

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FARM PAYMENTS—SHOULD A
CHANGE BE MADE NOW?

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last week there was nationwide publicity concerning an amendment adopted by the House of Representatives to the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture which would limit farm program payments to not more than \$20,000 to any one farm operator.

It was evident from debate on the bill that there is widespread misunderstanding concerning the purposes of the farm program. There is a belief widely held that farmers receiving payments must be on easy street. The deplorable condition of the agricultural economy belies this notion. Thousands of farm families continue to abandon farming as a way of life only because they are unable to make an existence. Lagging farm income forces those able to farm to acquire more land to operate only as a matter of survival.

An illuminating and timely editorial entitled "Farm Payment Change Should Await a Whole New Program," published in the June 2, 1969, issue of the Kansas City Times, does much to place in proper perspective the question of farm program payments. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

FARM PAYMENT CHANGE SHOULD AWAIT A
WHOLE NEW PROGRAM

The proposal to limit the amount of dollars paid to any one farmer under government farm programs is one of those emotional issues that reaches far beyond the immediate factors.

To suggest that large payments going to "rich" farmers could be better utilized by poor people is a dramatic presentation. If that were all there is to the proposal, the answer would be simple.

The fact is, programs for the poor are not dependent on appropriations for farm programs. Actually, the programs are designed to sustain a prosperous agriculture and certainly one avowed purpose is to decrease poverty. A depressed agriculture not only would contribute to poverty on the farm but in cities as well.

It can be properly asked, however, whether the current farm program is the best that can be devised. Most farmers would contend that their incomes should be higher. Statistical evidence, comparing them with other segments of the economy, suggests they are right, despite criticism of government payments.

The current program has two primary goals: To "buy" a reduction in acreage and thereby curtail the production of surpluses and to increase farm income. To get payments, farmers sign a contract with the government to cut their planted acreages. If the idea is valid that an acreage reduction is good for farmers and the economy of the nation, then it is valid for big farmers as well

as small farmers. If big farmers are pushed out of the programs and plant from fence to fence, their increased production would tend to reduce prices for the products from the small farms. These are among just a few of the reasons why the payments are necessary if the present program is to function.

The proposal to limit the payments is for one year—1970. The contracts for this year cannot be changed. The present farm program expires in 1970.

The proper place to eliminate payments to large farmers would be in the new program that must be developed for 1970 and beyond. Undoubtedly this would require many basic changes in the farm laws. New concepts necessarily would have to apply.

Clifford M. Hardin, secretary of agriculture, has told Congress he believes such a program can be developed for consideration in this session of Congress or early in the next. The payment limitation idea should await that time.

VOTER REGISTRATION EFFORTS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee is presently conducting hearings on the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This bill, which I am co-sponsoring, falls squarely within the American tradition of free expression and the political process combining to produce rational decisions. It is in the tradition that reason and persuasion rather than assault are the ways to bring about change.

The importance of the extension of this act to the vitality of our system is explored in a column by Don Oberdorfer in today's Washington Post. The analysis of the contributions of charitable foundations to enlarged voter registration is timely also in that it reminds us of the interplay and effect of otherwise separate considerations by the Congress. For the information of my colleagues I am including Mr. Oberdorfer's column at this point in my remarks:

ATLANTA, GA.—In the immediate aftermath of the sit-ins and freedom rides which ushered in this decade of racial protest, leaders of the U.S. Government, private foundations and civil rights groups met to chart a way to redress the black man's grievances in the South without tearing the society apart. The course they chose was as old as the Constitution—not white power or black power but political power through the ballot box on a free and equal basis, one man, one vote.

This effort has achieved dramatic strides, though far from complete success. Today it is threatened by Congress and the Nixon Administration. Decisions to be made in the next several months will determine whether the Nation will scrap this drive to update the Constitution in the case of the Southern Negro.

The concept of political and social change through the ballot box is, as they say, as American as apple pie, but its application to the black man in many areas of the South was long denied. In 1962, according to the best available data, less than 30 per cent of

the voting age Negroes in the 11 southern states were on the registration rolls.

This was the starting point for the Voter Education Project put together by the Southern Regional Council with the cooperation of major civil rights groups notably the NAACP, SCLC, SNCC and CORE—and with funds from private foundations and encouragement from the Federal Government. From its headquarters in Atlanta, VEP has funneled more than \$1.2 million from a dozen major foundations and other givers to local voter registration drives throughout the South. The campaign was strengthened immeasurably by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which suspended much-abused literacy tests and authorized Federal examiners in areas where Negroes were denied the vote.

By last summer, according to the latest statistics, some 62 per cent of southern blacks were registered—roughly double the percentage of six years before. Though this falls short of the 78 per cent registration ascribed to southern whites, and though the power of the black man at the ballot box is still limited by many circumstances and contrivances, the rise of the Negro voter has had a substantial and generally healthy influence on southern politics. Some 461 Negroes are now serving in elective posts throughout the South, more than six times as many as in 1965.

At this point, one might expect that the southern voting campaign would be receiving widespread and even perhaps exaggerated accolades as an example of the vitality of the embattled American political system. Instead, it is facing the possibility that Washington officialdom is about to wring its neck.

One line of attack is on the foundation money which has supported the drive. As part of the Nixon administration's tax reform program earlier this year, the Treasury Department recommended to Congress that private foundations be prohibited from financing any activity "intended to affect a political campaign" specifically including voter registration drives.

The recommendation arose from the Ford Foundation's grant of \$175,000 to the Cleveland, Ohio, chapter of CORE a few months before the 1967 election there. Much of this money went to CORE's registration drive in the inner city which helped nominate and elect Mayor Carl Stokes over white opponents.

A few weeks ago, executives of four major foundations—Ford, Carnegie, Taconic, and Field—met with presidential assistant Daniel P. Moynihan to plead that the voter registration campaign in the South should not be sacrificed because of the incident in the North. On May 9, the Treasury issued an almost indecipherable press release intended to show—as Treasury officials later explained—that the Government did not mean to interfere with "publicly-supported" registration drives such as that of the Southern Regional Council.

Last week the House Ways and Means Committee announced a tentative ban on "direct or indirect" foundation sponsorship of any activities intended to influence an election, including voter registration drives. While the text of this proposal has not been made public, the indications are that it would stop the funds to the southern campaign.

At the same time, the Nixon administration has shown signs of hesitation about the extension of the Voting Rights Act, which expires next year. The civil rights groups engaged in the voting drive—probably the healthiest surviving remnants of the civil rights movement—have appealed for the Act

to be strengthened to eliminate abuses. Now they fear that it will be weakened instead or even junked.

It is true, that Mr. Nixon and the Republican Party have won the support of very few of the 1.6 million southern Negroes who are reported to have registered since 1962. However, the broad principles and object lessons involved clearly outweigh any political advantage or disadvantage in this region of 18 million registered voters.

The Nixon Administration, like the Kennedy and Johnson administrations before it, has appealed to protesters to channel their energies within the system. Mr. Nixon has argued that violence and disorder are unjustifiable because legitimate means are available to deal with the problems at hand.

At the moment, the evolutionary process which Mr. Nixon extolls is being threatened in Washington. If he means what he says about the merit and vitality of the American system, he will not let the voting rights campaign go down the drain.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH MAKES STRONG PLEA FOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY LEGISLATION

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, accidents and illness in American industry are costing the Nation's economy billions of dollars every year. Many more people are injured, it is indicated, while at work than are wounded while fighting in the Vietnam war.

Last night the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, discussed this serious national problem in an address before the Occupational Safety and Health Conference conducted by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO. I was present as he carefully delineated the scope of the problem and urged the passage of the Occupational Safety Act of 1969, which is now being considered by his committee.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator YARBOROUGH'S knowledgeable and thought-provoking remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

AN INDUSTRIAL SAFETY LAW IS NEEDED NOW

Over the Memorial Day weekend, it was difficult to turn on the radio without hearing a plea to drive safely. There is constant emphasis on the ever increasing toll of injury and death due to highway accidents. Three years ago Congress made a start toward reducing these needless injuries, when it passed the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. Under this law the Secretary of Transportation has established safety standards for automobiles, and everyone is aware of the headrests, seat belts, dual braking systems and other improvements which are on the new model cars.

Yet, according to the National Safety Council there were more disabling injuries and deaths in the work situation than were due to motor vehicle accidents in the first six months of 1967. Specifically, there were 850,000 motor vehicle injuries and 23,600

deaths—and 1 million work injuries resulting in temporary or permanent disablement and 6,900 deaths.

During the same period in Vietnam there were 4,899 deaths and 31,913 military personnel wounded or a total of 36,812 injuries and deaths; that is, there were roughly 30 times as many people injured at work in the United States as were injured fighting in Vietnam during the same six months of 1967.

In 1967, work accidents and illnesses cost the American economy \$7.3 billion. Ten times more man-days were lost due to injury than were lost because of strikes in 1966. Obviously, industrial safety and health problems merit our most careful consideration.

Yet last year when Congressman O'Hara and I, with the help of Secretary Wirtz, Asst. Secretary Esther Peterson and Senators such as Jennings Randolph who is with me tonight, introduced into the House and Senate the first comprehensive occupational health and safety bill, we drew the critical fire of several organizations who claim that legislation of this type is too expensive.

One may well ask too expensive for whom? Is it too expensive for the company who for lack of proper safety equipment loses the service of its skilled employees? Is it too expensive for the employee who loses his hand or leg or eyesight? Is it too expensive for the widow trying to raise her children on meager allowances under workman's compensation and social security? And what about that man—a good hardworking man—tied to a wheel chair or hospital bed for the rest of his life? That's what we're dealing with when we talk about industrial safety.

We're talking about people's lives, not the indifference of some employers. We're talking about assuring the men and women who work in our plants and factories that they will go home after a day's work with their bodies intact. We're talking about assuring our American workers who work with lethal chemicals that when they've accumulated a few years seniority they will not have accumulated lung congestion and poison in their bodies.

Must we always have disasters in order to pass safety legislation? As a nation, we have simply not faced up to the real issue, and that is that our workers are being killed needlessly, that they are being injured and disabled and infected on the job by largely preventable accidents and disease.

It is true that many large industrial establishments have excellent employee health and safety records. They are to be highly commended, and they would not be affected by the basic standards that would be set under the proposed legislation now before Congress.

The real need for safety and health standards is to be found in plants that do not have adequate safety regulations. Most plants, as a rule, offer little or no protection for their workers. And these plants constitute 98 percent of all working establishments in the United States.

Today, job safety laws and regulations are scattered pretty thinly between local, county and state governments.

Many of these laws are not laws at all. They call for "voluntary" compliance—and you know how anxious management can be to spend money on its employees!

Four states still have no safety inspection staff of any kind—and no safety regulations. My own state of Texas has one of the poorest industrial safety laws in the nation.

In fact, there are only about 1,600 safety inspectors working for all state governments in the Union and 87 in the federal service. Of the state inspectors, about half are general safety inspectors and half are specialists who examine boilers, elevators and the like. That is about 17 general safety inspectors per state in the United States.

I should note that inspectors are useful not only for what they do, but more im-

portantly for what they represent—a commitment of the government to ensure proper working conditions for its citizens. Most companies don't violate the laws of the United States, but the laws must exist for the companies to know that it is the public policy of the United States to protect its citizens from industrial accidents and disease.

We know worker accidents can be prevented. The National Safety Council has 10,000 member companies who—over the past ten years—have maintained an excellent low-accident rate. These companies lost only one-fourth as many man-hours during the past ten years as the national average.

We know that our workers' lives can be protected. It's good business to protect your workers. And yet in 1966, there were 14,500 industrial deaths—2.2 million injured permanently—and another 7 million who sustained less serious injuries.

That's why I introduced my occupational safety bill last year, and why I was happy to defer as the principal sponsor of S. 2193 to Senator Williams, the new Chairman of the Labor Subcommittee. Needless to say, I am co-sponsor, and as Chairman of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I intend to make every effort to help better the working conditions of our citizens by improving occupational health and safety.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1969 will give the Secretary of Labor new powers to set and enforce safety and health standards. It provides for research, training and special safety education campaigns. And it encourages the states to set up their own strong safety programs and to enforce them.

For too long we have watched our fathers and our brothers and our sons and daughters suffer needlessly on the job. We have seen lives lost—limbs torn—wages and work-hours missed—and we have seen human grief.

The time for change is today. I need your help and your support to help pass the Occupational Safety Act of 1969.

TAXES, TAXES, TAXES

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, grassroots concern about rising taxes imposed at all levels of Government continues to grow. A very incisive editorial on the topic of taxes appeared recently in the Wellston Telegram, one of the leading newspapers published in the State of Ohio. Mr. Lawrence Townsend is editor of the newspaper and authored the editorial. I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

TAXES—TAXES—TAXES

Taxes at all levels of government have now risen to the point where authorities appear to genuinely fear a taxpayers revolt. Exorbitant property taxes, it is predicted, will force some people out of their homes. Refusal of voters to approve bond issues are compelling cutbacks in education frills and even the closure of some schools for limited periods. Taxpayer pressure is also felt at the federal level.

As a consequence of the rising concern over taxes, we may see in the coming months a new political approach to the whole subject of spending and taxation. For one thing, it is likely that the carefully cultivated illusion that people can get something for nothing from the government will go down

the drain, as public officials are faced with the ever-increasing necessity of balancing each new spending program with additional tax revenue or new bond issues.

For another thing, there will very likely be redoubled efforts to make tax systems more palatable—and more equitable. Indicative of the trend is a new Treasury Department study that has been submitted to Congress proposing sweeping tax reform for the federal government. The study is a 960-page 8.5 pound document, compiled by treasury experts over a two-year period.

According to experts, the highly detailed technical document is probably the most comprehensive tax reform ever put together by the Treasury Department. As such, it will be the standard for judging all other tax reform bills offered in Congress and the basis for whatever legislation is eventually written on the subject.

The proposals in the study are directed to making the tax laws more fair and not at raising money. In the main, they would reduce the federal tax burden of low income families, the elderly and the middle income group. To balance the tax loss from these groups, the study proposes closure of "loop-holes" used by millionaires and corporations.

Other proposals in the study deal with simplifying and changing many of the rules on deductions for charitable contributions, state gasoline taxes, etc. The study passes over some of the controversial targets of the more extreme school of tax reform. These include mineral depletion allowances, rapid real estate depreciation provisions, the capital gains tax and tax-free municipal bonds. Instead, the treasury experts suggest a minimum tax on gross income of the wealthy who reportedly use present laws to escape their fair share of taxes.

Press reports on the treasury study may easily lead people to believe that proposed tax reforms would shift much of the tax burden to higher income groups. Common sense should tell us this is not possible. The cost of government has become so great there is no one to bear the burden other than the majority of citizens of modest means.

As the pressure grows for tax relief, we should not lose sight of the main truth. Real tax relief must await a realignment of government spending in relation to the tax-paying ability of the people. Moreover, in the search for ways to ease the tax burden on those least able to pay, we should remember that a tax system must not only seek to be fair, but must also preserve the incentive of workers and producers. The fable of killing the goose that lays the golden egg is as valid today as ever.

SEMANTIC WARFARE

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a few days ago I placed in the RECORD a highly interesting research paper on the semantic differences in the language of negotiations between the United States and Russia. That research brief was most enlightening to me and I hope it proved beneficial to my colleagues and others in the Government of this Nation called upon to deal with the Soviets in international negotiations.

Since the Senate is called upon to advise the President and give its consent for the ratification of international agree-

ments, it is most important that we understand the nature of the semantic battle we are in with the forces of communism, or perhaps more properly with the forces of Marxist-Leninism.

Because of our open society, Mr. President, we are accustomed to the free interchange of ideas and often find that a new word or phrase more accurately expresses the things we have to say; so we often interchange words that in their essence means the same thing. We use U.S.A. to mean the Federal Government. We say United States when we mean Congress, the executive branch, the judiciary, the comparable governments on a State and local level, and all the people.

Behind the Iron Curtain the same semantic rules do not prevail. Because of the nature of an authoritarian society, the saying of a character from "Alice in Wonderland" is the rule of semantics:

When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.

So it is with those authoritarian governments that seek to subvert the whole world to their particular system; when they use a word, it means what they say it means, neither more nor less.

How then are we to prepare ourselves to properly negotiate when we are at this obvious semantic disadvantage? It becomes necessary for us to understand the nature of this conflict—this systemic warfare in which we are engaged. By understanding we can greatly reduce the effectiveness of the semantic trickery that has so often plagued our international agreements in the past.

Mr. President, to contribute to this understanding I ask unanimous consent that several pertinent quotations and an article entitled "Systems in Conflict," prepared by the American Research Foundation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

N. S. Khrushchev, November 23, 1955; Speech, Bombay, India: "You know that the heads of Government of the Four Powers met in Geneva and that the Foreign Ministers of the Four Powers met there later. Great efforts were made to achieve agreement but the results were very small so far. This happens because we understand the same words differently".

John F. Kennedy, Report on European Talks, Washington, June 6, 1961: "And just as our judicial system relies on processes appearing in court and on cross-examination, instead of hearsay testimony of affidavits on paper, so, too, was this give and take of immeasurable value in making it clear and precise what we consider to be vital, for the facts of the matter are that the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words—war, peace, democracy and popular will".

Weekly Journal, Warsaw, July 1958: "In our public, political and intellectual life, in our organizations and newspapers, there exists a special figurative language. It consists of the usage of certain terms of phrase. All that is needed is a clue. These who have guessed that clue are able to read public utterances as if they were an open book and thus learn a lot of things. It goes without saying that one has to read between the lines to follow hidden ideas, and this reading between the lines is not illegitimate. On the contrary, the texts are construed in such a way that reading between the lines is the only way to grasp their meaning. To be able

to follow this figurative language one has to possess many years training in reading it."

Evgeni Yevtushenko, Shosse Entusiyastov, Page 18, Moscow, 1956: "Comrades, you have to give words back their original meanings."

SYSTEMS IN CONFLICT

For years the Communists have plainly told us—and are still telling us—what they will do and how they plan to do it. They tell us, of course, in a language all their own. Sometimes this language is so esoteric that it is difficult even for people who are fully acquainted with the ideology and the organizational and operational methodology of the Marxist-Leninist camp to apprehend. This is by design, for language manipulation is one of their strategic methods of conquest.

Since the conflict between the World Capitalist System and the World Socialist System is being waged mainly in the realm of ideas, it is essential to be constantly aware of the strategy and tactics employed in the struggle. This awareness is possible only after careful and continuous analysis of statements issuing from the Communist sources, subjecting the words used in those statements to almost microscopic scrutiny in search of their meaning within the context in which they are used. Only when the Communist meaning is understood can it then be challenged.

As President Kennedy said, the two camps "give wholly different meanings to the same words". It is perilous, therefore, to assume that their meaning can be construed as equivalent to ours. Furthermore, the whole context of communication must be taken into consideration—the source and the object; the writer and the reader, the speaker and the hearer.

It is intended here to show the way to the understanding, meaningful comprehension, by pointing out a process of semantic analysis aimed at cutting through the superficial layers which can encrust the words and uncovering the significant core of their actual meaning. A reader of contemporary news finds himself confronted with numerous words, terms, and phrases which sound familiar but, to the Marxist-Leninist faithful these words more often than not, have a different meaning. Some of the terms are entirely new and strange. Many of them can be found in the Communist classics, but for the most part, they are the products of the last two decades. They tend to express relevant intentions and opportunities to advance Communist designs on the free world.

Marxist-Leninist programs, policy and action have always moved along dual channels the conventional machinery of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) as a nation-state, and the World Revolutionary Movement which is headed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). This latter operates under the name of the World Socialist System and its multipurpose subsystems; the Commonwealth of Socialist Countries, the World Marxist-Leninist and Workers' Movement, the class liberation movement which is labelled, the National Liberation Movement, and myriads of internal and world-wide fronts and infiltrated nonparty organizations.

There is another dualism with which we are concerned here, namely, the linguistic duality of communist terminology and usage. The language of Communism can itself constitute a deadly weapon to be used in the Marxist-Leninist assault on the free world. When that language is understood correctly, its effectiveness as a weapon is weakened considerably. It is essential, therefore, to focus sharply on the semantics of Communism, casting aside conventional, traditional meanings, and searching for the exact meaning attached to even the most commonplace words in the political vocabulary of today's struggle. The tendency to equate verbally what cannot be equated conceptually provides the Communists with semantic am-

munition for assault on all levels of life in the free world. In this, warlike intentions are attributed to the community of so-called "Peace-Loving" countries and states.

The study of semantics is a dynamic, vital craft. It can never be static. It is subject to constant change, particularly in regard to the shifting dual vocabulary of Communism. For in the free world, this is precisely where one of the major problems lies in efforts to determine the true meaning of the language of Marxism-Leninism. The behavior of the USSR/Soviet Union and the "Russian" complex is described by different terms at different times. There is an almost total absence of delineation and precisely defined words and terms. The Party Line and its symbols are ambiguous; occasionally, however, one may be able to detect at least three "standardized" terms of reference: Right, Left, and Correct. These three "standardized" usages change with the nuances of the Party Line.

Words are symbols for ideas and images without which we could not communicate with each other except by gestures and inarticulate noises. We take words for granted and find it difficult to imagine that ancient time when our primitive ancestors did not have them. In speech we often use words and terms loosely, knowing that we can rely on the tone of voice, inflection, facial expressions and gestures to get the meaning across. In writing, however, the word stands alone. It must in itself carry the full import of its meaning.

Effective communication through the use of language depends upon whether or not understanding is present. If words have different *intentional* meanings for different parties, mutual understanding is impossible. In trying to comprehend the true meaning of the language used, semantics, or the study of meanings, is important.

In any study of ideological or other *transnational semantics* it is necessary to examine doctrines, key words and terms, slogans and phrases from the point of view of how they are understood as well as what they mean. The style of language is very informative; it varies according to particular situations, but certain characteristics can always be observed as being indicative of its true source in a democratic culture or in an autocratic culture. To the skillful interpreter, style of language is also useful as a barometer to measure significant political and other trends. A correct interpretation will depend largely on the accuracy of that measurement.

Today, in a world where the expression of diverse ideas affects daily world events, whether the expression conveys meaning or not depends upon the writer/speaker and the reader/hearer. The words and phrases of common usage throughout the world, however, have been ideologically redefined and molded by the Communists and imbued with a new class meaning which is exclusively designed to serve their purpose. Thus Marxist-Leninist leaders may communicate with their followers and adherents anywhere on the face of the globe. Communists and their ideopartisans use terms of established conventional usage which we unconsciously understand and interpret in our accepted English connotation. These expressions have definite values for us. They do not have the same values and significance for the Communists who use them malevolently.

