korea and Laos, on a freeway for Taiwan, on a port project in the Philippines and on industrial finance in South Vietnam.

President Takeshi Watanabe comes from Japan but maintains his principal office in Manila. (His brother is on the faculty of

(the University of Hawaii.) He wants ADB to start cautiously and establish a record of success that will make capital contributions flow more freely in the future.

Such is the face of the international war on poverty.

The United Nations declared the 1960s as an international development decade but has fallen short of its goals.

Now it has declared the 1970s as a second such decade.

The voices heard in Honolulu in recent weeks are typical of a growing feeling among free world leaders that the battle must be undertaken and can possibly be won.

When and if the Vietnam war is ended, President Nixon will be increasingly urged to see that the world's richest nation plays its full part.

UNICEF TO AID NORTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Organization, through one of its propaganda agencies recently announced that it will honor V. I. Lenin as the UNESCO international humanist. Now another UNO indoctrinational agency, UNICEF, proposes an aid program for

North Vietnamese children and, of course, no opposition is dared because to do so might be construed as being against little children.

American children have trudged around from house to house begging money for UNICEF because they have been told they are helping poverty-stricken and underprivileged children. Any disillusionment at learning that these efforts are really helping the active enemy of our country—releasing Ho Chi Minh's resources to kill Americans—will perhaps be balanced by their happiness in learning that, according to the UNO, there are no poverty-stricken or underprivileged children in this country needing assistance. Who is in error—politicians out to make hunger-hay or the UNO world politicians, out to aid communism?

I include several UN news clippings in the RECORD:

UNICEF AIDE GOING TO HANOI

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

UNITED NATIONS, June 3.—A representative of the United Nations Children's Fund will go to Hanoi this month to discuss a possible aid program for North Vietnamese children, UNICEF announced today.

Dr. Boguslav Kozusznik of Poland will make the trip about June 15 as the representative of UNICEF's executive director, Henry R. Labouisse, following months of

confidential negotiations in Paris. Kozusznik, a physician, is second vice president of the UNICEF executive board.

A U.N. spokesman confirmed that this will be the first official contact between North Vietnam and the United Nations. Secretary General U Thant has met several times with North Vietnamese representatives, but always as a private individual.

In its annual meeting at Santiago, Chile, the UNICEF executive board approved an initial allocation of \$105,000 from a Dutch contribution to inaugurate a program if North Vietnam accepts the agency's criteria. The board authorized up to \$500,000 more from additional sources later.

Sweden is understood to have agreed to staff a UNICEF operation in Hanoi. UNICEF has worked closely with the League of Red Cross Societies, and the league's Swedish president, Henrik Beer, was in North Vietnam last week.

In agreeing to accept a UNICEF representative, North Vietnam did not specify his nationality. The choice of a Pole was made by UNICEF.

The Netherlands contribution is to be used for all children in Vietnam. Part has been used to reconstruct hospital facilities in Danang, South Vietnam.

FUNDS FOR UNICEF

UNITED NATIONS.—Christmas cards, a Halloween trick-or-treat collection and a special appeal for Nigeria-Biafra relief put \$7,773,500 into the U.N. Children's Fund last week. The money came in a check from the U.S. Committee for UNICEF.

SENATE—Thursday, June 5, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the source of our being, and the guide of our pilgrim days, we would hush our busy thoughts that we might learn in silence the mysteries of our being, and behold beyond the bounds of vision the goal toward which all history moves. We thank Thee for every thought that lifts us to Thyself, for the strength of reason and the inner kingdom of the mind, for beauty, goodness, and truth; for every noble desire and every holy impulse. O God, our life, our hope, our strength, keep us so close to Thee that in daily duties we may see beyond the tangle of human affairs, the pathway of Thy higher kingdom.

Bless our Nation, our leaders, and all the people, and make us a blessing to all mankind.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 2, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 2, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 4, 1969, received

messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations received on June 4, 1969, see the end of proceedings of today, June 5, 1969.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 2, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on June 3, 1969, received a message from the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 360D of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-602), I am herewith transmitting to you the first annual report on the administration of this Act. This report, prepared by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, describes activities undertaken to carry out the purposes of this Act during the 1968 calendar year as well as plans for further implementation of the Act during the current year.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 2, 1969.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 2, 1969, the following favorable executive reports of nominations were submitted:

On June 4, 1969:

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Commerce:

Peter Thomas Aalberg, and sundry graduates of the Coast Guard Academy to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of ensign;

Frederic J. Grady III, and sundry Reserve officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant;

Cluese Russell, and sundry officers of the Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4;

Charles A. Vedder, and sundry officers of the Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the grade of chief warrant officer, W-3; and

Gerald T. Victor, and sundry officers of the Coast Guard to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 2, 1969,

The Secretary of the Senate, on June 3, 1969, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 1995. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th