The most important and striking feature of the Communist dual use of language is the deliberate effort to convert it into a powerful instrument for the Marxist-Leninist hegemony to wield over the human intellect. The effort to transform the substance of language while maintaining its outward and visible or audible forms, to deliberately destroy the significance of words whose conventional meaning is inimical to Marxist-Leninist purposes and to attach a new specific meaning that makes words allies of Communist ideology is *semantic subversion and deception*.

On the surface, their meaning appears to be innocuous; but when read or heard by persons who know the Communist dual-value semantic inference, their true significance as conveyors of the Party's ideological and instructional directions can be perceived. Their true meaning is hidden from the uninitiated or casual reader. Hence by the use of ostensible, legal jargon, resorting to words of unquestioned virtue in another context, the Communist leadership is able to provide ideological guidance as well as organizational and operational directives from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union without having to resort to illegal or clandestine methods and activities.

The Marxist-Leninist ideological, organizational and action image as conveyed by their words and terms is shaped according to their New Scientific World Outlook or the New Historical Perspective based on concepts of Class Systems in Conflict. In order to perceive, therefore, what the Communists are really saying, we must study their writings in the light of their own ideological, indoctrinational and organizational conditioning as well as in the light of their practical action experience in the implementation of the Communist tenets. This conjunction of conventional words and terms and their implied Marxist-Leninist meaning can best be made clear through *semantic analysis* and subsequent interpretation. Consequently, in order to fully understand Communist *semantic warfare*, one cardinal rule must be rigidly observed when reading Communist and fellow-traveled writing; *note the origin of the writings and read them as they understand them*. Only thus can the real, the substantive meaning of these key words, terms and phrases with their variables be correctly understood. A regular perusal, study and analysis of Communist and Soviet Russian and non-Russian publications will disclose to the trained reader a great deal of information. To arrive at a correct semantic interpretation, however, not only literal translation (i.e., form), but also idiomatic interpretation (i.e., substance) must be applied.

When a key word like "peace" is used by the Communists, one must be cautious which clarifying variable or adjective should be mentally added to the term: Marxist-Leninist, ideological, or conventional geographic, tactical; or whether the word applies to the situation within the Communist Bloc or the situation within the Free World.

For instance, the Communists in their propaganda and agitation efforts would have the noncommunized world believe that peace in its fullest sense is universally enjoyed within that part of the world which the Communists control. On the other hand, the capitalist/imperialist world (as they would characterize it) is distinguished by aggression, exploitation, slavery, misery, hunger, tyranny, brutality, etc. It goes without saying here, that people of the free world believe identical conditions obtain within the communist world. Obviously both opinions cannot be correct. Both are extremely divergent conclusions based on the same set of inferences.

Facts which we can verify determine the correctness of opinion in the free world. On the other side, however, facts are irrelevant in the Communist controlled world if the facts conflict with the CPSU Party Line. Under communism facts are usable only if they aid or abet the Communist objectives. From the point of view of Marxist-Leninist ideology, conclusions are drawn *prior* to the formation of facts. Thus, peace may be lasting and universal only as a result of total annihilation of the World Capitalist/Imperialist System with all of its social, political and economic foundations based on private ownership and free enterprise. To the Communist this will occur only when victorious Communist revolutions sweep through the world.

This *semantic distinction* must consistently be made regarding a great number of other key words such as justice, law, democracy, disarmament, sovereignty, self-determination, free elections, etc. Only by careful and painstaking scrutiny of these and other words of similar ilk can semantic confusion be eliminated. Otherwise, a meeting of minds is impossible. However, having arrived at a meeting of the minds or agreement on definitions of words used in a given set of circumstances or negotiations, there is no assurance that the ostensibly agreed to results or programs will be carried out by the Soviets and their Satellites. The Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union *alone* will determine what action will or should be taken, what obligations honored, what obligations ignored or repudiated. The only criterion exercised is: Does compliance further the cause of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union? If the Communist cause is not furthered, by resorting to semantic subterfuge, the leadership of the Party can announce to its followers throughout the world that the ostensible agreements are not binding and are to be honored only in the breach.

Meanwhile, if semantically unenlightened, the Free World will formulate its plans on the erroneous assumption that agreement in fact has been reached and that the negotiators or treaty signatories are of one mind. All too often, as history unfolds it becomes obvious that such is in fact *not* the case.

Between the base, the superstructure and the infrastructure of the Marxist-Leninist system, there is an intricate framework of communications which is the prime exponent of Communist theory and practice.

The following sketch of the power framework within the USSR and satellite territories is found in the Marxist-Leninist concept of base and superstructure.

(1) The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the leading ideological and organizational peace force, the vanguard of the World Marxist-Leninist/Communist/and Workers' Parties throughout the world. They are in power or are seeking power under their true colors or under such guises as, for one, the Socialist Unity Party in East Germany. They may be legal, semi-legal or illegal. In all cases their "official" organs are *Pravda*, the daily paper, and *Kommunist*, the monthly publication. There are innumerable other publications prepared and edited by the AGITPROP of the Central Committee on the CPSU. These, too, carry the officially approved action line.

(2) The constitutionally nonexistent international and nation-state entity called the Soviet Union according to the Communists is the real ideological, organizational, strategic force and material-technical base of the World Socialist System, which embodies:

(a) the Commonwealth of Socialist Countries or the national (*not* nation-state) government superstructures of the USSR; the Socialist, People's, Democratic, and National-Democratic Republics and other international governmental fronts such as the Warsaw Pact, CEMA, and others.

(b) the World Marxist-Leninist (i.e., Communist) and Workers' Movement in developing countries.

(c) The World National and/or People's Liberation Movement in newly independent states and other developing countries and dependencies;

(3) The world-wide superstructures or subsystems of national, provincial, local, regional, international mass or front and infiltrated organizations which are directly or indirectly under the control or direction of corresponding party fractions.

This entire World Socialist System is cemented by the principles of unity of will and action, democratic centralism and proletarian internationalism.

For the most part, in an informal situation, the terms "USSR" and "Soviet Union" are used interchangeably as are the terms

"USA" and "America". It must be pointed out here that this casual attitude is not shared by USSR Government officials, members of the CPSU, and all other Communists throughout the world. To them, there is not only a formal, verbal difference; there is a very real ideological distinction between the two terms. The Soviet Union can be defined as the base, while the USSR is defined as the superstructure of the World Socialist System. The governments of other socialist states are also built upon this base and are, therefore, also superstructures of the World Socialist System and its components, the Commonwealth of Socialist Countries. In speaking and writing, USSR officials and Communists are very precise in their use of these two fundamental key terms.

The distinction between the two can be demonstrated by the fact that while the bases of Capitalist and Socialist Systems are in a class war with each other, their superstructure (i.e., the USA and the USSR) are living together in a climate of peaceful co-existence as nation-states. This co-existence is based on a nonviolent class and political struggle and a kind of peaceful competition. The peaceful co-existence of the superstructures further as the one held at Glassboro in 1967. Furthermore, the United Nations Organization, being an organization of superstructures, provides a forum for peaceful debate between the member superstructures.

With the base, however, it is a different matter. Since the October Revolution of 1917 the two bases have been in a class struggle. This class war between socioeconomic systems, according to the Marxist-Leninist, will continue until one or the other is destroyed.

Upon realizing the distinction between the terms Soviet Union and USSR, it is a simple matter to see why the Soviet Union as the base openly supports wars of National Liberation throughout the world while the USSR, on the other hand, can support such war only within the limitations imposed by conventional International Law and such recognized codes as the U.N. Charter.

Between the base and the superstructure lies the complex infrastructure of the Marxist-Leninist system, namely the party fractions. These fractions are in effect the tentacles of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They infiltrate and penetrate non-Party mass organizations and guide them along the path determined by the CPSU. Accordingly, the USSR, as well as the governments of socialist, peoples' and democratic states are nothing more than non-Party mass organizations or fronts which are penetrated and controlled by Party Fractions.

With this in mind, it is easy to reach the conclusion that governments which are infiltrated by Communist fractions must reflect a degree of ideological and other control by the CPSU. In the United Nations Organization, which incidentally is in itself a Superstructure according to Communist organizational concepts, this control and direction of the Superstructures by the base is evident directly and indirectly in the pattern of voting by the various member nation-states. The vote of nation-states with controlling overt fractions within the Communist bloc will indicate the Soviet Union's interlocking fraction leadership. These nation-states with overt fractions tend to vote according to the *indirect* guidance of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; the voting pattern of these states is less obvious.

To understand the semantic warfare waged by the Marxist-Leninists in their ideological class struggle, one must be able to project the concept of base and superstructure into socio-economic, political and diplomatic realities. By following this semantic analysis, one may conclude that the USSR and its allied Socialist States—those within the Warsaw, CEMA, and other fraternal pacts—are

nothing more than fronts, mass organizations or superstructures of the base, organized, controlled, guided and disciplined by the CPSU whose party program is actually the constitution of the USSR and the Satellite States.

By adding to this semantic analysis a semantic interpretation one may then conclude that any negotiations, treaties, agreements, etc., within and without the United Nations Organization, with the USA and other *bona-fide* nation-states of the free world are agreements between superstructures only. Such being the case, they can be readily broken whenever they endanger the base, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, alliances between nations of the free world such as NATO, SEATO, etc., are viewed with alarm as posing a physical threat to the base and consequently these alliances become targets for attack. Within the Bloc, ideological threats are viewed with equal concern. Such is the case with current developments in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Incorrect understanding of the Marxist-Leninist concept of base and superstructure leads towards almost complete and irremediable break in effective communications between the two mutually antagonistic world systems, Capitalist and Socialist. Furthermore, the misunderstanding of the substantive language of such international documents as the Yalta Agreement led later to the "legal" seizure of power in Poland by the Communists. The misinterpretation of the international court decisions at Nuremberg led to the "legal" charge that U.S. pilots downed in North Vietnam are war criminals. The tragedy of Korea in 1950, Hungary in 1956, Cuba in 1959, and aspects of the strife in the Middle East stem from the failure of the free world to understand the language of Marxism-Leninism.

The introduction of Marxist-Leninist language and phraseology into the proceedings and resolutions of the United Nations Organization and its agencies—Disarmament, Human Rights, Colonialism, Non-Interference in Internal Affairs of States, Nuclear Weapons, Space and other international legal statements—provides the USSR/Soviet Union, that is to say the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with legality and approved semantic license in conventional international relations.

This legality is necessary to the imperative to maintain relations with capitalist and other non-aligned nation-states pending the national liberation of the free world's class oppressed peoples who are to be inspired ideologically, organized and supplied by the world revolutionary base, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In order to exploit the concept of a Western parliamentary form of government, the superstructure, i.e., the USSR and the Socialist States as these latter exist as nation-states, were set up. The base considers these to be but temporary expedients, however, for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union rejects the concept doctrinally.

Peaceful co-existence between states has been devised as a convenient, long-range means or tactic for entering into formal inter-nation-states relations with non-Communist states without endangering the existence and security of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union whose ultimate goal is the establishment of the classless society throughout the world. Or, in other words, whose ultimate goal is world domination.

Before World War II, the communist party of the Soviet Union's world political party line was to take over the capitalist society and its governments by violent means or armed struggle. This policy did not produce the expected results, i.e., world revolution, so it was expediently changed to cold war, or political, diplomatic and economic struggle, or class war by other means such as seman-

tic deception and subversion with an eventual, nonviolent takeover of capitalist society and its governments. This, then, is the period of semantic warfare.

The Agitation and Propaganda Department (AGITROP) of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has the major responsibility for the conduct of semantic warfare. This Department has a vast scope of responsibilities, namely:

- (1) The Program of the Party, General Party Line, and other basic Party resolutions and decisions,
- (2) to designate specific courses of action, i.e., tactics, in all matters affecting government and other mass organizations or fronts on all levels,
- (3) to mold and mobilize public opinion within and without the Communist Bloc so that it will most effectively support and facilitate the implementation of short and long term aims defined by the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU,
- (4) to establish and implement guide lines for all communications media both governmental and public, both within the Communist Bloc and in the components which lie outside the Bloc,
- (5) to control all societal life, including press, publishing arts, scientific, technological and academic work. This control is exercised by ideological censorship,
- (6) to assist in economic, labor, education and other Party activities,
- (7) to serve as the internal and external security guardian,
- (8) to prepare all material and guidance for delegates and participants in international organizations,
- (9) to prepare and assist in all cultural, academic and other exchanges between nation-states, public organizations, societies, etc.

This broad spectrum of responsibility is carried out by fractions which the AGITPROP guides and controls ideologically through the cadre department of the central committee of the CPSU. It is the cadre department which is charged with the responsibility, the cadre department relies on the united fronts.

The formation of united fronts is an essential part of Communist technique for the seizure of power. It is a tactical weapon employed by Marxist-Leninists to broaden both the real and the apparent basis of support where they strive to attain power. Through the united fronts the Marxist-Leninist party seeks to form alliances or coalitions with non-Communist elements and organizations on mutually acceptable programs which embrace popular themes such as "Peace", "anti-imperialism", "neo-colonialism", "genuine democracy", "sovereignty", "anti-corruption", etc., which are popularly acceptable and at the same time consonant with the tactical approach of the Party. Being tactical, Communist objectives for the United Fronts vary with the country concerned. These objectives range from *minimum goals* to *maximum goals*. The following general objectives, however may be said to be universal:

- (1) to give the Communist Party respectability and to broaden its base of support,
- (2) to attack, discredit and denounce major ideological enemies of the Communist Party in order to eliminate class enemies under the guise of popular support,
- (3) to enable the Communist Party to make converts from membership of allied parties, and then build up fractions in those parties,
- (4) to capture, if possible, entire parties and organizations,
- (5) to prepare as large a proportion of the masses as possible for a sudden switch to the offensive when the *revolutionary situation* warrants and, ideally, to establish a

United Front, National Unity or a National Democratic Government.

The Communists usually establish two basic types of United Fronts,

(1) the United Front from below whose objective is the neutralization of the non-Communist leadership, gaining thereby access to the rank and file of the masses. Leaders are to be isolated by exposing them before the people in general. The ranks are to be won by appeals for unity in the struggle against exploitation by capitalism/imperialism.

(2) The United Front from above which is known as the Popular, or Peoples' front. This transcends a purely working class arrangement and seeks to compose an "alliance" with petit-bourgeois, peasant, and bourgeois parties for immediate aims of a specific nature. Into this category such organizations as the World Peace Council fall.

Our major concern here is, of course, with the language of international diplomacy and government. This is an area for the specialist, the expert. But an informed public is also an essential segment of the socio-political structure of our time. A correctly informed public can be a great force for stability in the free world. An incorrectly informed public can be said to be the Achilles' heel of government. In informing itself, the serious public is confronted with a problem of the first magnitude. The journalists which we rely on so heavily can be so misleading as to sacrifice truth in the interests of brevity. For example the words "Russia", "Moscow", or "Kremlin" are almost universally used as a broad symbol for the hub of the Communist world. In actuality, they are by no means synonymous, for as a political nation-state "Russia" died with the last Czar. In the world of hard political realities, "Russia" is an utterly meaningless word, except for its historical meaning.

Furthermore, even a literate public is inclined to project its own corpus of background, facts, inferences and value judgments into their interpretation of key words and phrases. For instance, take the word "Peace". There is no more pregnant word in the Communist vocabulary. To assume that they use the word with the same body of reference as does a spokesman for the free world is to lay one's self open for frontal attack. The assumption that everyone wants Peace in the same sense that we use that word is erroneous and can lead only to disaster.

The semantic barrier can be significantly reduced if wishful thinking is avoided and the problems are recognized in a realistic *substantive* manner rather than simply on the basis of the *form*. It must not be assumed that the Communist substantive meaning can be construed as being equivalent to ours.

Some people feel that there has indeed been a change of Communist policy for the better. As evidence of this they cite "Peaceful Co-existence". It must be cautioned here that that phrase itself is nothing more than a tactical formula designed to throw the free world off guard.

The factor of constant change served to complicate any semantic analysis of the language of Communism and emphasizes the need for intelligent, sophisticated and constant reevaluation. There are, however, some aspects of Marxism-Leninism which are fundamental and which need to be understood specifically in discussing Communist semantics. In spite of the seemingly overt appearance of change in the USSR/Soviet Union actions and verbal enunciations, the fundamental concepts of Marxist-Leninist theory and practices have remained intact since their inception.

There are many key words and phrases concealed in protective methods of expression or open codes known only to the indoctrinated communist cadres and their ideopartisans who master Marxist-Leninist ide-

ology and methodology. Through one key word, term, combination of words, or phrases which originate in Marxist-Leninist, Maoist and other classics and in history, an open code to an entire orientation or policy line can be presented.

Most prominent among these key terms is Marxism-Leninism itself. This term appears so frequently in written and spoken communications of the CPSU and its affiliates that it is the most important key to the identification of documents as expressions of the party line regardless of the ostensible source of the actual document itself.

Stalin himself posed the question, "What, then, is Leninism in the last analysis?" He also answered it: "Leninism is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, or to be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular."

In short, Marxism-Leninism means a commitment to the class doctrine of complete destruction of the existing social class system based on private ownership of property by the use of nonviolent (political) and/or violent (armed) struggle and combinations of tactics essential to the establishment of a classless social order, the World Socialist System, throughout the entire world.

Manuiski further defined Marxism-Leninism as "The teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin as developed and supplemented by Comrade Stalin in the scientific world outlook of the international working class, the class which has won an historic victory on one-sixth of the globe. It is destined to overthrow capitalism and build a new communist society. Marxism-Leninism is the most revolutionary theory and practice that has ever existed in the history of mankind."

In conclusion, if it were not harmful to national security and to our survival as a free society and democratic government, this linguistic duality of Communism could be ignored. However, if this dual-value Communist language is not understood properly and checked, the Communists not only can infiltrate, penetrate, subvert and disintegrate the Free World's social order, but more ironic, they can and will do it with semantic license employing the United Nations and other forums of the Free World to do it legally.

LEGION CITES DRIVER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks a great number of organizations and Members of Congress have issued statements commending former VA Administrator Bill Driver for the magnificent job he performed as a career employee in several key positions within the Veterans' Administration, and more importantly, its top position as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Last week at a special reception the Legion's National Commander William C. Doyle honored Bill Driver by the presentation of a special citation setting forth his and that organization's appreciation for the excellent service Bill Driver performed for war veterans and their dependents. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the wording of the American Legion Citation to Mr. Driver:

Born in Rochester, New York, May 9, 1918, and educated in the public schools and uni-

versities of this country, William J. (Bill) Driver decided to utilize his seemingly limitless talents and desire to serve his fellow veterans, community, and Nation.

This dedicated public official served with distinction as a Lieutenant Colonel, AUS, from 1941 to 1945, and in the U.S. Army from 1951-53, as evidenced by his military decorations, which include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, Order of the British Empire, and Croix de Guerre.

Mr. Driver continued his outstanding service to his country as a career employee of the Veterans Administration subsequent to his military assignments, having received the Veterans Administration's two highest awards: the Meritorious Service Medal in 1951, and the Exceptional Service Award in 1960.

His exceptional administrative abilities in serving the sick and disabled veterans of our Nation brought him national prominence when, in 1964, he was awarded the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League.

President Lyndon B. Johnson recognized Mr. Driver's extraordinary talents by appointing him Administrator of Veterans Affairs in January 1965, the first career Federal employee to hold this post.

As Administrator, Mr. Driver's scholarship in veterans affairs, his seriousness of purpose, and his sincere dedication in perpetuating the commitments this Nation has made to its veteran population, have brought unparalleled prestige to the Veterans Administration program. A gentleman of irreproachable moral and ethical principles, and one with a deep compassion for his fellow man, Mr. Driver initiated and brought to fruition several innovations within the program designed to improve the economic and social status of veterans, their widows and orphans.

The American Legion wishes to take this opportunity to express its heartfelt and sincere gratitude to William J. Driver for the excellent manner in which he administered the United States veterans affairs program during his tenure as Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

WILLIAM C. DOYLE,
National Commander.

APOLLO, PA., HONORS APOLLO 10

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Apollo, Pa., the only city in the Nation with the name Apollo, has honored the astronauts who manned each of the historic Apollo space flights by making them honorary citizens of that city. The men of the Apollo 10 have been similarly honored.

I ask unanimous consent that a telegram from the mayor of Apollo to the crew of Apollo 10 be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAY 27, 1969.

Congratulations on your historical Apollo 10 flight. Whereas on the 18th day of May 1969 the "men of Apollo" set forth from this earth via Apollo 10.

Whereas Apollo 10 did orbit the moon to further man's cognizance of the universe with the aid of one "Charlie Brown" and his capable companion "Snoopy" and

Whereas astronauts Thomas P. Stafford, John W. Young, Eugene A. Cernan did fur-

ther evolutionize the Apollo program with precise efficiency.

Whereas at 12:52 p.m. on this 26th day of May 1969 Apollo 10 returned from this fantastic mission to the moon therefore I, Duane S. Guthrie, mayor of Apollo, do hereby declare the "men of Apollo", Colonel Thomas P. Stafford, Commander John W. Young, and Commander Eugene A. Cernan, to be honorary citizens of Apollo, Pa.

DUANE S. GUTHRIE,
Mayor, Apollo, Pa.

A TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to one of the outstanding men of this century, our Chief Justice Earl Warren.

I feel privileged to be able to regard him as a close friend as well as a leader. During my tenure in the California Legislature, he was Governor of our State. Actually, I took office the same day he was sworn in, and I am convinced he will go down in history as one of the great Governors of California.

History will also regard him as one of our great Chief Justices. I choose to repeat the recent words of former President Harry Truman on the occasion of the Chief Justice's appointment as Chairman of the International Order for the Advancement of Peace:

Earl Warren's reputation in the world community symbolizes justice, understanding and compassion for all peoples of all Nations.

These words aptly sum up that for which Earl Warren has stood throughout his public life, including his service in California as a district attorney, State attorney general and three-term Governor, as well as for the last 15 years during which he has served as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

These words also suggest what in the best and most meaningful sense is so often called the "Warren Court." As Chief Justice, Earl Warren has headed the Supreme Court during a time of unprecedented turmoil and change in the world and the Nation. It has been a time when the Court has been called upon to decide some of the most significant and controversial issues ever to come before it.

The decisions of the Court under Chief Justice Warren's leadership, as many others have pointed out, have had a revolutionary impact on our legal, social, and political structures. It no doubt is unfair both to the Chief Justice and to the Court to label it and the decisions it has made during his tenure with the name of one man. The Court's responsibility is a collective one, while at the same time each Justice is responsible in the Court's collective judgments for his own decisions. Yet there is no doubt that Earl Warren has been particularly suited by his experience, character, and abilities to head the Supreme Court during a period marked by "judicial activism" and, as has been said by Justice Schaefer of the Illinois Supreme Court, by its inten-

tions to put "flesh and blood" on our constitutional ideals. One does not have to agree with all or each of the specific decisions of the Court in the Warren era. But history will not fail to recognize the tone and quality of the leadership Earl Warren has provided as the Court has sought to fulfill the substantive meaning of our constitutional rights, concepts and ideals.

In a recent statement on the work of the Court over the past 15 years, the Chief Justice mentioned those decisions which he thought were the most important rendered by the Court in this period. These were *Brown v. the Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), the first of the school desegregation cases, which spurred and dramatized a national awakening to the problem of racial justice in our society; *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), which required a reapportionment of the State legislatures in accord with precepts of justice in political representation during a time when the Nation's population has shifted massively to great metropolitan areas; and *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 355 (1963), which symbolizes the Court's concern with civil liberties in the field of criminal procedure.

This summary by the Chief Justice of the Court's work during his tenure reflects Earl Warren's passionate concern for justice under the law that has distinguished his leadership of the Supreme Court, and the judicial philosophy which has guided his and the Court's decisions during this period in its history. This concern and philosophy were given eloquent expression by the Chief Justice himself in an address made in 1968 after he announced his impending retirement from the bench. The following excerpt from this speech deserves to be repeated as a testimony to his long record of public service to the Nation:

Justice in individual cases is the basis of justice for everyone. A failure to protect and further anyone's individual rights leads to justice for no one. . . . Justice will be universal in the country when the processes as well as the courthouse are open to everyone. This can occur only as the institutions of justice, the courts and their processes are kept responsive to the needs of justice in the modern world. Such a goal will be accomplished only as all elements of the legal system, the law-makers, practicing attorneys, legal scholars and judges, recognize the ever-changing effects of the law on society and adapt to them within the principles which are fundamental to freedom.

OIC EDITORIAL

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on May 23, a Philadelphia television station, WCAU-TV, broadcast an editorial urging its listeners to "give meaningful support to a very meaningful program," the Opportunities Industrialization Centers. OIC was started several years ago by the Reverend Leon H. Sullivan in an effort to create a workable training program for the hard-core unemployed of Philadelphia. It has since flourished under the

imaginative leadership of Dr. Sullivan, and now operates in more than 75 cities.

In an effort to expand and encourage this private effort, three of my colleagues joined me recently to introduce S. 1362, a bill to provide Federal financial assistance to the OICs. For a further understanding of the OIC concept, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the WCAU-TV editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

OIC EDITORIAL

It started in an old abandoned jailhouse in Philadelphia. Now it has been visited by Presidents and international leaders to see what makes it go.

We're talking about Leon Sullivan's O.I.C. (Opportunities Industrialization Center) and it's not only going on here in Philadelphia but also in almost 80 cities in this country and in several foreign cities.

Even with the success of O.I.C., it has one basic flaw that you can help to alleviate. O.I.C. programs just cannot expand fast enough to meet the needs here in Philadelphia.

A financial donation to O.I.C. by a business or an individual is not a handout, it's an investment which helps all of us. Here's how it works. It costs on the average of about \$1,000 to take an individual into O.I.C., train him and get him into a job. (Film.) There are over 80 specific courses at O.I.C. involving anywhere from a couple of months to a year for training. The electronics training course, for example, takes one year.

Many of the applicants to O.I.C. are recipients of welfare money. You and I are contributing to that welfare money through our taxes. Now, through O.I.C. the man is trained, he's on the job, and he begins (perhaps for the first time in his life) to earn money. No longer is he a welfare recipient, so some of our tax money is saved. But even more important, that man becomes a taxpayer. He also becomes a consumer with money in his pocket. And, according to Dr. Sullivan, by 1980, O.I.C. graduates will be adding some \$150 million to the city's purchasing power. (Film out.)

Through a well-rounded training program, we see men and women come from the fringes into the mainstream of society. The one thousand dollar investment is paid back in no time at all.

But there just isn't enough expansion of O.I.C. programs because of the limited funds. There are over 10,000 people on the waiting list at O.I.C. in Philadelphia—over 10,000 who want to be trained, who want to work; many who want to get off welfare.

In its current campaign, the O.I.C. headquarters at 1225 North Broad Street in Philadelphia is hoping to receive, in addition to federal money, one million dollars from businesses and private citizens from around the Delaware Valley. WCAU-TV hopes that you will give meaningful support to a very meaningful program.

With individual participation by Philadelphians, the O.I.C. campaign will be a success. With increased funds, O.I.C. programs can be expanded.

Here's your chance to get involved.

WILLIAM J. DRIVER

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my name to those of my colleagues

who have expressed this Nation's sincere thanks to William J. Driver, who is retiring as head of the Veterans' Administration.

Bill Driver has been a respected leader and devoted servant to veterans for nearly a quarter of a century and in the past 4 years he has administered this huge sprawling agency with efficiency, integrity, and compassion.

He can take much credit for the vast changes we have seen in the past few years that have increased, improved, and expanded benefits to this country's 26 million veterans.

I express my appreciation to Bill Driver for a job "well done" and wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT NIXON
AT U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Confrontation With Reality," published in the Washington Daily News of today, June 5, 1969. The editorial relates to President Nixon's address yesterday at the Air Force Academy.

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

CONFRONTATION WITH REALITY

President Nixon is overloaded with problems, many of them tough and delicate. But none is tougher or more delicate and none involves more gambles, more misunderstanding or bigger stakes than the military-defense-peace situation.

This situation is a whole complex of problems, and it was this complex Mr. Nixon faced in his speech yesterday at the Air Force Academy. We think the public, Congress, our allies and our foes should have a better insight into the Administration position than they had before.

The President, it seemed to us, laid it on the line: What we have to do, why we have to do it, what the alternatives are.

"I have no choice in my decisions," he said, "but to come down on the side of security."

To fail in this would be to risk failure in survival.

Without security we could do nothing. We could not promote peace, we could not solve our domestic problems. The weak can only hope and beg. Only the strong can deter adversaries, or bargain with them.

Moreover, if the United States does not stay strong, does not keep geared to the danger that "has changed but . . . not vanished," does not lead in striving for peace—then, as Mr. Nixon says, "the rest of the world would be living in terror."

This, then, is the national policy—as it has to be.

But standing up for a policy is one thing; putting it to work another. Here too, tho, Mr. Nixon faced the problems. And one of them is the rising torrent of anti-military oratory in Congress.

Mr. Nixon made plain his fundamental disagreement with "skeptics and isolationists" and effectively rebuked them. And he met head-on the new critique in the Senate which suddenly has loosed a blanket attack on

"militarism" with all the generalities that connotes.

But even more reassuring was the President's statement that he was not disagreeing with those who reveal waste and inefficiency in defense operations, or who demand clear explanations of military buying policies, or who "want to make sure a new weapons system will truly add to our defense."

Such challenges are responsible and essential.

The military establishment invites much of the political assault it endures by its own shortcomings—by wasting money, by goofing on purchases, by going astray with its planning.

It is just as important for the President to recognize these things as it is for him to defend his Administration against the insinuations of ambitious political fault-finders.

The Defense Department should never be anybody's scapegoat, as Mr. Nixon said, but neither should it be everybody's sacred cow. It is not all virtue any more than it is all sinster.

The President, it seemed to us, was eminently sound in the perspective he applied to that issue.

We are in the midst of another hot debate—whether it turns out to be a "great debate" is uncertain. But the moral and social aspects of our defense posture, as well as the tactical phases, are being aggressively challenged—sometimes wisely and sometimes frivolously.

This is, by and large, healthy and necessary. Our strength is illusory if our policies are not resolute, if the enforcement of policy is confused, if our military system is not sharp and prudent, if our money is frittered away on the impractical or the wasteful.

What is cheering about Mr. Nixon's extraordinary speech at Colorado Springs is that it leads us to believe we have a President who clearly understands all these things, and is prepared to deal with them, who is keeping his cool and holding to his course.

And if this is so, then we can take heart that we may yet plod our way out of the babble of confusion and raucous dissonance which lately seems to have clouded our national purpose and dimmed our common aspirations.

PHILADELPHIA CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION AGAINST SHIPPING OF MUSTARD GAS

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Paul D'Ortona, president of the city council of Philadelphia, has brought to my attention Resolution 140, which was adopted by the council at a meeting on May 15, 1969. I am unalterably opposed to the planned shipment of mustard gas through Philadelphia sometime this summer as I feel there is a possibility an accident could occur—through mechanical failure, human failure, or subversion—which would be catastrophic for the citizens of Philadelphia. Therefore, I am interested that my colleagues have the benefit of the views of the Philadelphia City Council, as follows:

RESOLUTION 140

Resolution prohibiting the shipment of 2,975 tons of surplus mustard gas, and 30 tons of tear gas by rail or any other carrier through the City of Philadelphia

WHEREAS, The Department of Defense of the Army is planning to ship 2,975 tons of surplus mustard gas and 30 tons of tear gas by rail through Philadelphia this spring or summer for burial in the Atlantic Ocean at a point 250 miles east of Atlantic City; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Defense of the Army also states that 30 tons of tear gas are stored in 55 gallon drums; and

WHEREAS, The reason for this disposal is that the containers that these gases are stored in are either corroded or have become ineffective so that they leak gas; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Defense of the Army has failed to take into consideration the density of population that exists in the City of Philadelphia; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Defense of the Army has failed to take into consideration the possibility of a derailment or other kind of accident if another carrier is used; and

WHEREAS, If such accident takes place the results could prove fatal to many residents in the City of Philadelphia who either live or work adjacent to the routes used by the carrier; therefore

Resolved, That this Council immediately instruct the City Solicitor of the City of Philadelphia to take immediate and appropriate court action that would block any movement of these gases through the City of Philadelphia; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to Senators Hugh Scott and Richard Schweiker and all Congressional Representatives from Philadelphia enlisting their aid at the Congressional level.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest.

CHARLES H. SAWYER, JR.,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS RESULTING IN PART FROM STRIKES POSE SERIOUS THREAT

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have an interest and concern in the problems of collective bargaining as they relate to the transportation industry. I have endeavored to work with labor and industry representatives, as well as with Government officials in order to achieve a greater stability of labor-management relationships.

Recently, the activities of the Transportation Association of America in this same direction have been called to my attention. The TAA is a nonprofit educational organization with a broad spectrum of membership. It includes many types of transportation users, investors, and the six transport modes—air, freight forwarder, highway, oil pipeline, rail, and water. TAA's basic objective is to maintain and foster a sound national transportation system under private ownership and operation.

During the past 18 months, at the direction of the TAA Board of Directors, a transport labor-management study has been underway under the guidance of a TAA Transport Labor Committee. The committee is headed by Director Henry E. Seyfarth, of Seyfarth, Shaw, Fairweather & Geraldson, Chicago, Ill. In the words of Mr. Seyfarth:

The essential purpose of TAA's labor study is to get into the best possible position to make a worthwhile contribution to the solution of the labor problems of the transportation industry.

At a recent meeting of the TAA committee, one of the members presented a scholarly and provocative paper containing his own views on the settlement of labor disputes. The paper, entitled "Transportation Labor Legislation: From Peine Forte Et Dure to the 20th Century," was authored by Arthur M. Wisehart, corporate secretary and assistant general counsel of American Airlines, Inc.

Without expressing any comment or reaction to the document, I think it represents a statement worthy of wider circulation. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the document be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRANSPORTATION LABOR LEGISLATION: FROM PEINE FORTE ET DURE TO THE 20TH CENTURY¹

(By Arthur M. Wisehart)²

This is a revised version of a paper presented recently at a symposium in Dallas sponsored by the Journal of Air Law and Commerce at Southern Methodist University.

Those of you who are students of Law French know that the phrase "peine forte et dure" in the title means "pain strong and hard". Having emerged recently out of a three-week strike with the type of settlement that is customary these days, the phrase seems an apt description of the game we euphemistically call collective bargaining.

"Peine forte et dure" was an English legal procedure which evolved in the middle ages as a substitute for trial by battle. It was invoked when an accused felon refused to accept a trial by jury, preferring trial by battle, and involved piling heavy weights on his chest until he either "confessed" or expired.³ One of its purposes was to encourage "voluntary" acceptance of the rule of reason, in the form of a trial by jury, in lieu of the rule of force. Unfortunately, in collective bargaining today, we have not yet progressed beyond trial by battle, and Professor Arthur Goodhart, the eminent Anglo-American legal scholar, has singled out this problem as one of the greatest challenges facing our legal system today.⁴

As a technique, *peine forte et dure* bears an interesting resemblance to suggestions for the use of "non-stoppage" strikes or seizure in which the consequences are so painful that one party either "settles" or, as the formerly private New York City bus system, expires. One high corporate official has suggested that perhaps if a carrier and union would agree to propitiate the god of collective bargaining by ritualistically offering up and burning in a huge bonfire \$20,000,000 in one dollar bills, in lieu of the revenues and wages which otherwise would be lost as a result of a strike, and then settle their agreement, at least the traveling public could be spared the inconvenience.

I. IS THERE A NEED TO CONTROL TRANSPORTATION STRIKES?

A recent law review article sets forth my proposal for amending the Railway Labor Act to control transportation strikes.⁵ Copies are available for those who are interested in reading it.

Under the proposal, the responsibility for determining whether an airline labor dispute—or any part of it—should be submitted to arbitration would be transferred from

Congress to the emergency boards. In deciding whether a dispute should be arbitrated, the emergency board would be guided by two important criteria: the effect of the threatened strike on the public and the prospect for settlement by collective bargaining. If an emergency board were to determine that a dispute should be arbitrated, the parties would be given a reasonable period of time to agree upon acceptable arbitrators and procedures. If the parties should fail to do so, the emergency board itself would prescribe the terms of arbitration. Thus, it should be possible (i) to restore emergency boards to the effectiveness originally contemplated, (ii) to eliminate what has been described as one-sided compulsory arbitration in which the carriers, regulated by the government, are virtually compelled to accept emergency board recommendations which the unions can ignore with impunity, (iii) to give collective bargaining a better chance to work by strengthening mediation, (iv) to relieve Congress from the necessity of reviewing the merits of labor disputes on an ad hoc basis, and (v) to place in the hands of disinterested experts—who would function somewhat as a specialized ombudsman or blue ribbon jury—the delicate question of whether the nature of the dispute and the public interest are such as to require third-party determination.

While I will be glad to discuss any questions about the proposal, my plan is to use the time available to analyze the need for limiting strikes in transportation. Once the need is generally recognized, then I think the means to satisfy the need will suddenly not seem so elusive. The first step in solving an intractable problem is the seemingly simple but often most difficult matter of recognizing that the problem exists. This fact is reflected in Step One of the Alcoholics Anonymous program, which is an admission that "... our lives had become unmanageable." So let's look at the question, "Have transportation strikes become an unmanageable disease—is there a need to curtail them?"

II. DO TRANSPORTATION STRIKES CREATE AN EMERGENCY?

The argument is frequently heard that transportation strikes create no true emergency, and that limiting them therefore is unwarranted. Whether such strikes create an emergency, of course, depends entirely on how "emergency" is defined. What may be an emergency to one is a tea party to another. I remember hearing some who had been personally affected by the five-airline strike in 1966 bravely insist that it was not an emergency so far as they were concerned. On the other hand, there were others who believed that the grounding of 6,450,000 passengers and the elimination of 70 percent or more trunkline service for 43 days from over 300 cities in the United States, in the midst of Viet Nam, if not an emergency, was a luxury that we could ill afford. It is estimated that a strike of the same five carriers in 1970 would inconvenience 10,000,000 passengers and 15,000,000 passengers in 1975.⁶

In Sweden the problem of defining what is an emergency was solved in an interesting way. To forestall the enactment of restrictive legislation against strikes, the two confederations of management and labor entered into a basic agreement for the control of disputes, and the framework established by that basic agreement remains in effect today.⁷ In drafting the basic agreement, one of the most serious problems was in defining what constituted an emergency strike. After much fruitless debate, those responsible did a very practical thing. They concluded that no definition could be made which would both be objective and win general acceptance. They said that the need for restricting strikes in the public interest is directly dependent upon the circumstances of each case, a con-

cept not foreign to the common law, so they established a Labor Market Board to assess the facts of each case as it comes up. If the Labor Market Board concludes that a given dispute threatens the public interest, then the confederations of management and labor cooperate in defusing the threat.

The lesson the Swedish experience teaches is that we need not throw up our hands in hopeless dismay simply because of lack of agreement in defining what constitutes an emergency. A reasonably adequate procedure for making such determinations as each situation arises can be established, and I think that the proposal in my Michigan Law Review article does that.

III. WHAT ARE THE COSTS OF A TRANSPORTATION STRIKE?

It may be that there will not be repetition of the 1966 airline strike. The IAM has gone back to the strategy of whipsawing one carrier at a time, the strategy which led to the demise of Capital Airlines in 1958. And the rail unions, faced with ad hoc arbitration legislation whenever a national rail strike is threatened, are also adopting the whipsaw tactic of carrier-by-carrier strikes. But a strike against a single airline such as American, United, or TWA today is the equivalent of a strike against the whole industry in 1954. And the New York transit strike in 1966 demonstrates that a transportation strike need not be national in scope to have consequences which are a serious matter for the entire nation. That strike, in a transit system in which advances in productivity have been virtually negative, brought the City of New York to its knees and extorted a settlement which at that time was unprecedented—three 5 percent wage increments over a period of 18 months.

The New York transit strike by the Transport Workers Union established a pattern which a rival union, the IAM, could not ignore when the time arrived for settling the open mechanics' contracts on five airlines later in the year. The IAM later took full credit for shattering the Presidential guidelines in the aftermath of its 43-day strike—and was criticized for having done so:

"The settlement, which has just been ratified by the International Association of Machinists, will raise the compensation of its members by an average of 4.9 percent a year, not by the 6 or 8 percent a year which some reports have inaccurately claimed. In addition, there is a provision for limited cost of living escalation, effective during the last 12 months of the three-year contract.

"The Council [of Economic Advisers] greatly regrets that its settlement so substantially exceeds its guideposts of non-inflationary wage behavior. It regrets the unwillingness of the Machinists' Union to accept the reasonable and responsible settlement of this dispute recommended by the President's emergency board, or even the somewhat higher settlement which the union's representatives negotiated on July 29."⁸

The strategy of the 1966 IAM strike was aptly summarized by C.A.B. Examiner Arthur S. Present in the Initial Decision approving, for the third time, the Mutual Aid Agreement. He said (*Mutual Aid Agreement (Renewal)*, Docket 9977, Initial Decision, March 7, 1969, p. 36):

"The real goal of IAM in this controversy appears to have superseded immediate objectives peculiar to the airline industry. Thus, IAM, with a total membership of approximately 1,025,000, only 68,000 of whom are employed in the air transport industry, strove to demolish the President's Wage-Price Guidelines and succeeded in doing so."

But in fact, the guidelines had already been demolished by the TWU's transit settlement. And, as a practical matter, with the TWU representing mechanics of two other airlines, American and Pan American, the IAM could do little but follow suit. The IAM settlement approximated the increase in the

¹Footnotes at end of article.

New York transit settlement, as did the subsequent American and Pan American settlements.

The pattern thus established was carried over into the railroad shopcraft negotiations, which ended with a like settlement, and the virus spread to other parts of the economy as well.

Thus the public interest involved is not to be weighed only in terms of the effect of the transit strike on the City of New York, or the effect of the five-airline strike in grounding millions of passengers and tons of airfreight, or the harm which would have resulted from a national rail strike.⁹ Far more serious was the disabling effect of inflation on the economy.

This spiral of cost-push inflation was felt by the employees no less acutely than by others. Workers winning a collective bargaining "victory" in 1966 of a 5% increase for 1968 (at a loss in earnings of about \$900 for each employee participating in the 43-day strike) might well wonder whether it was not Pyrrhic victory when considering that the net differential between their increase and the ensuing 4.7% increase in the Consumer Price Index for 1968 was only .3 of 1%. As Mr. Gardner Ackley prophetically said while Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors:

"Efforts by the Government to curb inflationary pressures and maintain steady economic growth cannot achieve their objectives if business and labor continue to agree on wage and benefit increases that far outrun our ability to produce the additional goods and services on which higher incomes can be spent.

"Other unions that are in the process of formulating bargaining demands and other employers who are entering labor negotiations or setting prices must remember that higher wages and profits beyond those justified by productivity trends can only be collected by reducing the real incomes of all Americans. The efforts of others to protect themselves from such reductions by excessive increases in their own wages and prices will in the end destroy the initial gains of those who started the process." (Emphasis added.)

As the forces set in motion by these inflationary settlements have yet to be contained, it remains to be seen how disagreeable the hangover will be. The Committee for Economic Development recently released a study which is hopeful that fiscal and monetary "fine tuning" will stem inflation. However, their conclusions presuppose (i) the subsidence of Viet Nam, (ii) no similar conflict arising to take its place, (iii) an end to inflationary wage increases, and (iv) the acceptability of high interest rates and taxes. Inflation can be mitigated by increased unemployment, but unemployment entails its own problems. The nation loses the productive labor which could be contributed by the unemployed, and the damaging effect on problems of minority employment and urban turmoil is self-evident. An increase of unemployment from last year's rate of 3.6% to 4.7% would mean almost a million more people out of work (Wall Street Journal, March 26, 1969, p. 1).

It has been reported that many of the 1969 settlements exceed the 6.6% average wage-and-fringe gains in 1968 settlements.¹⁰ In transportation, the Philadelphia transit agreement embodies a 17.1% package increase, 9.2% of which is for the first year; the New York longshore settlement is 29.6% over three years; and mechanics on Flying Tiger Line received a three-year package worth 28%.¹¹ The recent settlements by American, Eastern, Northeast, and Pan American, naturally, are in the same ball park. With settlements such as these, a great deal of "fine tuning" indeed will be needed to prevent inflationary consequences.¹²

Further, we are still far from able to assess all of the effects of fiscal and monetary fine tuning. What has happened to date is that real growth in our economy declined from \$10.9 billion for the first quarter of 1968 to \$5.2 billion for the first quarter of 1969, while inflation has increased from \$9.3 billion to \$10.8 billion.¹³

Meanwhile, the proposed repeal of the investment tax credit, which inevitably will weaken the chief tool available for combating rising labor costs, technological improvement admittedly "did not arise within the Administration in the context of considering whether existing policy was adequate to cool off the inflation."¹⁴ With respect to the regulated industries having relatively inelastic demand curves, subject principally to cost-push rather than demand-pull inflation, and already making an inadequate return on investment, the effect of repeal can only be inflationary.

IV. DO TRANSPORTATION STRIKES CONTRIBUTE ANYTHING OF VALUE TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING?

I have often wondered what positive contributions transportation strikes could be said to make to collective bargaining that would justify their tremendous economic and social costs. The more I think about that question the more convinced I become that the disadvantages far outweigh any possible advantages.

1. Strikes are not needed to bring about organization of employees. Most transportation is highly organized already.

2. Strikes are not needed to enforce collective bargaining. Collective bargaining in transportation is a legally enforceable right of relatively ancient vintage, being the product of statutes which go back to 1888, far antedating labor laws in other fields.

3. Strikes are not attributable to grievances. The Railway Labor Act mandates adjustment Boards for grievances, and the grievance procedures are highly developed.

4. Strikes are not needed because transportation employees are underprivileged. The rates of pay and fringe benefits received by transportation employees compare favorably with comparable employees in any other industry. I could digress here about such facts as the rates for the 747 aircraft going into service this year—which, under a TWA Agreement, will produce \$58,000 a year plus about 20% more in pension and annuity contributions, or a total of over \$70,000 for airline pilots who have a monthly maximum of 75 hours flight time—or the fact that airline mechanics will be making \$12,000 a year—but it would take too much time to go into these details, and most of you are familiar with them anyway. Meanwhile, the airlines themselves are earning less than half the rate of return the Civil Aeronautics Board found to be reasonable.¹⁵

5. Strikes are not needed to make collective bargaining function properly. Management and labor, in agreeing originally to the terms of the Railway Labor Act, apparently regarded strikes as unnecessary to collective bargaining because it was their understanding that the Act would virtually eliminate strikes. It did so, and collective bargaining on the railroads functioned acceptably for about fifteen years without significant strikes. It was only after World War II that the original understanding was forgotten and strikes began to afflict the railroads and airlines. The National Mediation Board has described the situation as follows:

"Until the wage movements of 1941, the recommendations of emergency boards were commonly accepted by both sides. After the experiences of that year, the pattern changed, and it has become customary to reject rather than accept, the recommendations of emergency boards set up to handle national wage and rules movements . . . since 1941, emergency board recommendations have served only as a base to be used for securing further

wage and rule concessions in a final settlement, usually made under Executive auspices."¹⁶

6. Strikes do not contribute toward a sensible solution of problems.

Perhaps it would be easier to defend transportation strikes if one were assured that settlements produced through the strike process were worth waiting and suffering for because they are somehow better. But the opposite would seem to be true. Strike settlements are not the products of a rational, objective process as much as they are the result of lack of sleep, emotionalism, irrationality, and expediency.

Further, strikes are indicative of sickness, not health, in collective bargaining. When they impose more injury on bystanders than on the combatants themselves, why are they permitted? Perhaps it is because of some mystique wrongly attributed to them.

Trial by battle—personal combat—was an accepted method of settling disputes in Norman England. Superficially this system would seem, like strikes, to be based on the morally indefensible premise that "might makes right." However, in the 12th Century, it had a loftier source—i.e., the medieval faith that God would quash the unjust.¹⁷

As plausibly intoned by the King in Shakespeare's Henry VI, Part II:

"What stronger breastplate than a heart untaught!

Thrice is he arm'd that hath his quarrel just,
And he but naked, though lock'd up in steel,

Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted."

(Act III, Scene II.)

Over the centuries, those with practical experience in the affairs of men inevitably began to develop doubts about the soundness of this proposition. If God would indeed quash the unjust, it must have seemed a curious coincidence that the unjust was also always the weaker of the antagonists. A waning enthusiasm for trial by battle led Richard II to banish both antagonists—

"For that our Kingdom's earth should not be sold"

With that dear blood which it hath fostered. . . ."

(Shakespeare, Richard II, Act I, Scene III.)

The usual cultural lag existed, however, and it was several centuries before perception became settled in practice.

It was not until 1819 that England was able to do away with trial by battle entirely.¹⁸ This came about as a result of a lawyer's ingenuity, and successful, assertion of the right as a defense in a celebrated civil case decided by the King's Bench the year before.¹⁹ In an action for damages for the alleged murder of a near relative, when the King's Bench upheld the defendant's right to trial by battle, the plaintiff, "having been further advised" that he faced something far more rigorous than the pleasantries of a trial by jury, stated that he "prayed no further judgment", and the suit was discharged.²⁰ Legislation followed.

Today we leave many collective bargaining disputes to the modern equivalent of trial by battle. And, with God not in the picture, I'm afraid that the rationale has to be that "might makes right."

Thus transportation strikes as a procedure for resolving collective bargaining disputes are the antithesis of due process. They are not the embodiment of the force of reason, but the exaltation of force over reason. We tend to forget that strikes are not a natural right, a part of the social contract. God did not give to the late Michael Quill a stone tablet that said, "I grant you and your union the right to strike," nor did the founding fathers mention this right in the Constitution.²¹

Because the law at present fails to establish an equal balance of power between labor and management, those unions which strike to settle disputes are so rewarded, at the public's expense, that no aspiring union leader or competing union dares ignore the example. Thus our law not only tolerates strikes but, contrary to its stated purposes, actively encourages them.

It is romantic to suppose that what we have for settling labor disputes in transportation is a system of collective bargaining. What we have instead is a system of strikes. Like the natives organizing a corporation as a form of government in Gilbert and Sullivan's "Utopia, Limited," the unions go through the ritual of bargaining, but not the substance, waiting only until the power to strike becomes available as the determinant.

When one considers what actual usefulness those marathon talkathons may have, one is reminded of the following bit of dialog between father William and his son:

"You are old," said the youth, "and your jaws are too weak

For anything tougher than suet;
Yet you finished the goose, with the bones and the beak—

Pray, how did you manage to do it?
"In my youth" said his father, "I took to the law,

And argued each case with my wife;
And the muscular strength, which it gave to my jaw,

Has lasted the rest of my life."
—Lewis Carroll, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, ch. V, p. 65.

There may be some among you who think that this exaggerates the case. To make the point clearer, I could refer to statements made frankly by union representatives in the privileged vicinity of the bargaining table. But it is not necessary to do this. The bankruptcy of collective bargaining in transportation, the futility of pretending it exists, the complete absence of the balance of power which is supposed to nurture it, are all reflected in the brief filed in the *Mutual Aid Renewal* case before the Civil Aeronautics Board on behalf of six unions including the IAM and TWU.²³ The brief very persuasively argues that the five airlines struck in 1966, instead of attempting to comply with the government's urgent requests for a noninflationary settlement, would have been better off not to have bothered with bargaining at all, and should have merely accepted the IAM's original demands. Whether this is an implied threat that, if the carriers insist on wasting time by bargaining, the unions will have their revenge, I do not know, but here is what the brief says:²⁴

"Reference to Carrier Exhibit No. 31 shows that more than two-thirds of the claimed past losses of the Mutual Aid carriers from strikes resulted from the disputes on Eastern, National, Northwest, Trans World and United with the IAM in the summer of 1966. It is perfectly clear that the decision to undergo this strike cost the carriers involved substantially a greater sum of money than if they had accepted the original union demands without any strike or indeed without any negotiations of any kind. Six Unions Joint Rebuttal Exhibit No. 13, a Board study, states that the total loss of net income during the strike for the five struck carriers is estimated at \$103 million. To this figure must be added the cost of the settlement which Carrier Exhibit No. 26 (page 16) estimates at \$85,700,000. Thus, the total cost to the carriers of the strike and the settlement was \$188,700,000. On the other hand, the carriers value the original union demands prior to any negotiations thereon at \$114 million (Carrier Exhibit No. 26, page 4). Thus, the carriers involved would have

been better off in the amount of \$74,700,000 if they had accepted the original union proposal without a strike or indeed without any negotiations at all." (Emphasis added; footnote omitted.)

The lesson from the foregoing is clear: The airlines are foolish to give greater weight to government requests than to union demands. They should simply capitulate, regardless of the public interest. This position of the unions may be short sighted however. As Edmund Burke said:

"Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites. . . . Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without." It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."²⁵

The Fifth Amendment of the Constitution guarantees that no person ". . . shall be . . . deprived of . . . property, without due process of law". Yet I can think of no procedure sanctioned by law that results in a more direct taking of property from the public, and with such an obvious lack of due process, than transportation strikes. When such a strike occurs, the public loses, first, the use of common carriage facilities, the cost of which to a significant extent may have been contributed by the public, second, the confirmed reservations and contracts of carriage which have been made, and, third, the increased fares the public inevitably has to pay. Who can doubt that the practice of the blockading a public highway to enforce the demands of a minority group could not be sustained. Yet we now have a collective bargaining practice which encourages a union, which is also an interest group, to deprive the public of its common carriage facilities to enforce union demands. One wonders why the public may not be deprived of the use of its facilities and property in one case, but may be deprived of them in the other.

V. WHAT ARE THE CHANCES FOR TRANSPORTATION STRIKE CONTROL LEGISLATION?

In coming to the question of what chances there might be for transportation strike control legislation, I must immediately disclaim any political expertise. Speaking as one nurtured in the democratic tradition, however, my conviction is that, in the long run, the public will not be denied a correction in a system which adversely affects so many of its members. The increasing public sentiment in favor of such legislation is indicated by recent polls.²⁶ And that there is a need for a correction is one fact which seems indisputable. As long ago as 1952, the National Mediation Board said:

"The present situation, if it continues, can result only in a complete breakdown of the machinery for the settlement of wage and rules disputes which was so carefully and hopefully constructed by the legislators and sponsors of the Railway Labor Act in 1926."²⁷

In 1961, W. Willard Wirtz said in a speech:

"There is reason to suspect that the same thing may be happening to the concept of force in the labor relations fields as in the international arena, that the destructive power of the available force has become too great for it to be used freely and fully. The strike and the lockout, like the force of arms in international relations, may continue to be regarded as effective in comparatively small, limited disputes. But the big strike, the big lockout, covering a whole vital industry, may well be moving into much the same position as the atom bomb."²⁸

In his State of the Union Message on January 12, 1966, President Johnson made the following statement in connection with the New York City transit strike:

"I also intend to ask the Congress to con-

sider measures which, without improperly invading state and local authority, will enable us to effectively deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."²⁹

Shortly thereafter Plato E. Papps, the General Counsel of the IAM, made this statement in a speech before the American Management Association:

"One final topic upon which I'll touch is 'national emergency' disputes and the collective bargaining process. Such obvious things as transportation—air, rail and truck—I'll leave to your imagination because I don't believe that the Congress will again tolerate what recently transpired in New York. In fact, there are already several bills in the hopper which will try to meet this problem."³⁰

One of the original architects of the New Deal, Samuel I. Rosenman, recently came out in favor of such legislation. He said:

"I urge that the time has now come, at least in those industries where a strike would cause an emergency, to adopt a bill along the lines of S. 176, and to substitute the reason and considered judgment of the courtroom for a verdict based only on comparative strength and resources. Giving up rights like the right to strike—and even more ancient rights—for the general good and welfare of the community—is nothing new in civilized countries."³¹

On January 16, 1969, Secretary of Labor Shultz told the Senate Labor Committee that, although he would be "very careful about recommending any legislation" which might have the effect of "destroying collective bargaining in areas where it's working well and most collective bargaining in this country is working well", he also said that "I'd like to see the situation under the Railway Labor Act improve."³² And subsequently President Nixon said, responding to a question about the dock strike:

"Now, long range, I believe that the Taft-Hartley Act's provisions for national emergency strikes, which I helped to write along with other members of the Labor Committee 20 years ago, that those provisions are now outmoded. I do not believe we have enough options in dealing with these kinds of disputes and breakdowns. I have, therefore, asked the Department of Labor to develop some new approaches in this field, and we will submit them by legislation to this Congress."³³

To me it seems only a question of time until the foregoing sentiments are expressed in the form of legislation and the Twentieth Century at last arrives in transportation labor relations.

FOOTNOTES

¹ A paper presented on May 5, 1969, at a meeting of the Labor Committee of the Transportation Association of America.

² Member of the New York Bar. B.A. 1950, Miami University; M.P.A. 1953, Wayne University; J.D. 1954, University of Michigan. Mr. Wisehart is Corporate Secretary & Assistant General Counsel of American Airlines, Inc. The views stated in this paper are those of the author and are not attributable to American Airlines.

³ Knappen, *Constitutional and Legal History of England* 51 (1942).

⁴ Professor Goodhart recently retired as Master of University College, Oxford. An American citizen (nephew of former Senator Lehman of New York) and educated here (Yale), Professor Goodhart was made Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire in 1948.

⁵ Wisehart, "Transportation Strike Control Legislation: A Congressional Challenge," 66 Mich. L. Rev. 1967 (1968).

⁶ Statement of Everett M. Goulard, Vice President-Industrial Relations, Pan American World Airways, Before the Special Committee on National Strikes in the Transpor-

tation Industries of the American Bar Association, May 5, 1967, p. 10.

⁷ See Schmidt, *The Law of Labour Relations in Sweden* 263 (1962).

⁸ Statement of August 22, 1966, by Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

⁹ Ad hoc arbitration legislation was enacted to end the threat of a national rail strike. 81 Stat. 122 (1967).

¹⁰ Curiously, S. I. Nakagama of Argus Research Corporation has noted that non-union workers received higher increases in 1967 and 1968 than those represented by unions. The increases negotiated by major unions in those years were 5.6% and 6.6%, respectively, while the increase for all workers (including non-union) were 6.0% and 7.2%. Kraus, "Wage-Price Specter," *New York Times*, February 12, 1969, p. 53.

¹¹ *Wall Street Journal*, February 18, 1969, p. 1.

¹² In separate comments in the report by the Committee for Economic Development, M. C. Turner, Jr., a member of the Research and Policy Committee, stated (p. 34):

"I am sure that the Committee gave consideration to the strong inflationary effect of excessive wage and benefit increases, but the statement does not appear to give adequate recognition to this factor. There have been many union agreements in major industry which are far beyond any productivity improvement and, therefore, they are truly inflationary. . . . This situation is just as important to recognize as monetary and fiscal measures which are controllable by government and business. . . . While nobody would like it, it appears that we must consider the proposal of labor courts and final and binding arbitration." (fn. cont. on next page)

¹³ *New York Times*, April 30, 1969, p. 67, col. 3.

John Kenneth Galbraith has said:

"The American economy, whatever wishful analysis there may be to the contrary, is not stable at or near full employment. Wages will always shove up prices, and prices will always pull up wages, and this spiral will revolve for Republicans and Democrats alike. Moreover, it has been the experience of virtually every other major industrial country that some machinery for wage and price restraint is the only alternative to inflation or heavy unemployment." Quoted in Kraus, "Wage-Price Specter," *New York Times*, Feb. 12, 1969, p. 53.

¹⁴ Herbert Stein, member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, as quoted in the *New York Times*, April 30, 1969, pp. 61-63.

¹⁵ The rate of return for the domestic trunk carriers is estimated at 5.3% for 1968; the figure set by the Civil Aeronautics Board as "fair and reasonable" is 10.5%. *General Passenger Fare Investigation*, C.A.B. Order No. E-16068, Dkt. 8008, 32 C.A.B. 291, 308-309, 331 (1960)

¹⁶ 17 NMB Ann. Rep. at 33.

¹⁷ 52 Knappen, *Constitutional and Legal History of England 197* (1942): "It was commonly considered unjust to punish men after a verdict obtained by human means when a divine tribunal was available."

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ For a fascinating if rambling discussion, see Kendall, *Trial by Battle* (3d ed. 1818).

²⁰ *Ashford v. Thornton*, [1818 K.B.] 1 Barn. & Ald. 405, 19 Rev. Rep. 349 (1818).

²¹ I have borrowed here from my colleague, Kenneth L. Meinen, who used a similar figure in an excellent speech, "Aviation and the Public Interest: The Dynamic New Dimensions," at the Connecticut General Flight Forum, December 8, 1966.

²² Brief on Behalf of Six Union Parties to Examiner Arthur S. Present, C.A.B. Dkt. No. 9977 (Renewal) (Dec. 20, 1968).

²³ *Id.* at 31-32.

²⁴ As quoted in an editorial by James Reston, *New York Times*, Jan. 15, 1969, p. 46.

²⁵ See Wisehart, op. cit., at 1698, fn. 6.

²⁶ 17 NMB Ann. Rep. at 33.

²⁷ From a speech in Chicago by W. Willard Wirtz on August 3, 1961.

²⁸ *New York Times*, Jan. 13, 1966, p. 13.

²⁹ *American Management Association News*, Feb. 11, 1966, p. 6.

³⁰ Statement in Favor of S. 176, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., Oct. 17, 1967, published in 23 Record of Assn. of the Bar of the City of New York 33 at 64-65 (1968).

³¹ *Wall Street Journal*, Jan. 17, 1969, p. 6.

³² Legislative Status Report, Feb. 7-14, 1969 (President's News Conference of Feb. 6, 1969, in Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Monday, Feb. 10, 1969, p. 229).

DECLINE OF U.S. NAVAL STRENGTH

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Governor of Arizona, Hon. Jack Williams, has during the course of his life spent many years as a columnist both in the newspapers and on the air, and he has, during this period, developed a keen sense of history and an ability to read into the present, lessons and mistakes of the past. Very recently he spoke on the air expressing his great concern about the decline of our naval strength and the incline of the naval strength of the Soviets. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

Thank you and hello again . . . it is not my practice to pontificate on international politics. I've frequently described myself as a parochial governor . . . interested in the state I've lived in all of my early years and adult life. But when I read something such as a report released by the House Armed Services Subcommittee on seapower that reports the U.S. Navy has deteriorated into an aging collection of worn out ships . . . that the ships inherited today are rotting so badly that some crewmen work as much as 80 hours a week to fight rust and corrosion, I feel impelled to comment. In 1934 Churchill deplored the fact that the defenses of England were being allowed to deteriorate. His remarks then in the House of Commons could be paraphrased by any United States Senator or Congressman today. Said Churchill then:

"I am not to be understood to mean that the possibilities of a gigantic war are nearer, but the actual position of Great Britain is much less satisfactory than it was this time twenty years ago, for then at least we had a supreme fleet; nobody could get at us in this island; and we had powerful friends on the continent of Europe, who were likely to be involved in any quarrel before we were; but today, with our aviation in its present condition, we are in a far worse position."

Then Churchill continued: "There is no greater danger than equal forces. If you wish to bring about war, you bring about such an equipoise that both sides think they have a chance of winning. If you want to stop war, you gather such an aggregation of force on the side of peace that the aggressor, whoever he may be, will not dare to challenge."

Three years later Churchill said: "When the situation was manageable it was neglected, and now that it is thoroughly out of hand, we apply too late the remedies which then might have effected a cure. There is

nothing new in the story. It falls into that long, dismal catalogue of the fruitlessness of experience and the confirmed unteachability of mankind."

Two months later Churchill warned: "It would be folly for us to act as if we were swimming in a halcyon sea, as if nothing but balmy breezes and calm weather were to be expected and everything working in the most agreeable fashion. By all means follow your lines of hope and your paths of peace, but do not close your eyes to the fact that we are entering a corridor of deepening and darkening danger, and that we shall have to move along it for many months and possibly for years to come."

These were words spoken only shortly before Hitler began to move. But much earlier in 1931 Churchill warned: "The great liner is sinking in a calm sea. One bulkhead after another gives way; one compartment after another is bilged, the list increases; she is sinking, but the captains and the officers and the crew are all in the saloon dancing to the jazz band. But wait until the passengers find out what is their position!"

Then in 1937 on April 14th Churchill warned: "We seem to be moving, drifting steadily, against our will, against the will of every race and every people and every class towards some hideous catastrophe. Everybody wishes to stop, but they do not know how!"

Again and again, his voice cried out in commons. "Historians a thousand years hence will still be baffled by the mystery of our affairs. They will never understand how it was that a victorious nation with everything at hand suffered themselves to be brought low and to cast away all that they had gained by measureless sacrifice and absolute victory—gone with the wind."

All of this was inspired by a friend, Holmes Alexander, who opened his column recently with: "The awful truth about America's sickening plunge into military inferiority is politically untellable." So, I thought you might be interested that the story is not new. Churchill told it 30 years or so ago, and Cassandra long before that.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 28, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, although I have been in favor of lean foreign aid programs during my brief tenure in the House, I do want to point out to my colleagues the priority given family planning in President Nixon's aid message.

Too often we get so immersed in the immediate problem of hunger that we fail to see the important link between it and family planning. With the present estimate of the world population doubling itself in 35 years, this link cannot be overlooked.

I have long felt that we needed to totally revamp our foreign aid program to give primary emphasis to population control and agricultural improvement. I have felt that we have made a huge mistake in concentrating our foreign aid on building technology rather than on helping to bring these countries up to a level where they can feed their own population. If we really want to help people with our aid, then, cannot we do it better by increasing agricultural pro-

duction. Nothing could be more humanitarian than to dent the grim list of 10,000 who die each day of malnutrition and starvation.

In the aid message the President said:

At least another decade of sustained hard work will be needed if we are to win the battle between economic development and population. But our assistance to voluntary family planning programs and support for the work of the United Nations and other international organizations in this field must continue to have high priority, as will our support of efforts to increase food production.

This is exactly the kind of action that has been needed and I find it most heartening.

A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 312 OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1964—THE REHABILITATION LOAN PROGRAM

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the Housing Act of 1964 we established the section 312 rehabilitation loan program which provided for 3-percent rehabilitation loans to owners or tenants of properties in urban renewal and concentrated code enforcement areas, to enable them to bring the structures up to local code requirements and make the many existing structures in our cities more decent and livable homes. In a sense, this was a new concept in our urban renewal program which would make use of the existing housing stock in a renewal area by rehabilitating them through low cost loans rather than bulldozing them down.

The 312 rehabilitation loan program has been generally a successful operation. It is designed to encourage renewal of housing and buildings by repairing, remodeling, and restoring rather than demolition and clearance. An applicant for a 312 loan must be an acceptable risk, although the nature of the loans involve certain risks that make them marginal by most lending institution standards.

In the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 we amended this program to authorize loans for owner-occupied residential properties in areas outside renewal areas but in an area definitely planned for rehabilitation or code enforcement within a reasonable time. We also provided that 312 loans may be made to owners and tenants whose properties have been deemed reinsurable by statewide property insurance plans—State FAIR plans—in order to bring the property up to insurable standards.

An amendment was added to this program which restricted loans for residential properties to persons with incomes within prescribed income ceilings of the section 221(d)(3) below-market interest rate program. This amendment has severely restricted the application of this program in most of our large cities. In some cities the 312 rehabilitation loan program is dead. In my own congressional district, the city of Pawtucket Redevelopment Authority has told me that the program with this income ceiling of \$8,500 gross family income is inoperable.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which strikes the income limitation placed on the 312 rehabilitation loan program. In recent hearings held by the Housing Subcommittee, I have asked numerous witnesses whether they would favor this removal of the income ceiling. In every case the answer has been "Yes." Support for such a removal has been endorsed by the National Association of Home Builders, the National Housing Conference, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, and the Conference of Mayors-League of Cities. Mayor Tate of Philadelphia stated in strong terms that if the cities were to use existing housing stock then the 312 loan program is absolutely vital, but with the existing income ceilings the program is unusable. Sherman Maisel of the Federal Reserve Board stated to the subcommittee that Congress should place greater stress on rehabilitation than it has in the past if we are to meet our national housing goals. My bill, then, will enable us to use this rehabilitation program effectively, and make it one of the strong programs that we need to make decent and sanitary housing available to our citizens in our cities.

TRUMAN WARD

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our closest friends, Truman Ward.

He was, in every sense, a Christian gentleman. I had no more than arrived in Washington before he was working to persuade me to attend services at his church. As the years passed, it was not uncommon to find a sermon or church bulletin he wanted me to read attached to printing being delivered from his shop.

There is much evidence that he had real concern for humanity and a compassion for others. It reflected itself in whatever he did. I think people who knew him sensed this.

As a printer, he was an innovator with whom complacency never caught up. He was forever looking for a better way to help his congressional customers capture attention back home. As I look over the programs and projects of my own office, I can see Truman Ward's ideas everywhere. He had technical skills and the ability to translate them into useful political tools.

As a businessman, he made everyone feel as if he were his only customer. Probably, he was too generous. I am thinking of all the favors and small printing jobs he did for me and for Mrs. Taylor when she was president of the Congressional Club for which he refused to accept payment. "That's okay," he would say with a grin, "come back and see me when you have a big job."

We will miss this man and the example he set for us in our daily lives.

INTELSAT—A BLUEPRINT FOR MODERN COMMUNICATIONS

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Leonard Marks, former head of the U.S. Information Agency and more recently Chairman of the Plenipotentiary Conference on Definitive Arrangements for the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium (Intelsat), and Chairman of the U.S. delegation, recently delivered an address to the Electronic Industries Association meeting at Los Angeles, Calif., entitled, "Intelsat—A Blueprint for Modern Communications."

In view of the fact that the conference on definitive arrangements for the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium will reconvene in the near future, I feel that the impressions and opinions of this dedicated American and public servant will be of inestimable assistance to all those interested and concerned in this very vital area.

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

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

AN ADDRESS BY HON. LEONARD H. MARKS,*
MAY 12, 1969

INTELSAT—A BLUEPRINT FOR MODERN COMMUNICATIONS

Progress in the field of communications satellites has been so rapid and dramatic that few realize that only seven years have elapsed since the experimental Telstar was launched by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company; and only four years since the first commercial communications satellite, Early Bird, was put into orbit. A review of what has happened during these exciting years would make an interesting book; but I intend, today, not to outline that volume, but merely to report on the most recent chapter—the INTELSAT conference of 98 countries which has just been held in Washington, D.C.

After Telstar was launched, it was apparent to Congress and to our communications industry leaders that a new era had arrived, and that communications satellites were no longer fiction conceived by Arthur Clarke.

In the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, Congress had declared U.S. support for a single global communications satellite system, and had charged COMSAT, as the U.S. chosen instrument, with the responsibility of creating it. When Comsat was organized, I was appointed by President Kennedy as an original incorporator, and later elected by the stockholders as a director. Our Board of Directors recognized the importance of the single global concept, and as soon as it was possible, we arranged for an organizational conference with any and all countries who wished to join in this venture. After 8 months of negotiation, 10 countries arrived at the agreement creating an *Interim Consortium* to build, launch and operate the satellites. Thus, in 1964, Intelsat was born. At the inception it was agreed that five years later, its creators and adherents would again meet to discuss permanent arrangements.

* Formerly Chairman of the Plenipotentiary Conference on Definitive Arrangements for the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium (Intelsat) and Chairman of the U.S. Delegation.

From this humble beginning Intelsat has had an exciting growth. Let's review some of the progress:

The original ten countries have grown to a present membership of 68 nations, who collectively are responsible for 90 to 95 per cent of the world's international communications traffic.

The first commercial satellite, Early Bird, had only 240 circuits . . . today the Intelsat III series carries 1200 circuits.

The next generation of satellites, Intelsat IV, will be capable of carrying from 6000 to 10,000 circuits.

In 1964, satellite service was available only between the U.S. and Europe, with an Atlantic satellite. Today, there are two satellites positioned over the Atlantic, two over the Pacific, and one about to be launched over the Indian Ocean.

In five years, earth stations have been developed in all continents. There are now 24 in existence, and another 30 being constructed or in advanced stages of planning.

In five years, the nations of the world have moved from the "idea" phase to the operation of a truly international communication satellite system.

These accomplishments are not only impressive, but unique, for the INTELSTAT venture is the first truly international partnership of independent nations in a commercial venture. The three Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, operate an airline; there have been various bridge and tunnel joint ventures between neighboring nations. There has been economic and banking cooperation, ranging from the World Bank to the European common market, but never before have as many countries worked together in operating a "business" embracing traditional commercial concepts. The success of Intelsat hopefully will furnish a precedent for similar efforts in the future.

Before we examine the recent Intelsat conference, it is essential that you understand the basic structure created in 1964, and how Intelsat operates its business:

1. Ownership Interests.—From the outset, it was agreed that shares in the Consortium should be allocated according to use of the system. Obviously the U.S., with its large international traffic to all parts of the world, would become the single largest user, followed by Canada, Japan and the European nations. Initially, the U.S. was allocated a 60% share; the next largest was the United Kingdom with 8%, France and Germany with approximately 6%, and others receiving lesser amounts down to a minimum of 0.5%.

2. Expansion of Membership.—To achieve international character, the Interim Agreement provided that any of the 135 nations belonging to the ITU (International Telecommunications Union) could join at any time that they desired by accepting the terms of the agreement. When they did so, a share would be assigned to them, thereby reducing the holding of the founders. Accordingly, as membership grew to the present 68 nations, the U.S. share declined to 53%.

3. Capital Contributions.—Currently, Intelsat has an invested capital of approximately \$100 million contributed by the members in the proportions outlined above. As additional funds are needed, assessments will be made, up to a limit of \$300 million, established by the 1964 agreement.

4. Policy Control.—Following the pattern of business corporations, the interim agreement provided for a committee—the Interim Communications Satellite Committee—which would function essentially as a Board of Directors is planning for the system, procuring equipment, launching and operating the satellites, establishing rates of return, and determining other aspects of the service.

Each country which had a 1.5% or greater share was entitled to a seat on the Board. Smaller countries could group their

holdings to make up 1.5% and choose a common representative. Under this arrangement, the ICSC now consists of 18 members representing 48 countries.

Since the U.S. had more than 50%, it was decided that, as a protection to minority owners, an action would not be approved unless it was supported by 12.5% of the remaining members.

5. Management.—When Intelsat was organized, the U.S. was the only member country having the technical capability to manage this unique and complex venture. Accordingly, Article VIII of the Interim Agreement specified that the newly organized Comsat was to act as manager "in the design, development, construction, establishment, operation and maintenance of the space "segment" pursuant to general policies of the ICSC.

6. Procurement.—Although the founding nations acknowledged that the United States had developed the concept of the communications satellite, and that our space industry was the most advanced in the communications field, the organizers of Intelsat wanted to have alternative or competitive suppliers for the space hardware. Therefore, Article X of the Interim Agreement provided that the manager should "develop and procure the best equipment and services at the best price for the most efficient conduct and operation of the space segment," but specified that contracts and subcontracts be distributed "in the States whose Governments are Parties to this agreement in approximate proportion to the respective quotas of their corresponding signatories . . ."

On this point it is significant to note that all of the technical know-how developed by our space contractors through NASA contracts has been made available to Intelsat, and that the launch facilities at Cape Kennedy are provided at out-of-pocket costs.

7. Duration.—The Interim Agreement signed on August 20, 1964, by nineteen countries specified that within one year after the initial global system became operational and in any event not later than January 1, 1969, a report on the changes proposed for the permanent Consortium was to be sent to all members and a meeting called within 90 days. Until the permanent agreement was reached, the Interim arrangements are to continue in effect.

These are the principal characteristics of the Interim Agreement under which the Consortium has operated and which were reviewed at the Conference on Permanent Arrangements from February 23 to March 21, 1969.

Now, let me give you some background on how the Conference was organized and the problems that we considered during our four weeks of deliberations:

At the outset, the United States, as the host government, was required to send out invitations to attend. Of course, all members were invited to participate, but we had to consider who else would be invited or permitted to attend. When we reviewed the Congressional intent in adopting the Communications Satellite Act in 1962, and the avowed purpose of creating a single global system, we concluded that all ITU member countries should again be reminded of their eligibility to participate. Accordingly, notifications of the meeting were sent to all nations in this group. Some did not have diplomatic relations with the United States, or other members; some had governments which had openly declared their hostility to other members of the Intelsat Consortium; many had primitive means of communicating within their borders, and at most makeshift links to the outer world. The group invited included the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries of Eastern Europe who had recently announced their intention to create Intersputnik, a network of satellite communications which might rival Intelsat.

The response was most gratifying for

those who believe in the importance of international cooperation. U.S.S.R. and all of the Eastern European Socialist countries were included in the 28 countries who responded and sent representatives to observe the conference. In addition, the UN and the ITU were seated as observers.

I want to point out a significant condition of the invitation to these observers. An invitation was extended to those who had a "serious interest in the possibility of becoming an Intelsat member at a future time." No commitment to join was required, but a serious interest was clearly specified. Those who attended demonstrated by their presence at the meetings that they took this condition literally. Their delegates were able men, versed in diplomatic matters and specialists in the field of communications. Their participation was meaningful, their questions were searching, and their observations were most helpful in the deliberations. During the conference one nation announced its intention to join, others indicated that they would recommend joining to their Cabinets or Parliaments.

The agenda for our meeting was based on a review of the Interim Agreements of 1964. For nearly a year prior to the Conference, the ICSC had met and carefully considered their four years of experience. All viewpoints were canvassed and a report prepared containing recommendations for change and observations on the existing agreement.

When the meeting was organized on February 23, 1969, rules of procedure were adopted creating four substantive committees. I was elected as Conference Chairman and the heads of the delegations from Argentina, Italy, Japan and Australia as Committee Chairmen. Formalities were omitted and on the second day we settled down to a discussion of the agenda items referred to each of these four groups.

I want to compliment my colleagues for the very business-like atmosphere that pervaded throughout our deliberations. There was little waste motion. Sessions began on time and lasted after the announced closing hour. Delegates refrained from polemics, and spoke to the point at issue. As a result, in three and one-half weeks, the entire agenda was reviewed and reports were delivered on 75% of the items. There were differences of opinion, but in the discussion many were eliminated and compromises reached. Where differences remained, they were clearly identified in the committee reports. As a result, when we concluded our deliberations on March 21, we had heard in plenary session from all committees, subcommittees and working groups with alternative recommendations or the agreed text.

Let me stress that the Conference was not called for the purpose of considering a new or fundamentally different form of Intelsat, but rather to consider changes in the existing Intelsat organization to improve its operation.

Many members of the Consortium have expressed their satisfaction with the basic structure, the efficiency with which it has functioned, and the remarkable success of the program. Some pointed out the need for changes to accommodate the large group of members as compared to the original founders, and to adapt procedures for operating an existing world-wide system as compared to planning for such an enterprise.

With this in mind, let me identify the principal issues of the agenda:

1. Scope of Intelsat Operations

Should Intelsat be authorized to provide facilities for other than point-by-point and broadcast use, such as services for aeronautical and maritime use? If so, should this be on an exclusive or non-exclusive basis?

2. Legal Status of Intelsat

Should the Consortium continue to operate as a joint venture or have a legal personality such as a corporation?

3. Organization

What changes are needed to give a voice to the small countries not represented on the ICSC? Should the role of the U.S. as a majority "shareholder" be altered?

4. Management

Should Comsat continue as Manager as heretofore? Or should changes be made in its authority?

5. Procurement

Was the procurement to be on a "best price, best quality" basis or should this be waived to subsidize suppliers in other countries?

Should patents developed by Intelsat contractors be made available for others? . . . On what basis?

At the end of the four week session, the Conference recessed until November, 1969. During the interim, a Preparatory Committee will give further consideration to the unresolved questions on the agenda and draft the text of language for the Permanent Agreement.

Although no final decisions were made in the March conference sessions, the outline of an agreement became apparent. In my judgment the following will be included:

1. *Creation of an Assembly in which all member nations will be represented.*

This group would meet periodically to discuss issues of general policy in the same fashion as an annual stockholders meeting. This concept introduced by the U.S. Delegation, received wide support. Some members suggested two assemblies—one consisting of countries, and the other, of telecommunication entities. In my opinion, one of these alternatives will appear in the Permanent Arrangements.

2. *Enlargement of the ICSC to a maximum of 22 members to permit the smaller countries to have a greater voice in the consideration of policy on operating problems of Intelsat.*

3. *Authorizing Intelsat to furnish a communications service for the aviation and maritime services on a non-exclusive basis.*

The technology is at hand, and the industry is anxious for the new service. Some countries prefer that it be rendered by regional groupings rather than Intelsat, but I sense that the prevailing opinion is contrary to that view. This service offers opportunities for greater safety in international travel, cutting down the congestion in airports at take-off and landings and expediting customs and immigration clearances. With satellites offering abundant circuits at relatively inexpensive rates, airlines can send to the authorities at a passenger's destination photocopies of all passports and any other information required on arrival. While passengers are in flight this material can be checked and clearances issued before arrival. Air carriers using the satellite for traffic control should be able to schedule arrivals so that landing delays are eliminated. In fact, this service should be able to expedite everything except the delivery of baggage and getting a taxi to take the passengers into town.

4. *Retention of the present method of procurement, with greater emphasis on best price, best products.*

5. *Retention of Comsat as the general manager of the Intelsat system, with the inclusion of more non-Americans on the management team.*

During the conference, Comsat was repeatedly praised for its excellent performance in planning, executing and operating the world-wide network of satellites. It has earned the respect of its co-venturers for having performed with great efficiency and skill. There is no other comparable organization in any member country that could undertake the complex responsibilities which Comsat now performs.

Some representatives wanted greater "internationalization" of the management, and

the creation of a Secretariat with a Director-General to operate the system. Others urged the transfer to a secretariat of some functions, such as financial, administrative, legal and public relations. I do not believe that any basic changes in management will be made at the next meeting.

6. *Permission for all countries to launch and operate domestic satellite systems outside of the Intelsat framework and for regional groupings within the Intelsat structure.*

In considering this subject, member nations stressed their sovereign rights to operate their own communications networks, and no one seriously questioned that philosophy. Intelsat is prepared to make facilities available for those who seek such, but if a nation wants to launch its own satellite for domestic services, it is free to do so if it coordinates its planning on frequencies and other engineering aspects with Intelsat.

Within the past month, Canada announced plans for such a domestic satellite, and other countries are studying the possibilities. Those who have completed their studies have found that satellites will not be economical unless the country has large land areas to cover, for which cable and microwave would not be feasible. Few countries can justify domestic satellites and most will rely on Intelsat for such circuits as they need for domestic use.

In this connection, I want to stress that the time has come for the United States to arrive at a determination on how we shall use satellites for our domestic communications links. For more than two years the problem has been under study. Suggestions have been made by the common carriers, the broadcasters, the specialized users, the principal hardware manufacturers, the Ford Foundation, and others interested in the improvement of communications. Some have proposed a pilot program; others regular operation.

In my judgment we do not need further experimentation. The technology is clear, the need is substantial and the time has come for action.

Communications satellites offer the United States great opportunities for an abundance of circuits and a dramatic reduction in costs of some services. I doubt that the price of a long distance call will be greatly affected, but hopefully the additional circuits made possible by satellites will harness the computers of this nation into a "network of knowledge":

Doctors in remote towns and villages should be able to immediately tap the resources of our great medical libraries and medical research centers.

Diagnostic clinics in central locations should be able to read electrocardiograms and X-Rays instantly and respond with analysis and advice for the patient.

Reference libraries should similarly be used by colleges, universities and industries in the smallest towns.

Factories can have immediate access to home offices and laboratories with closed-circuit television, facsimile and any other form of communication, written or oral.

We may be able to develop national daily newspapers with editions being printed in principal cities simultaneously.

Rates for educational television may be drastically reduced from the present tariffs for coaxial and microwave connections.

All of this awaits us in the United States in the next few years, but it will not be possible until we announce a national policy on how the satellites will be launched and by whom. The time is overdue for a decision and I hope that this plea will be heard by the FCC, Congress, and other Government agencies involved.

7. *Finally, a reaffirmation of the need for INTELSAT.*

Few would dispute the wisdom of having a single global system. I told a story to

my colleagues which illustrated this point very dramatically. When I was a youngster living in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, my parents had a telephone connected with the Bell System. My grandparents, who lived just two miles away, were subscribers to the Keystone System. As a result, although we both had phones, we could not talk with each other. This situation does not exist any longer in the United States, and must not exist in relationships between countries. If it does we will have wasted the miracle of the satellite.

Unless we have a single global system, in which all countries participate either as owners or users, we will have created artificial obstacles to international trade and commerce; but more significantly, we will have stifled opportunities for a better understanding between peoples everywhere.

We must use the satellite to exchange ideas between countries with different ideologies, and with different languages. Satellites can bridge oceans, cross impenetrable mountain ranges and jungles, and seek out the otherwise inaccessible.

Communications is the lifeline of civilization, and we must not sever the cord which can unite us. When we communicate with each other, we find that all men have common aspirations, regardless of language, race, color, religion, or place on the map. We all yearn for a chance to live in peace; to have enough to eat, a roof over our heads, a chance to perform work that satisfies, and an opportunity to leave the world a better place for our children to live.

I can think of no more important first step we can take toward reducing world tensions than that of broadening the communications links between powerful nations representing different political systems.

We should not rely just on a few hot lines. We will all be better off when we have thousands of cool lines linking us—the big and the small, the rich and the poor, the powerful and the weak.

Today our satellites look down on earth from a distance of 22,000 miles. They see the earth as it truly is—the green-blue globe that is the home of us all. They see a world where no national boundaries are visible, no divisive lines between men of differing race, or economic circumstances, or ideologies. The map may show lines dividing neighboring countries, but the satellite erases all of these artificial boundaries and sees no oceans, mountains or man-made barriers. By rising above both geographical and man-made divisions, they can serve us all in building the works of peace.

COLORADO SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 1969 OPINION POLL

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 I initiated an opinion poll in my district to give my constituents an opportunity to express consensus on the broad issues which we, in the Congress, must debate.

Since that time, the poll has become one of the largest samplings of public opinion in the Nation. In 1967, for example, I received—by actual count—the opinions of more than 50,000 Coloradans.

I know of no poll of its kind which has been more successful, both in terms of

total response and the usefulness of the resultant data.

This week I am mailing to every post office patron in my district the 1969 edition. Since my district is one of the most

populous in the Nation, 207,000 individual ballots will be required.

For the information of the Members, I would like to present the format which I utilize:

(If married, both husband and wife may participate)

	Men's opinions			Women's opinions		
	Yes	No	Undecided	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor proposals which have been made to utilize a "lottery" selection system for the draft?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. Do you favor legislation limiting the number and type of questions to be asked in the census?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. Should Federal grants and loans be denied students who participate in campus disturbances?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4. Should the Federal Government share a fixed percentage of income tax revenues with schools, local and State governments for use as they see fit?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
5. Should more of our Federal, State, and local resources be channeled into law enforcement?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
6. Do you feel that the proposed 6-month extension of the 10-percent income tax surcharge is justified?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
7. Do you favor continued U.S. efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, regardless of the outcome of the Paris talks?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
8. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations?-----	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Your age group: A. 20 to 35; B. 36 to 49; C. 50 and over.-----	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Political affiliation: A. Republican; B. Democrat; C. Independent.-----	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Occupation, head of household: A. Business or professional; B. Industrial worker; C. Government; D. Farmer; E. Educator; F. Retired.	<input type="checkbox"/>					

The results will be tabulated by modern business machines. So that my colleagues may be informed on how the people of my district stand on these issues I will reproduce the tabulation in the RECORD.

NEBRASKA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was one of Nebraska's most distinguished sons, Senator George Norris, who led the fight for rural electrification in the Congress some 35 years ago. In the subsequent period the Rural Electrification Administration has made available loans to provide for 116,000 electricity consumers and 26,000 subscribers in Nebraska.

The first REA-financed line in the State was energized December 2, 1936. At that time only 7.1 percent of Nebraska farms were receiving electric service. Today, more than 98 percent of our farms and ranches are receiving central station electric service.

The ever-increasing importance of electrical energy to the rural citizens of Nebraska is easily measured by the use they make of it on their farms, and in their homes and businesses. In 1956, the average monthly consumption per consumer was 429 kilowatt-hours. By 1967, that figure had risen to 988, substantially above the national average of 751 kilowatt-hours per month. More than simply indicating growth, these figures demonstrate the vital role that electricity—and the REA—plays in contemporary rural life. Today's farmer is as dependent on kilowatt power as his grandfather was on horsepower.

As of January 1, 1968, the REA had advanced more than \$185 million to bor-

rowers for electric system in the State. The funds have been invested by the borrowers in local electric facilities, including 62,211 miles of line, serving 107,335 farm and other rural consumers.

From the time of the first REA telephone loan in January 1954 to January 1, 1968, the REA had approved over \$15 million in loans to telephone borrowers in Nebraska.

Mr. President, it has become an annual practice for the Nebraska Rural Electrification Association to sponsor, as an educational endeavor, an essay-writing contest on the subject of the REA.

This year the topic was "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community." Hundreds of essays were submitted and a few were selected. As part of the prize these youngsters are sent to Washington, courtesy of the NREA.

A highlight of the trip is the Nebraska congressional breakfast at which these young people are presented with copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing their essays.

Mr. President, I have here some of the winning entries from this year's competition, and, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks essays written by the following:

Joe Reynolds, 16, a junior at Wood River High School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Reynolds of Wood River, Nebr. Sponsor: Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Grand Island, Nebr.

Bruce Carse, 17, a junior at Palisade High School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Leon Carse of Palisade, Nebr. Sponsor: Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr.

Barbara Gottschalk, 16, a junior at McDonald High School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. B. E. Gottschalk of Benkelman, Nebr. Sponsor: Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr.

Dotty Jo Beeler, 18, a senior at Oxford Community School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Earl M. Beeler of Oxford,

Nebr. Sponsor: Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebr.

Tom Haffey, 17, a senior at Oxford Community School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Haffey of Oxford, Nebr. Sponsor: Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebr.

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

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION, AN EXERCISE IN COOPERATION

(By Joe Reynolds, 16, junior, Wood River High School; father: A. F. Reynolds, R.R. No. 1, Wood River, Nebr.)

(Contestant sponsored by the Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Grand Island, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Rural electrification is of great importance in my life even though electricity was in this area long before I was born. Electricity has given me and my neighbors a sense of responsibility and cooperation, a fact that has been, and is being, proved countless times each year.

As I sit here writing this essay, I look out the window and see the bluish haze of reflections from yard lights on farms nearby. I acquire a feeling of satisfaction and joy from this sight, because its wondrous sight tells me that everything is just the way it should be in the world tonight. Yet, I also realize that without the cooperation of many, many people in the miracle of creating light, I could be looking out into bleak, dark, ebony blackness. I could also be writing this paper by candlelight or gaslight, but I'm not, and thankful to be able to work under illumination that is bright, steady, and gained by simply pushing a button.

Perhaps my appreciation is greater because of the experience of having had no electric lights one night during this past winter. The snow was falling, and the wind was blowing, creating a real blizzard. Already the lights had flickered off and on a couple of times since darkness set in. I was working on homework that night when the lights went off and didn't come back on. I rummaged through drawers, found candles and went back to work, but with considerable difficulty—candlelight flickers at the slightest air movement. About an hour later, I saw a car go by outside. What I saw was something I will never forget! An REA truck was traveling slowly down the road, shining a spotlight on the wires and poles. I hadn't expected the electricity would be fixed until sometime the following day. But there they were, freezing at the peak of the storm, trying to fix the trouble for the people in this area and me. Two hours after the power failure, electricity was back on. Ever since then, I've wanted to thank the REA, and now's my chance to express my deep gratitude to those men who performed that night, far above and beyond the call of duty! That is real cooperation and genuine service!

This event, together with the acts of my friends and neighbors, have shown me that people do care for people and are willing to help out and become involved whenever the need arises. These deeds have also taught me the pleasures and joys there are in reciprocating the sacrifices of others who have rendered their aid by my own sacrifices. In so doing, these sincere gestures of others have helped me to become a better citizen and have also given me guideposts to follow and have been gigantic steps in growing up.

Yes, rural power users really do have more than electricity; they do have cooperative spirit—a spirit that will never die and will never fade away—a spirit that will last as long as there are civilized men—a spirit started by electrification of rural areas.

These are moments I will always remember when I look out the window and see the bluish haze of yard lights, conquering the ebony blackness.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Bruce Carse, 17, junior, Pallsade High School, father: Leon Carse, Pallsade, Nebr.)

(Contestant sponsored by Southwest Public Power District, Pallsade, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Electricity is the cheapest servant you could ever wish to have. And, it's the most powerful! Pharaoh, in building his pyramids had thousands of slaves, but he couldn't compare to what you have at your command in your electrical switch.

Where was this servant born? In 1936, Senator George Norris of Nebraska and Representative Sam Rayburn of Texas sponsored the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. The act provided that the Administration is authorized to make loans for rural electrification for the purpose of financing construction of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines for the furnishing of electric service to persons in rural areas. At the time the Act was passed, only 10% of America's rural areas had central station electric power; today, that figure is 98%.

Nebraska rural electric systems operate about 59,307 miles of line and serve about 102,315 customers. Each rural electric system sets its own rates, hires its own employees, pays its own salaries and makes its own policies.

Yes, rural electric is great! . . . Great because they provide a necessary service, and provide it continuously, economically and dependably—but with very little fanfare.

On the farm alone there are more than four hundred uses of electricity; at least two hundred and fifty of them increase production or make farming more profitable. An important result of this program is the increased business it brings into rural communities. The rural market for appliances and equipment is estimated at more than a billion dollars a year.

Electricity's greatest convenience on the farm is in the form of power. At the touch of a switch electricity will pump water, dry, grind, load, or convey grain, or power many different shop tools.

One of the most pleasant uses is the excellent lighting it provides. Good lighting means more efficient and safe work. It makes more comfortable the specific tasks such as reading, sewing, cooking, and also makes our recreation more enjoyable.

Electricity in the house has made it a home. The homemaker uses many appliances to make her work easier, more efficient and enjoyable. Water pumps and heaters mean instant hot water for all household needs. Electric dishwashers, washers and dryers, mixers, vacuum cleaners, skillets, coffee makers, toasters, and many other appliances allow the housewife freedom to do other things. Radios and television provide news, weather, and entertainment for the whole family. Electricity provides a controlled room temperature summer or winter with heaters or air conditioners.

It is predicted that by 1980 our electric power needs will be nearly three times greater than what we now use. Experts predict that by 2000 the average use of electricity per person will be more than twenty times the present consumption!

Think what a precious gift my generation is inheriting. One that will provide better health, wealth, and happiness to its people.

All in all, rural electrification has been the means of lightening the heavy loads of work rural America has to carry and I believe it will be an even greater servant in the future.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Barbara Gottschalk, 16, junior, McDonald High School, McDonald, Kans., father: B. E. Gottschalk, Benkelman, Nebr.)

(Contestant sponsored by the Southwest Public Power District, Pallsade, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

What is the cheapest most powerful servant that you could ever wish to have? No, it's not a brawny housemaid or a powerful butler, but electricity! Today, when you flick an electric switch, you are in command of more power than any of the ancient kings or conquerors could ever have dreamed of possessing. Rural families were still living in the "Dark Ages" for over 50 years while their city cousins reigned over electric power, but thanks to modern rural electrification, city and farm dwellers are now equals.

Yes, today rural farms are just as "turned on" as the younger generation and they are as much a part of the American scene as the cities! Farming technology is advancing by leaps and bounds every day and electricity is playing a big part in this. Specialized operations such as dairy farms, irrigation projects, livestock feeding yards, and the like are becoming almost wholly dependent on electric power. Electric augers, grain dryers and welders are examples of farming equipment which provide extra help that a farm 50 years ago would have had to do without.

The housewife appreciates electricity perhaps better than any of the other members of a farm family. Radio and television give her contacts with the rest of the world, and household drudgery is nearing extinction, thanks to electric washers, dryers, stoves and countless other appliances.

Today's younger generation can't imagine life without electricity. Children watch television and listen to the radio without giving the electric power that operates them a second thought. One part of the home can be just as comfortable for them to play in as another part because of central electric heating or cooling.

Electric power may be a willing servant, but it should be appreciated. Perhaps today we don't have to think of electricity every time we use it, but since the creation of REA in 1935, countless scores of dedicated people have made it their business to continually improve, and lower the cost of REA service. We owe a lot of gratitude to these public servants who have helped to bring us electric power that makes our lives more enjoyable every day.

REA benefited greatly from enthusiastic open-minded people at the start of rural electrification cooperatives and it is still searching for people who will open the doors to greater advancement in future generations. Even though a farm youth might not choose a particular career in the REA program, his life will be more satisfying and productive because of rural electrification, no matter what his career may be.

The story of electrification in rural America is by no means over. Every year electric power enters the homes of 140,000 new rural consumers, bring higher living standards with it, and consequently changing their lives. Moreover, increasing amounts of electricity are being sold each year to existing consumers.

The whole American way of life is symbolized by the REA program. Only in a free democratic country could citizens work together for their own common good. In the past 30 years that REA has served rural America, electricity has increased farm living standards at an astonishing rate. What will happen in the next 30 years? It is beyond the imagination of anyone, but as REA continues to expand in the future, we can be assured of seeing a rural America that will be a stronger and an even more dependable

part of our free country, the United States of America.

HOW RURAL ELECTRIFICATION HELPS ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Dotty Jo Beeler, 18, senior, Oxford Community School, father: Earl M. Beeler, Oxford, Nebr.)

(Contestant sponsored by the Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

When I think of the myriad of ways Rural Electrification has helped me—a girl born and raised on a farm—literally hundreds of ideas pop into my head. It is really amazing that such small wires can carry so much comfort! In the winter our electric furnace keeps my family and me warm; in the summer our air conditioner keeps us cool. Electricity has greatly expanded family entertainment from the time my mother was a girl. I can watch television, listen to the radio, or read late at night and not have to worry about batteries, candles, or kerosene lamps. As in the rest of the house, when I work in the kitchen, my servant, electricity, is always at my side furnishing power for the electric stove, refrigerator-freezer, dishwasher, washer and dryer.

Not all of my work is in the house because as a livestock producing 4-H girl, I work outside a lot. When I go about my chores, I realize just how much electricity is needed on our farm. I would hate to carry all the water for the cattle that our electric pump furnishes. We used to run a seventy-five cow dairy. The few times the power failed brought to our attention how much we really needed electricity for our dairy. Another silent helper is our vapor light which not only discourages prowlers, but also provides a reassuring atmosphere for our livestock. Dad often discusses how much easier it is to wean calves in a lighted pen.

In my community I see excellent examples of what Rural Electricity has done for the small town. Many factories are moving from the cities to smaller communities. One such factory is Dyna-Forge which located near Oxford. The executives of Dyna-Forge wanted a small community that would provide a place to build an airport adjacent to the plant. Without REA our community would not have been able to furnish the electricity needed for both the factory and the airport. Another rural located factory, which is just beginning to provide employment in my community, is a church pew factory. Many of the workers for these factories could not find rental property in town and now live in farm houses with electricity furnished by REA.

While driving down the highway in the evening, I see the rows of lights from turkey houses where, again, our Rural Electrical servant has lighted the way. For a generation turkeys have been my community's largest industry. If it were not for Rural Electrification, we would not have this large industry and many Americans would miss the turkey for holiday dinners.

REA is the All American Power for all Rural Americans. I shudder when I try to imagine what it would be like if we suddenly lost our electricity and rural America returned to the "Dark Ages."

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Tom Haffey, 17, senior, Oxford Community School; father: Leo Haffey, Oxford, Nebr.)

(Contestant sponsored by the Twin Valleys Public Power Districts, Cambridge, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

The water surges endlessly up from the earth giving life to the land that had before been barren except for dry grass and cactus.

The steady hum of a power line and the drone of an electric pump laboring under unseen weight can be heard pushing the water through rows of pipes. This is a modern day miracle, making land which had previously been useless for raising crops, because of the lack of water, green and fertile.

This modern day miracle had been made possible, in part, by rural electrification bringing electricity to farm areas throughout the nation. With the aid of rural electrification the farmer, or rancher can now enjoy many of the benefits of electricity. It makes irrigation away from streams, rivers and all open water sources possible with the aid of a reliable electric pumping system. By using electricity to power a mechanical feeding operation, the feeder can increase production and thus increase his profit.

As a member of a farming community I can realize the importance of electricity in a rural area. Rural electricity makes it possible to gain more from the land and raise livestock more quickly and efficiently.

There are many applications of electricity on the farm today. Many of these uses increase both the speed and the quality of production. An example of this is the air-conditioned housing unit for the raising of swine. Electricity to heat and cool the building results in year round production of swine and a decrease in the number of animals lost during farrowing. Electric lighting of the farmyard makes it possible for the farmer to have longer working hours or more leisure time to spend with his family after the working day is over. Farmyard lighting also discourages would-be thieves from trespassing.

Rural electrification plays an important part in the success of a rural community, also. A community with an inexpensive and

efficient power supply has a greater chance of promoting new businesses. By using electricity to light its streets a community may become a safer and better place to live; electricity also makes possible many different ways of entertainment, such as theaters and lighted recreation facilities, to keep the younger people busy.

Electricity is an important part of a rural area. Without it the United States would not be what it is today; a world power exporting products to all parts of the world. Electricity may well be one of the mainstays of rural America.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, each year I attempt to ascertain the thinking of my constituents on matters of importance to our country by sending questionnaires to them.

Since many of my colleagues would like to know the nature of the questions I am asking, I am inserting the questionnaire at this point in the RECORD. Also, when all responses have been received and tabulated, I will share the results with my colleagues.

The questionnaire follows:

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Should the Federal Government develop laws to help prevent strikes by public employees?..... | Yes | No |
| 2. Do you favor legislation which would return to the States a percentage of the money now collected in Federal income taxes?..... | Yes | No |
| 3. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?..... | Yes | No |
| 4. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a Government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis?..... | Yes | No |
| 5. Red China—do you favor U.S. support for admission of Peking to the United Nations?..... | Yes | No |
| 6. The President's economic advisers recommend extension of the 10-percent surtax, along with other Federal actions, as essential to control inflation. Do you agree?..... | Yes | No |
| 7. With regard to Vietnam, do you favor— | | |
| (a) Continuing present military operations while negotiating for an indefinite period time, or }..... | a | b |
| (b) Setting a time limit on the peace talks?..... | c | d |
| 8. In the absence of meaningful agreements at the peace talks would you favor that we— | | |
| (a) Announce the beginning of systematic withdrawal of U.S. forces, or }..... | a | b |
| (b) Exert all military and diplomatic pressures necessary for victory?..... | c | d |
| 9. For future presidential elections, do you favor— | | |
| (a) Continuing the present method..... | a | b |
| (b) Apportioning the electoral votes from each State so as to reflect the popular vote cast }..... | c | d |
| (c) Casting one electoral vote for the successful nominee in each congressional district (with the two state-wide electoral votes reflecting the successful nominee statewide)..... | e | f |
| (d) Electing the President by direct, popular vote?..... | g | h |
| 10. Would you rate President Nixon's overall performance since he took office as— | | |
| (a) Excellent (b) Good..... | a | b |
| (c) Fair (d) Poor..... | c | d |

DEATH OF R. G. LETOURNEAU

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I learned of the recent death of Mr. R. G. LeTourneau of Longview, Tex.

Mr. LeTourneau led an active and productive life. He personally made a significant contribution to his country's military effort in World War II as the developer and manufacturer of the world's largest earth-moving equipment.

All through his life, he never lost sight of his own need for divine assistance and the role of the Lord in the lives of all men.

His 80 years of life constituted a unique linkage of personal resourcefulness, creativity and ability with dependence upon God. This linkage has been an inspiration to many of those who knew Mr. LeTourneau and to those who worked for him.

His motto was, "God is my partner." His life was a symbol of success of the free enterprise system.

His three uncles and two sisters were missionaries, and he himself traveled many hundreds of thousands of miles preaching.

A native of Vermont, Mr. LeTourneau took correspondence courses in engineering and geometry and went to work at the age of 14, first as an iron molder, then as a garage mechanic in California.

During World War I he served in the Navy and he learned the electric machinist's trade. After the war, he went

into business repairing tractors. Soon his creative genius with machines resulted in an improved method of building earth scrapers and this in turn resulted in his becoming an industrialist.

He opened his first plant in 1920 and within a decade was manufacturing heavy-grading equipment.

During World War II, the LeTourneau Co. produced 70 percent of all the earth-moving equipment used by our Armed Forces. LeTourneau machines leveled jungles and revolutionized roadbuilding techniques.

In 1946, Mr. LeTourneau introduced a machine which could lay the concrete required to build a four-room house in a single day.

Later, he turned his attentions to producing other types of machinery including a jungle tree crusher and an ocean-going drilling barge.

During all of this industrial success, he continued his evangelistic work. He sponsored religious activities at all of his industrial plants. He once said:

A factory can be dedicated to God as well as a church.

And added—

It may be used as a means of saving many souls.

In 1935, Mr. LeTourneau established a foundation which distributed 90 percent of the dividends from the stock he held in his own company to Christian and charitable causes.

In 1946, Mr. LeTourneau purchased a surplus Army hospital facility in Longview and converted it into a technical institute, now known as LeTourneau College, a 4-year liberal arts and engineering college having more than 750 students.

Mr. President, this great man contributed much to his Nation, to the people he met, and to Christianity. He is sorely missed.

THE SOUTH DAKOTA STOCK-GROWERS ASSOCIATION

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association is holding its annual meeting this weekend in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The keynote speaker at the 3-day convention will be Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin.

I would like to commend the stock-growers association as a vital cog in providing South Dakota with a sound agricultural economic base.

Beef provides the largest source of agricultural income to South Dakota farmers, and the State ranks sixth nationally in the number of beef cows.

It is interesting to note that beef cows have more than doubled since 1950 and beef income in South Dakota represented 47 percent of all the total cash farm income from crops and livestock last year.

The future of beef production in South Dakota will be even more promising with the development of the Oahe irrigation

project, which will assure a guaranteed feed supply to feed out cattle on South Dakota feedlots which are presently prepared for market in neighboring States.

TAX-FINANCED PROPAGANDA MACHINE

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, 2 or 3 years ago, Congress debated quite hotly on the issue of financing some sort of public broadcasting corporation. With a full public airing, a carefully limited program was authorized. The main fear stemmed from the possibility that once Government gets into the propaganda business, it is hard to know when to stop.

Now it appears that what Congress would not permit to be done directly is being done indirectly. I call attention to an excellent article appearing in Barron's magazine which gives documentation to the degree of growth Government propaganda has experienced over the past 3 or 4 years.

It seems that several departments have audiovisual departments and production capabilities that rival Hollywood and New York. In addition, these productions—prepared with tax money—often seem to be in direct contradiction with stated policies of the executive branch of the Government.

In a time when we are seeking ways to cut the Federal budget, I would suggest this as a prime area for consideration. It makes little sense to me to have an audiovisual publicity department churning out commercials on how to get Government to do more things for you, when we are trying to get people to be more self-reliant.

In addition to all this, I would suggest it is not proper for one Federal agency, the Federal Communications Commission, to be insisting that broadcasters devote a certain portion of their air time to "public service," and at the same time to be providing a great bulk of material to be used in that same "public service" time. It is not hard to imagine a broadcaster being under some degree of intimidation in such a situation. I can well believe that a station manager may schedule some of the releases of HUD, OEO, HEW, or Agriculture just to "cover" himself in case his next license renewal is questioned. Thus, in such a situation, we find Government, tax-financed radio-TV material competing for a limited amount of air time with such organizations as the Red Cross, United Givers Fund, March of Dimes, and other private or voluntary "public service" announcements.

Mr. President, I suggest that each department examine the budget it is now preparing to cut back or eliminate a great deal of this kind of activity. I have no objection to departments providing assistance to news media in their pursuit of any important programs being carried on by those departments and

agencies—however, even those activities can be overdone. What I do object to, and I think most of the American people will agree on this point, is the building of great propaganda empires to turn out reams and reels of material trying to turn the populace's desire toward more Federal intervention into their lives rather than less. That was not the basis upon which the Nation was built, that was not the basis upon which the Nation became great, and it is not the direction in which I believe the majority of the American people wish to proceed. I think that was clearly indicated in the reluctance and care exercised in the discussion over public broadcasting.

I further suggest that members of the various appropriations subcommittees charged with the financial oversight of these activities may wish to inquire into these activities so as to satisfy themselves that the money requested in the budget for fiscal 1970 is really essential to carrying out and implementation of the department's work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mrs. Shirley Scheibla, published in the May 19 issue of Barron's magazine, be printed in the RECORD.

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

YOUR MASTER'S VOICE: "PUBLIC SERVICE" BROADCASTING HAS BECOME A PROPAGANDA MACHINE

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—In carrying out plans to close 59 Job Corps centers, President Nixon may find his task made harder by radio and color television spot announcements which the Office of Economic Opportunity recently sent to stations throughout the country. In a staff memorandum dated February 14, OEO said: "Three new Job Corps TV spots, with the theme of 'Give Yourself a Chance,' have been distributed to all TV stations and will be shown in addition to those currently used. Additional radio spots have also been distributed." (While the Labor Department, slated to take over the Job Corps, persuaded OEO to withdraw plans to advertise the Job Corps on the side panels of every mail truck in the country, it failed to talk OEO into killing the radio-TV spots.)

HIGHLY CONTROVERSIAL

A few years ago, federal production of TV and radio material to propagandize highly controversial programs was most unusual. Today it's the rule rather than the exception for most government agencies engaged in social endeavors, nor are their efforts confined to spots. On the contrary, today they turn out vast quantities of long and short TV films, video tape and radio productions and scripts. They're doing it on their own; through donated professional services; and under contract with private companies and non-profit institutions like universities. Some agencies even have a "Spotmaster" which enables stations to broadcast recordings directly from a phone after dialing the right number.

Nobody knows how much money the government spends on such activities, or even the approximate value of the gratis services. Nobody even knows how much Uncle Sam spends for public relations; most agencies take such disbursements out of their administrative budgets. However, one independent producer of TV films for the government estimates that expenditures for that item alone run into hundreds of millions of dollars. (He likes the work because it doesn't involve competitive bidding.)

Nobody at the top in government studies the radio and TV messages being disseminated. Herbert Klein, communications director for President Nixon, doesn't have the time. Small wonder. The Agriculture Department alone has 300 different films available for television, not counting about 350 spots, plus radio material.

The uncontrolled avalanche of federal propaganda gets a great reception from radio and television. Broadcasters apparently are delighted to receive free material of commercial quality. Moreover, it is one way to comply with the requirement of the Federal Communications Commission to devote some of their time to "public service"; all federal productions for the airwaves are lumped into the "public service" category. But they're beginning to look less like a public service and more like a propaganda monster.

OTHER REALMS, TOO

President Nixon may find himself in opposition to federal radio-TV material in other realms as well. As he tries to "bring us together" and still the voices of racial turmoil, he will be running into a TV spot distributed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which says, in part, "If you're black, you've got to be famous to live where you want. You call up; the agent has a house. Show your face; it vanishes."

While Mr. Nixon is trying to bring OEO's community action under control, a HUD radio spot is urging listeners to "organize community action groups." (A 14-minute Interior Department TV movie suggests community action to remedy a water shortage.) Although, the Chief Executive's advisors are pondering the problem of too many requests for HUD money, the agency's TV and radio spots tell people to send for a booklet, "Better Communities," which urges readers to apply for nine different kinds of grants from HUD.

Communications Director Klein says he would like to inspire a new pride in America. But here's what the booklet says: "Today America's urban communities are at a juncture. Their sidewalks are unsafe, streets jammed with traffic and air polluted. Their office and apartment buildings are all too often uniformly drab and unoriginal in design. Their cores are ridden with slums, junkyards and neon forests. Their splayed amorphous suburbs are rapidly becoming unsightly and unlivable. Whether they will continue to deteriorate or will be revitalized and rebuilt is in question." The answer, says the booklet, is that everyone "must be made aware of the abundant opportunities available to them for bettering their communities," i.e. money from HUD. Proudly HUD reports it has had 1,500 requests for the booklet directly attributable to the spots.

SOLICITING BUSINESS

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is another agency which appears to be using spots to solicit more business than it can handle. Despite its admitted inability to deal with the huge volume of complaints it has on hand, EEOC has a radio spot which says, in part, "Do you need a job? If so, go to your United States Employment Service or visit a private employment agency. If you hear of a job that you can do and you would like to have, go today and apply for it . . . If you are turned down because somebody thinks you are the wrong color or the wrong race or the wrong sex or religion or national origin, that somebody is breaking the law—and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission wants to hear about it."

The Agriculture Department's huge roster of TV movies and radio material promotes virtually every controversial activity within its jurisdiction, including farm and electric cooperatives. A film now in preparation will tout the federal meat and poultry inspection service which recently has been criticized for

issuing biased reports on conditions in the meat-packing industry (Barron's, April 7).

HOLLOWES AND RUTS

Back in 1965, when President Johnson was struggling to win support for the War on Poverty, the Department produced a 28½-minute film titled, "Poverty in Rural America." It remains in circulation for TV use. According to the Department's catalog: "This film takes you where the 'Hidden Americans' live—into the mountain hollows, to the end of the rutted dirt roads, and into the bypassed communities."

This a long way, of course, from Smoky the Bear, who now is revered as the grandfather of the mushrooming federal broadcasting ventures. The Department still is promoting its fire-fighting bear and features him on about 95 commercially produced TV spots. They are the only films which the agency doesn't turn out in its own studio in its sprawling South Building. During fiscal 1968, the studio made 87 TV films for the Department, compared with 94 in 1967. "But owing to a sharp increase in the requirement for longer films," it explains, "the level of activity in terms of finished screen minutes held essentially constant."

Here is what the Department reports on its growing radio activities: "Agri-Tape," a weekly tape recorded program, went to 427 radio stations, exceeding what was thought a year earlier was near production capacity (400) for regular handling with existing facilities. "Agriculture USA," another weekly taped program, grew from 220 regularly using stations to 236. The daily radio featurettes, "Consumer Time," issued on a weekly reel of six programs (three and a half minutes), continues serving 325 to 350 radio stations."

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) is so deep in dramatic productions for the airwaves that it employs a former theatrical agent—Harry C. Bell—as its radio-TV officer. Among the Department's recent TV films are two running a half-hour each, called "Beware the Wind" and "Battle Below the Clouds." Dealing with air pollution, both are distributed under the auspices of HEW's Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service.

A 15-minute weekly show by HEW's Social Security Administration is carried by 743 TV stations and 3,698 radio stations. A five-minute weekly show, recorded for Social Security by singer Eddy Arnold, is aired by 2,000 radio stations a week. In addition, Social Security reports that during the final quarter of last year, 185 TV stations used its live programs; 91, its long films and 703, spots.

"Three years ago," says Mr. Bell, "we were producing virtually no TV spots; now we have them out on anti-smoking, air pollution, drug abuse, rehabilitation, the Teacher Corps, financial aid to students and Social Security."

With over 1,000 community action centers scattered all over the country, OEO is in a unique position to exploit radio and TV as a propaganda tool. It is urging every center to literally get into the act. Volume II of an OEO Public Affairs Handbook called "Sound and Sight" tells how to do it.

"Under terms of their licensing by the Federal Communications Commission, TV and radio stations must devote a certain amount of broadcast time to public service" and "your Community Action Program fits the definition of a public interest program," the booklet advises.

SCRATCHING THE SURFACE

But wangling free spot announcements and guest appearances on existing programs is "only scratching the surface," according to the booklet. Send news releases about CAA activities to TV and radio stations and develop with them a public affairs series telling "what the poverty program can do for the community and what the community can do for the poverty program," it urges.

CXV—945—Part 11

"Know the special prejudices of your audience. . . . In a rural area . . . emphasize the 'individuality' or 'self-help.' . . . In an urban area, where group cooperation is more of a way of life, your program might portray those efforts in which the community joins together toward a special goal," declares the booklet.

With a \$100,000 grant from OEO, the Community Action Training Institute of Trenton, N.J., produced a TV show series which recently was nominated for a special citation by the National Academy of Arts and Sciences. Called "Ya Es Tiempo" (It's About Time), the five Spanish language shows were aired over UHF channel 47 in Newark last August and September. The theme was that it's about time to do something about poverty and that the answers lie in community action.

ACTION-TYPE CLUBS

CATI reports that over 50 buyers' clubs, block clubs and "other action type" clubs were formed as a direct result of the Spanish-language showings.

On each of the five evenings when the TV programs were shown, 224 Spanish-speaking CATI group leaders conducted training sessions in their homes for 2,300 people in connection with viewing the programs.

Here, in essence, is how CATI describes the show on employment problems: A man who has worked at a factory for seven years is fired without being told the reason. His union will not help him. When he tells his friends, they are afraid that if they help him, they will be fired. But finally they meet with an employment specialist at a CAA. "He suggests they form a group so they can learn what to do; e.g. how to participate in the union so it's working for their benefit." The specialist also helps the fired worker "get into a training program that will prepare him for a new career."

This is what CATI reported about advance promotions: "The group leader and actor network of local people, assisted by many CAAs, local organizations and churches in New York City and northern New Jersey, distributed more than 3,000 posters and 50,000 throwaway announcements. This neighborhood promotional effort reached 36 Spanish barrios. . . . Channel 47 gave free air time for short promotional spot announcements. . . . An advertisement was placed in The New York Times the day of the first telecast."

Currently being aired in Newark—over radio station WNJR—is the Newark Report, produced by the United Community Corp., the top CAA in that city. Started last October, it is a panel discussion show of the programs of the UCC, and WNJR says it is very popular.

DYNAMIC PLATFORM

According to The Crusader, a newspaper published by the UCC, television "can provide a dynamic platform to bring the basic problems of the ghettos more clearly into focus. . . . The poor have come to recognize that their demand for a free and equal access to the mass media is an intrinsic part of their being able to succeed in the struggle for freedom from hunger, from privation, from exclusion."

Down in Williamston, N.C., Martin County Community Action, Inc., puts on a 15-minute radio program twice daily. "An antipoverty agency is not the easiest thing to sell the public on, but we have been rather successful in our efforts with the affluent as well as the poor," says Harmon St. Clair of MCCA.

OEO itself sends out radio-TV material in addition to that on the Job Corps and urges its local community action groups to help persuade local stations to use it. For instance, OEO recently sent all TV stations half-a-dozen new color spots lauding VISTA.

"The Owl Who Gave a Hoot" is described as an OEO cartoon film which "alerts low-

income groups to their rights as consumers, rights being denied them because of malpractice, fraud or their own lack of knowledge."

Mention of the future prospects for the role TV and radio will play in government public relations brings a sparkle to the eyes of many information officers of the aforementioned agencies. They talk of only beginning to exploit the possibilities.

Obviously those who are battling creation of a Public Broadcasting Corp. to forestall federal broadcast propaganda are unaware of what is now going on.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY AID DIRECTOR ENDORSES ROYBAL BILL, H.R. 11044, FOR NATIONAL WELFARE STANDARDS, WITH 90-PERCENT FEDERAL FUNDING

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing the country today is the urgent need for reform and revisions in our public assistance programs.

For that reason, I was particularly happy to receive a letter from Mr. Ellis P. Murphy, director of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services, and a nationally recognized authority in the welfare field, in which he offered his enthusiastic support for my bill, H.R. 11044, to establish minimum standards for welfare benefits to apply across the board in all 50 States, with provision for 90-percent Federal cost reimbursement.

H.R. 11044 would also repeal the arbitrary child welfare "freeze" in the program for aid to families with dependent children.

Because this issue is of vital concern to millions of citizens throughout the country, I include Mr. Murphy's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES,
Commerce, Calif., May 28, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: I want to thank you for introducing your bill, H.R. 11044, establishing national welfare standards with 90 per cent federal funding. In view of the recent Supreme Court decision eliminating durational residence requirements for welfare, national standards become imperative.

Ninety per cent federal funding would mean a saving to Los Angeles County property taxpayers of \$84,553,656, equal to a 46 cent decrease in the tax rate. At a time when increasing taxes place more and more of a burden on the property owner, this reduction is especially welcome.

Your bill also benefits recipients of public assistance by encouraging a uniform standard of need for aged, blind, and disabled individuals, removing the "AFDC freeze," as well as increasing the amount of aid being provided. As you know, we have long advocated uniform standards for aged, blind, and disabled recipients since we feel it removes certain unnecessary inequities in the programs. The removal of the "AFDC freeze" will let us

extend help to all families in need without an arbitrary quota being imposed. Any attempt to help recipients keep up with the generally rising cost of living is, of course, very much appreciated.

I have written to our Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors urging them to give their full support to H.R. 11044.

Again, thank you for your bill on behalf of both recipients and administrators of public welfare. I certainly hope it becomes law. Sincerely,

ELLIS P. MURPHY,
Director.

THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it has long been commonplace that every American could succeed in whatever pursuit he chose, so long as he had the ability and desire to work for it. The falseness of this cliché has for an equally long time been apparent to members of minority groups, particularly black Americans. It is an unfortunate fact of life that many of our citizens are the victims of racial discrimination, barred from aspirations that most of us consider normal.

It was to wipe out this disease that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was created. The Commission has endeavored to carry out its statutory mandate of implementing the employment provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but has been slowed in its efforts by its own lack of enforcement power.

Hopefully, this administration will demonstrate real and sincere leadership in pursuing the goal that is so critically important to the attainment of the American ideal—equal opportunity for all. The President has already moved in this direction by naming William H. Brown III to be Chairman of the EEOC. Mr. Brown's experience covers the whole spectrum of civil rights, and his legal activities have been of international significance. Prior to passage of the public accommodations law, it was he who assured black African diplomats traveling between New York and Washington of the common courtesy of being served in a restaurant. I am confident that William Brown will not "walk soft" where there are injustices to be remedied. His personal history gives the lie to any such supposition. As a distinguished member of the Philadelphia bar he has many times lent his services to civil rights causes aimed at obtaining better jobs and housing for black people. Success has not sapped his drive to improve the lives of the less fortunate. But if he is to succeed in his new mission, he must have the wholehearted backing of every organ and instrumentality of this Government. Any other course will not maintain the confidence of a people in its institutions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks President Nixon's remarks at the swearing in of William H. Brown III as mem-

ber, and announcement of his designation as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

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

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

(The President's Remarks at the Swearing In of William H. Brown III as Member and Announcement of His Designation as Chairman of the Commission, May 6, 1969)

We are here today for the swearing in of the member of the Commission and then I will make an announcement after that about Mr. Brown's appointment.

He will be sworn in by an old friend, Judge Hyde.

Mrs. Brown, would you hold the Bible and stand here?

[At this point, Judge DeWitt S. Hyde of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions administered the oath of office.]

Now, if the Senator and others would come here, all of you who would like to congratulate Mr. Brown, then I will say a word and leave him to the press.

In making the appointment of Mr. Brown to this Commission, I did so with the full knowledge that he was a man who was uniquely qualified for it. He comes from Philadelphia. I suppose we could describe him as a Philadelphia lawyer, because he is a lawyer. But he is a Philadelphia lawyer in a much broader sense than we usually think of that term.

He knows the law. He is an expert in the law. But he also has what I would call a spirit of brotherly love which the city of Philadelphia has been so long associated with.

Combining that legal expertise with a deep dedication to the principle of equality of opportunity for all people in this country, an equal chance for all people, I think these are the unique attributes that we need, not only as a member of the Commission, but as Chairman of the Commission.

I am delighted to be able to appoint a man so well qualified, so full of dedication, to this very important position.

We wish him and the members of the Commission well. I know that, having had a chance to talk to him, he will provide the leadership that this administration wants in this vitally important field.

Now, I will leave you for your first press conference as Chairman of the Commission here in this very pleasant place.

(NOTE.—The President spoke at 4:15 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.)

D-DAY

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks a very special day for every American—D-Day, the day in World War II when our valiant fighting men began the liberation of Western Europe.

To commemorate the 25th anniversary of this occasion, some 350 veterans of the 4th Infantry Division and their families are retracing the route they followed in 1944.

The 4th Division, which spearheaded the invasion of Normandy and the liberation of France, was flown to Europe on two charters by Pan American World

Airways on May 31. The dedication tomorrow of the 4th Infantry Division monument at Utah Beach will highlight the trip.

First stop on the itinerary was London where 2 days were spent before visiting former training sites near Exeter. From Britain, the veterans will sail tomorrow to Normandy, revisiting the invasion beaches, to take part in the D-day ceremonies. The group will then continue to Mont-Saint-Michel, Paris, Luxembourg, and Cologne with stops at famous battlefields en route.

The movie "The Longest Day" was released to Pan Am by Twentieth Century-Fox for a special showing on the New York-London flights.

I can think of no more appropriate way to commemorate this occasion—lest we forget.

WELFARE NEEDS OVERHAULING

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News carried an excellent editorial on the need for overhauling the Nation's welfare program.

I am pleased the Daily News noted my own concern with existing programs.

The Chicago Daily News quite properly points out that action on this entire subject is necessary and with the influential voice of the Daily News calling for needed reforms, I am sure the goal is so much closer of achievement.

The Chicago Daily News editorial follows:

WELFARE NEEDS OVERHAULING

The cost of providing the necessities for the poor bears heavily upon state and local budgets also strained by other needs. The welfare program tends to perpetuate itself—the poor stay poor and their children succeed them on the welfare rolls. It often contains little or no incentive for independence. It is debasing to its clients. It tends to fragment families. Wide differences in welfare payments among the states encourage massive movements to the high-paying states.

Obviously, something's got to be done, and mayors, governors, congressmen and the President are all working on it. A week ago Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.) introduced three bills to equalize welfare payments, assist the states in meeting their obligations, and ease the rule applied in some states prohibiting child-aid payments to families with "a man in the house." On the same day Mayor John Lindsay told the President's Urban Affairs Council that the present approach to welfare should be scrapped and replaced by one that would include job incentives, encourage families to stay together, increase federal government financing, and would be flexible. Rep Roman Pucinski (D-Ill.) has already introduced a bill that would standardize welfare payments, create work incentives, and provide full federal funding of the welfare program.

President Nixon is considering two revisions. One—the "Family Security Plan"—would provide income maintenance, by the federal government, of families with employed fathers. The alternative revision would establish a minimum national welfare standard, probably at about \$40 a month per

person, and give federal aid to the poorer states.

At the moment these are only beginnings, but they are trending in the right direction—toward increased federal financing of welfare programs, toward incentives to encourage employment and help break the poverty cycle, toward better treatment of human beings and families. It is encouraging that many official minds are at work on the problems and are concerned for the cost of poverty and for the consequences if that cost is not met.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN WESLEY POWELL'S FIRST EXPLORATION OF THE GREEN AND COLORADO RIVERS

HON. GALE W. MCGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, a few days ago, on the banks of the Green River in Wyoming, I participated in the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of John Wesley Powell's first exploration of the Green and Colorado Rivers. We gathered on the banks of the Green at Green River, Wyo., the jumping-off place for Powell's excursions and a likely starting place for any modern travelers who would like to see a large swath of the West, including the mighty rivers Powell mapped.

Jack Goodman, in an article published in last Sunday's New York Times, outlined the trip for motorists with a week or two to spend on such an excursion, from Green River, where the road takes one along the rising cliffs of the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, to the south rim of the Grand Canyon in Arizona, where a plaque will be dedicated in another centennial ceremony in August. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Goodman's article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1969]

FOLLOWING POWELL'S RIVERS IN AN AIR-CONDITIONED SEDAN

(By Jack Goodman)

GREEN RIVER, WYO.—This anniversary year of Maj. John Wesley Powell's exploratory rides down the waters of the Colorado River system is being widely marked by ceremonies, dedications and re-enactments of his thrilling boat trips. While the re-enactments attract the adventurous, any sedentary tourist who wants to get close to the Green and Colorado Rivers without getting his feet wet or getting near a rubber boat, can do so from the comparative comfort of his own or a rented and air-conditioned automobile.

The motorist may have to make an occasional judicious choice of route, but anyone with a week or two to spend in this part of the West can see a great deal of Major Powell's rivers.

The major's exploratory mission in 1869, and a more thorough mapping project two years later, were detailed in his journal published in 1875. In it, he gave the nation its first practical program for Western reclamation and Great Basin agriculture. Powell went on to help establish the United States Geological Survey, of which he served as director for 12 years, beginning in 1881.

THROUGH A MAZE OF CANYONS

The major had planned to run the Green River through Utah Territory, departing from the town of Green River, Wyo., and continuing to the river's junction with the Grand River (now the Colorado) in a maze of canyons south of Moab, Utah. Beyond the rivers' confluence, the streams joined to form the "Colorado River of the West," which somehow ambled, cut and roared its way into Arizona Territory, on to California and then to the Gulf of California.

This year, boatmen will navigate the Green and Colorado Rivers, portaging around Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon Dams, the twin concrete monoliths built by the same Bureau of Reclamation that Powell helped father. Wyoming and Federal officials launched one trip here in Green River last week, when a National Park Service historic site on nearby Expedition Island was dedicated to the major and his men.

On June 26, at Split Mountain Gorge in Dinosaur National Monument, Utah and Federal officials will dedicate a new highway, campground and monument to Powell. At this ceremony, Ute Indians will dance and rivermen will set off downstream for Lake Powell and the Grand Canyon.

Still another ceremony will take place at Glen Canyon Dam in Page, Ariz., on June 19, when a museum saluting Powell will be dedicated. And on Aug. 15, an observance at Bright Angel Point in Grand Canyon National Park will mark the date, 100 years ago, when Powell's two battered boats were beached beneath the canyon walls.

In making this north-south highway junket paralleling and crisscrossing the Green and Colorado Rivers, motorists can follow paved and/or hard-surfaced roads for all but about 175 miles of the 1,000-mile route. Large cities are still few and far between in this part of the West, but there are adequate motels and eating places.

DRESS FOR VARIED ELEVATIONS

The country hereabout ranges in riverside elevation from 6,000 feet above sea level in Green River to barely 1,000 feet above sea level near Lake Mead, and the roads cross high mountain passes and hot desert country. This means that a variety of garb should be carried. There are service stations along the entire route, but in one sector they are 130 miles apart.

The trip can be made in three days, but the region is so rich in scenery and history, Indian cultures, natural wonders, opportunities for side jaunts and camping that even two weeks may prove inadequate. If you choose to boat and fish, take side trails, use a camera or go rock-hounding along the way, allow a full month for the trek. The area covered is larger than most European nations.

WHERE TO BEGIN

Jumping-off place for the highway tour downriver is Green River, Wyo., on Interstate 80; the town is on the main line of the Union Pacific Railroad and the historic Mormon and Pony Express trails. The nearest scheduled airline stop is Rock Springs, Wyo., 15 miles to the east, while the closest metropolis is Salt Lake City, 175 miles westward. If Green River motels are crowded because of the Powell centennial, which is unlikely, seek out the highly modern, very sizable motel in Little America, 24 miles west of Green River.

South of Green River itself, the best road paralleling Powell's river run is State Route 530, even though the motorist unfortunately loses sight of the Green River as the stream moves toward the depths of Fire-hole Canyon. The road crosses dry, rolling hills in which you may see a few pronghorn antelope, and then enters increasingly scenic country south of Blacks Fork, a tributary of the Green River.

For much of the 48-mile drive between Green River and Manila, Utah, the pavement skirts a series of rising cliffs and the

boundaries of the newly established Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area. There are pleasant camp, picnic and boat-launching sites on the western shores of 90-mile-long Flaming Gorge Lake, man-made, placid, open water formed by 502-foot-high Flaming Gorge Dam.

South of Manila and the Utah state line, the Uinta Mountains forced the Green to cut deep gorges for its passage. As a result, portions of the 48-mile route between Manila and the towering Flaming Gorge Dam—it is near Dutch John, Utah—are unpaved or eroded by occasional floods.

RED CANYON OVERLOOK

The road veers in all directions as it swings toward Red Canyon overlook, Flaming Gorge Dam and lodge and a half-dozen campgrounds. At this point, the road paralleling both lake and river is Utah State Route 44.

The lodge and campgrounds at Flaming Gorge, roughly 100 miles south of Green River, can provide pleasant quarters for the night, especially if you wish to try fishing in the clear, rapid-running waters of the Green below the towering power dam. There, the river is easily traveled by portable boat or rubber raft; it has a reputation as being one of the finest trout streams in the West.

Below Flaming Gorge Dam, State Route 44 runs south through scenic, rugged country within the borders of Ashley National Forest. However, Powell's river route swings off to the east, as the Green River carves its series of white-water gorges through Red Canyon, crosses the Colorado state line at Browns Park and enters strikingly scenic Lodore Canyon.

GATES OF LODORE

There is a graveled road to the river at this point—it is accessible from Maybell, Colo., to the east—but those wishing to view the Gates of Lodore should plan to spend an additional day in the area.

At Vernal, one of the better food-and-lodging centers on the trek, a brief stopover at the Utah State Natural History Museum is worthwhile. From there, motorists head to Jensen, 12 miles east on U.S. 40, for a swing into Dinosaur National Monument.

State Route 149, entering the monument just above Jensen, follows the now placid Green River across meadowland and ranch pastures. After a stopover at the visitor center and the Dinosaur Quarry, there to watch scientists chip away at ancient skeletons, the motorist should drive on to Split Mountain Campground.

At this spot on June 26, Utah and Park Service officials plan to hold afternoon and campfire ceremonies commemorating the Powell voyage. One reason for the celebration is completion of pavement to the riverbank.

The monument's only other paved road to the river enters from U.S. 40 just east of the Colorado state line and extends to a 7,500-foot-high viewpoint at Harpers Corner. There, motorists can peer across to Steamboat Rock, the junction of the Yampa and Green Rivers, and the site of the proposed Echo Park Dam.

Below Jensen and Dinosaur National Monument, the Green flows untrammelled and unreachable by any major road as it cuts through the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation. A 20-mile spur road does cut into the reservation, meeting the Green at Ouray, where the White River flows into the mainstream. However, the road deadends abruptly at riverside.

The best and most scenic way south is to proceed on U.S. 40 to Duchesne, Utah, and there onto State Route 33, a road that is reasonably well paved for more than half of its 45-mile length. There are no service stations along the route which tops a 9,000-foot-high pass near Gray Head Peak.

DESOLATION CANYON

Beyond Castlegate, Helper and Price (a good motel and dining town) on U.S. 6-50,

the motorist heads southeast across some 60 miles of desert in the lee of the Roan Cliffs. At Green River, Utah, the road finally meets the river, which has chewed its way through countryside that Powell aptly named Desolation Canyon.

Situated there is Green River State Park, at 4,080 feet above the sea. This means that Powell dropped 2,000 feet in elevation coming down the upstream rapids of the Green.

An annual "cruise" set forth from the state park launching ramp this weekend. It traversed 117 miles of the Green to its confluence with the Colorado, and then swung 65 miles up the latter river to Moab.

Those vacationists who welcome the challenge of rough country, and do not fear a lack of pavement, should proceed south from Green River, Utah, on State Route 24, newly paved for its scenic 53-mile length to Hanksville (last place for gasoline, so fill up there).

OFFERING MOUNTAIN VIEWS

From Hanksville, State Route 95 also has been freshly paved to Trachyte Junction, a 68-mile journey offering fine views of the 11,000-foot-high Henry Mountains. From pavement's end near the new Hite Bridge across the Colorado, Route 95 is graded, bladed, dusty and bumpy for nearly 100 miles to Blanding.

Before reaching Blanding, State Route 95 passes Natural Bridges National Monument, with its three memorable sandstone spans; the road also provides the motorist with views of one of the most spectacular Colorado River gorges in this vast sector of mesas and cliffs.

The monument has no lodge, but does have pleasant campgrounds, well-marked trails and viewing points and a cool, shady visitor center. At Blanding, good motels are plentiful.

The alternate route from Green River, Utah, leads east to Crescent Junction and then south on U.S. 160 to Moab. Just north of Moab, a newly paved road takes one to Dead Horse Point State Park, with its striking views straight down on the Colorado.

A connecting road, unpaved but easily traversed, goes into the upper section of Canyonlands National Park. A terrace at Grand View Point enables the visitor to peer down to the confluence of the Green River and the subsequently renamed Grand, which come together some 3,000 feet below to form the Colorado.

ARCHES NATIONAL MONUMENT

While near Moab, the traveler should explore Arches National Monument. Motorists also can drive 18 miles downstream along the Colorado to a point almost directly below Dead Horse Point, and they likewise can drive north and east up a paved sector of State Route 128, a trip that takes them through the cliff-girt gorge. Also while in Moab, the vacationist with time to spare can make a boat trip of an hour or two either upstream or down.

Nearly 60 miles south of Moab, a well-maintained road leads west into Canyonlands National Park, which is bisected by the Colorado River below its confluence with the Green. This section of river can be reached only by four-wheel-drive vehicles.

Guided tours into this portion of Canyonlands, with visits to the confluence, Angel Arch and the Needles, can be arranged in Moab or Monticello. The latter lies southeast of the park entrance and, like Moab, is equipped with good motels.

NO ROAD TOUCHES THE RIVER

Utah State Route 47 should be followed south from Monticello to Blanding and on to Bluff, where St. Christopher's Mission to the Navajos is situated. From this point south and west across the Navajo Indian Reservation, no road touches the Colorado or its successor, 180-mile long Lake Powell.

The only available cross-reservation road is the Navajo Trail, U.S. 164. The Navajo

Visitor Center at Monument Valley, on the reservation grounds, is a good stopover point.

At Tuba City, Ariz., also on the reservation, vacationists have another choice of routes. A 43-mile drive north on U.S. 89 leads to Alternate U.S. 89, the Marble Canyon Bridge across the Colorado and a patch of placid, riverside road at old Lees Ferry. The newer road, U.S. 89, goes to Glen Canyon Dam and the Waheap Marina. Lake tours extend to Rainbow Bridge and up shimmering Lake Powell.

South of Page, Ariz., and Lake Powell lies Grand Canyon National Park. A 150-mile trip along U.S. 89 and State Route 64 brings one to the canyon's South Rim, where a plaque will be dedicated to the explorer on Aug. 15.

CHURCH COUNCIL ADOPTS ANTI-ABM RESOLUTION

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last month the general board of the National Council of Churches adopted a resolution opposing deployment of President Nixon's proposed Safeguard ABM system. I now place that resolution in the RECORD:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: RESOLUTION ON THE ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL BOARD ON MAY 2, 1969

The General Board of the National Council of Churches

1. Recognizing wide diversity of opinion and controversy in our churches and the country concerning construction and deployment of a United States antiballistic missile (ABM) system, the most recent version of which was announced by President Nixon on March 14, 1969, as the "Safeguard" ABM system; noting that this debate has become a primary focal point for the broader national debate on the meaning of national security and the reordering of national priorities;

2. Reaffirming the Policy Statement of September 12, 1968, "Defense and Disarmament: New Requirements for Security," which addressed itself to the issues of national defense and security in Christian perspective and attempted to set forth a framework for a new concept of security;

3. Recalling that one of the next steps toward a national reorientation on defense and security matters suggested in that Policy Statement was "a mutual halt in the further production and deployment of strategic offensive and defensive missile systems, including the anti-ballistic missile system";

4. Believing that the ABM debate has raised questions of fundamental importance for the future direction of United States foreign policy, for the real security interests of the nation, for the use of our national resources, and for the quality of our society;

5. Understanding that among the serious questions calling for clarification are those concerning the basic justification for the ABM, its effectiveness, its eventual cost, its effect on the arms race, its relation to the spirit and intent of the Nonproliferation Treaty, its use of resources needed for other national and international needs, and its contribution to the real security of the nation;

6. Believing further that these questions, raised frequently by knowledgeable persons including many of the nation's leading scientists, experts on Soviet and Chinese affairs, many members of the Congress, and former

high government officials, have not been given satisfactory answers;

Does therefore

1. Oppose deployment of the ABM on the basis of the case now made as to its necessity for national security, its effectiveness, its effect on the arms race and disarmament negotiations generally, its implication for the Nonproliferation Treaty,¹ its cost, and its drain upon national resources;

2. Request churchmen, and all concerned citizens, because of the potential consequences of this watershed decision for international peace and the quality of our own society, to consider these grave matters and to exercise their rights and responsibilities as citizens and to state their conclusions to appropriate decision-makers.

WATER POLLUTION—ADDRESS BY MAURICE B. TOBIN

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Maurice B. Tobin, former counsel to the House Committee on Public Works, recently addressed a luncheon of the National Water Pollution Convention in Houston, Tex., on the subject of the pollution question as we move into the seventies. Because of his experience as a staff member on the legislative team that helped to write the water pollution laws, I believe his remarks are of interest to all of us. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

GEARING UP FOR THE SEVENTIES—THE POLLUTION QUESTION

One of the truly critical areas on the domestic front as we reach to open the door of the seventies is the whole problem of pollution. We can't do much about holding back the nineteen seventies, but surely when that door is opened some light must be shed on our efforts towards pollution control.

Behind the door to the seventies is an ever-mounting backlog of work to be done to fulfill the nineteen sixties legislative mandate for action. Congress started the sixties by passing strengthening legislation to the pollution act only to have it cut down by a presidential veto. Congress came back the next year (1961) and by a 3-1 margin amended and strengthened the Water Pollution Control Act. More teeth were put in the Act by the unanimous passage of the 1965 Water Quality Act; the next year, 1966, saw financial promise with the unanimous passage of the Clean Waters Restoration Act; 1968 saw the passage of the Water Quality Improvement Act, though adjournment prevented a conference and, finally in 1969, a similar improvement act passed the House by over 390 votes and is now pending before the Senate—so the legislative pace of the sixties pushed, pulled, and passed on amendments that bolstered the outcry for clean water.

ONLY 21 PERCENT FUNDING

Now a decade of legislative gains is brought to a near halt by the gut issue of no money. The inventory of pollution needs

¹ The relevant part of the Nonproliferation Treaty is Article 6: "Pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date. . . ."

were paraded from one end of the country to the other—but, the no money problem halted the march to action. Of the billion dollars Congress unanimously authorized for water pollution control for FY 1970, the Federal budget allows only 21% or \$214 million. So only 21% of the waste treatment plants sorely needed to treat sewage across the country will be built. Keep in mind this \$214 million is for the whole nation. It must reach into the nation's over 4,494 cities and towns.

ROCKEFELLER TAKES LEAD

To spread this meager \$214 million out across the nation's cities and towns requires a minor miracle. One state—New York—could devour this entire amount in one easy gulp as the Federal Government now owes New York over \$267 million in reimbursements for sewage treatment plants already constructed. Like many states, New York could not wait. Under the constant push of Governor Rockefeller, the citizens of New York voted four-to-one to tax themselves on a billion-dollar bond issue to raise their share of the necessary pollution control dollars. Then they had to get extra money to take care of the Federal share until such time as the Federal share can be paid. Other states with less dynamic leadership find it next to impossible to raise not only their own share, which is nearly three times that of the Federal Government, but also raise the Federal share with the understanding that some day they will be repaid.

CITIES OUT FRONT

Following the Rockefeller lead, cities have voted bond issues to help raise sorely needed pollution control dollars. To get on with expansions, additions, and modernization, St. Louis voted by a five-to-one margin on a \$95 million bond issue to stop the discharge of untreated sewage into the nation's water system. Education, urban renewal, welfare and crime control, etc., all vie for the municipal tax dollar too, but progressive and far-sighted cities are moving ahead with pollution control programs. Among these cities taking the lead in getting the money to do what we are all talking about are Kansas City, Cleveland and Chicago. Some New England cities voted bond issues—their industries had the money in hand—yet, the Federal share for a joint treatment plant was not forthcoming and well planned programs faltered or dissolved.

OTHER PROGRAMS

Other programs of national concern like space or highways gallop into the seventies with little or no cutbacks. Both the highway and the water pollution control programs were brought into existence by Congress about the same time. Yet, since their birth in 1956, the highway program has spent over \$50 billion while the pollution control program limps along with a little over one billion dollars since 1956. The highway dollar is on a 90 Federal to 10 state ratio where Federal construction funds for sewage treatment when available contribute 30% compared to 70% raised by state-municipal. Our highways with their vast expressways and clover leaves are truly the engineering marvel of the world—while our underground sewers have changed little from the ancient aqueducts of Rome. When there is a proposed cutback in our highway program, appropriate interests are marshalled and its priority to the Federal dollar is quickly re-established. President Johnson's three different multi-million dollar highway cutbacks were all ultimately restored. One proposed highway cutback was greeted by a deluge of 41 wires of protest from governors the next morning; the other nine wires arrived by lunch time. Needless to say shortly thereafter the budget was restored. Yet, going into FY 1970, we are 79% short of the authorized money for construction of sewage treatment plants and there is no immediate outcry. Isn't it time for a green light on

clean water plans? Or at least some sort of searchlight to find the formula to finance our way to clean water in the seventies?

THE BACKSIDE OF THE MOON

As we pass through the doorway into the seventies, the fantastic brilliance of our space effort will put man on the moon. Our own nation's singular success in this race in the sky is a justified source of national pride. But, if we can marshal men of every scientific discipline to get us to another planet, surely we can finally master a problem as old as civilization itself—namely the disposition of her wastes. Can we in clear conscience take a trip to the moon, and leave our own earth slowly poisoning herself with her own wastes?

SOLVED BY OTHER COUNTRIES

Other countries anticipated the seventies and met their pollution problems head-on. The Ruhr River Basin is a prime example. It contains nearly one half of West Germany's industrial capacity—yet the Ruhr River is clean enough to swim in. The stream flow in the Ruhr River is much less than the lowest ever recorded on our historic Potomac River in the nation's Capital. Even with the country's heavy industry, the Ruhr River finances a system to keep its streams clean.

INDUSTRIES TO THE RESCUE

Industry is gearing up to face the seventies realistically by launching costly anti-pollution programs. Long accused of being slow to answer in the call for clean water with solid financial support, industry is now at the front ranks in this national effort. A pacesetter announcement in this massive move is U.S. Steel's declaration that it will "end all water pollution from its Great Lakes installations by 1972."

Leadership in the fight to retain the 7% investment tax credit for pollution control expenditures is also evidenced by industrial leaders such as President Verity of Armco Steel. In telegraphing President Nixon, Mr. Verity stated, "In the case of Armco Steel and many other companies, the investment 7% tax credit is crucial to our efforts to control air and water pollution." Other industries across the country are coming to the front with new and expanded ideas in pollution control.

For the first time, industry may participate in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's grant program. These grants to industry are to develop and demonstrate new, novel, or modified waste treatment processes that have industry-wide application. Though the 1966 Act authorizes 70% grants, the Federal Government has found but 45% funding of this vital program. Industry has come up with the remaining 55% so that the program doesn't collapse due to lack of funding. There are roughly 275 grants actively in the mill at this time. Industry has come up with over \$51 million, but due to lack of funds, the Federal Government has committed only \$23 million for this vital program that could provide solutions to the major standard industrial classifications of waste in this country.

GOVERNORS GO AHEAD

As the governors across the country prepare their attack on pollution in the seventies the basic problem is highlighted by Maine's popular Governor Ken Curtis. In his report to the 104th Legislature, the Governor states: "The most basic problem in our slow fight against water pollution is the continuing unavailability of Federal funds to meet the Federal share (up to 55%) of the total cost of any project. Despite Maine's total needs of \$250 to \$320 million, the Federal money available is \$1.8 million for this current year." The Governor went on to ask his state to go ahead even though the Federal Government backed down on producing its share. Said the Governor: "The time is now approaching when we cannot

wait for authorized Federal funds to be appropriated. There are many situations where state and local governments are ready to move, industries have made their commitment and the only input lacking is the Federal one."

The Governor went on to urge Maine to act "now to authorize the advancing of state funds to cover the authorized Federal share because inaction costs money. The cost of not dealing with the problem becomes greater than the costs of dealing with it. The cost of Maine in interest payments while we wait for eventual Federal reimbursement will, in all likelihood, be offset by the lower costs of construction now as compared to construction three, four, or five years from now."

SOLUTIONS ARE BEING REACHED

Governors, mayors, presidents of companies are all faced with the money shortage; yet, success is being realized in the continuing battle for clean water. Faced with the shortage of clean water, Bethlehem Steel takes the entire sewage of Baltimore and after complete treatment uses it for industrial purposes. The small town of Santee in water scarce California came up with a solution by completely treating, filtering and restoring its sewage to provide a million gallons of drinking water a day. In Los Angeles County, one purification plant reclaims 10,000 acre feet of water a year out of a trunk sewer. Western Research Company of Dallas is working on a solution to prevent tank oil spills such as the Torrey Canyon incident.

The nation will look to research such as Western's to find solutions to the growing pollution problems of the seventies. Western's prescribed solution is a technique that prevents spillage by rapidly gelling oil in the ruptured compartment of a tankship. The gel forms and blocks the outflow of oil and the inflow of water. Hopefully, we can enter the seventies with confidence that oil spills can be quickly mitigated because of this research.

SEMINARS ON THE INCREASE

Since pollution is on all our lips going into the seventies, it is encouraging to see the number of conferences or seminars geared to find solutions to our pollution problems. Public awareness of pollution has forced to the front even international conferences on water pollution. Recently, an international pure water conference (PURAQUA) in Rome, Italy, attracted some 37 countries. Encouraged by the tremendous response to this conference and exhibition, the United Nations is sponsoring an International Conference on Water Pollution in Sweden in 1972. Numerous panels, papers, meetings, studies across the nation indicate the wide interest and concern for solutions in the pollution dilemma.

THE POLLUTION SCARE

It is indeed encouraging to see the number of conferences and willingness of men to set their minds to reaching for solutions to the centuries-old problem of human waste. Red flags on the horizon concerning pollution range from the helpless housewife in Prince Georges County, Maryland, who can't risk a barbecue in the backyard of her \$55,000 home because of the summer stench of septic tanks to Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg of the nation's Atomic Energy Commission who says: "All 22 river systems in the United States will be 'biologically dead' by the end of this century if pollution continues at present rates." U.S. Geological Survey's Dr. Raymond Nace warns us that "our world population is expected to double to nearly seven billion by 2000." He further warns "out of its total potentially controllable liquid assets, the United States uses 95% chiefly as a conveyor belt on which to send waste products out to sea." Since the world depends on the sea for over 70% of its oxygen, it is little wonder that Cornell University's Dr. L. C. Cole admonishes us for reckless pollution

habits by saying, "Mankind seems bent upon his own extinction since the sea is at once the chief supplier of fresh water to the land and of oxygen to the air."

WHY LIMP INTO 1970?

It seems obvious then that in gearing up for the seventies all systems must go if we are to realistically meet the demands made on the air we breathe and the water we drink. It is encouraging to see the quick pace with which industry, cities, and the world is responding to the call of the seventies. But it is most disheartening to see the Federal Government limp into 1970 a full 79% away from the billion dollars that Congress unanimously authorized to meet the pollution problem going into the seventies. How can the promise of partnership in the battle for clean water be won if the Federal Government continues to falter on its share of the money? Even with the extreme demands of the Federal dollar today, surely there must be money somewhere to bolster the war on pollution. The State Department's Water for Peace Program initiated in 1967 is concerned with a host of programs ranging in scope from provisions of drinkable water on a local scale to large river basin development programs. As part of this project, the United States is spending about \$400 million a year in many countries to build waterworks designed to supply household and industrial needs. Although this is a most laudable program, why can't we find more than \$214 million per year for our own country's crying need for construction of waste treatment plants. The cities and states have somehow found the money for the majority of the cost of these plants but somehow the Federal Government is woefully behind in its commitment. At a time like this when the cadence is loud and clear in support of anti-pollution, how soon can we expect the Federal Government to get in step?

THE 6-DAY WAR

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years since the 6-day war in the Middle East, while the Arab States have pursued their twin policies of diplomatic intransigence and military terrorism against the peaceful nation of Israel. It has been 2 years since the end of the war in the Middle East when the valiant army of the beleaguered nation of Israel defeated the massed forces of the Arab countries, but there have been no steps toward a permanent peace. It has been 2 years since the guns were silenced, but the echo continues to ring in the ears of the Israeli people, who wait each night for the next incursion of the guerrilla armies sent from the Arab land to maim and kill. It has been 2 years since the Israelis began their patient vigil at the conference table of peace, but the Arab leaders, with the encouragement of their Russian conspirators, have wasted those 2 years in a torrent of meaningless propaganda.

For the past 23 years, Israel has tried unsuccessfully to find a way to reach a peaceful settlement with the Arabs. The United Nations has appointed commissions, mediators, and committees, it has sent representatives to the region, it has passed resolutions, and it has provided the forum and the good offices where

both sides could meet and discuss their mutual problems, but to no avail. The U.S. efforts in the search for peace in the Middle East have met with similar failure, but the rebuffs of the past must not diminish this Nation's attempts to seek and find a peaceful solution to the Arab-Israeli problem: In fact it is incumbent upon the United States to do all that it possibly can to help speed negotiations and to facilitate the pacific settlement of this most tragic dispute. We must not let another anniversary of the June war of 1967 pass without achieving peace in the Middle East, a peace that will guarantee the continued life of the State of Israel.

FBI TAPS ON KING

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, public acknowledgement that Martin Luther King was under FBI surveillance can be accepted in only one manner—that is, that King's activities, confidants, and financiers were felt by top intelligence people to be questionable in relation to our national security. How many other conversations of King's were monitored—who were these people?

On Monday, June 2, on page 14427 of the Record, I urged the present administration to authorize J. Edgar Hoover and the Justice Department to make public their records on King's activities so that our people may know who this man really was.

Deceit and slanted information have blurred his true character to the disservice of some well-meaning Americans. We owe it to contemporary understanding and history itself to refocus the picture from distortion to clarity. The present concern of many Americans is that the intelligence dossiers could be destroyed or misplaced and that information beyond retrieve for honest inquirers.

I insert a news article on the King surveillance, as follows:

FBI TAPS ON KING, BLACK MUSLIMS ARE DISCLOSED AT HEARING FOR CLAY

(By Nicholas C. Chriss)

HOUSTON, June 4.—A Federal District Court hearing today into an effort by Cassius Clay to overthrow a 1967 draft-evasion conviction turned into a startling disclosure of FBI eavesdropping methods and secret surveillance reports.

The summaries of four "top secret" and illegal FBI wire-tapped conversation Clay had with the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and various Black Muslim leaders in 1964 and 1965 were publicly revealed for the first time over Government objections.

The revelation of the conversations, the times and places and the introduction of the documents as evidence in the six-hour hearing spelled out officially for the first time that the FBI actually had eavesdropped on Dr. King. It also detailed how active the investigative agency was in monitoring the telephone conversations of various Black Muslim leaders.

The former world heavyweight champ's attorneys contend that the wiretap evidence is relevant to the case because it might have been used to prejudice his attempt to declare

himself a conscientious objector to the draft. The monitored conversations were not revealed by the Federal Government until the boxer's conviction had reached the U.S. Supreme Court, which ordered the hearing.

Federal lawyers contended the conversations took place in 1964 and 1965 and therefore could not have affected the 1967 draft-dodging conviction against Clay, nor the 1966 ruling exempting him from a conscientious objector status.

Clay's telephone apparently was not tapped in any of the four conversations, but the telephones of those persons who called him or received calls from him were monitored. His lawyers called Clay "the innocent third party."

John S. Martin, an attorney in the U.S. Solicitor General's office and a member of the prosecution team here, said the revelation of Dr. King's conversation was the first time it had been officially revealed that the civil rights leader had been under FBI electronic surveillance. Martin also acknowledged that the four FBI wiretaps were illegal and that the Government did not choose to contest the legality of them.

Most of the information about the FBI wiretapping and surveillance came as Clay's attorney, Charles Morgan Jr. of Atlanta, southern representative of the American Civil Liberties Union, pressed an FBI agent who had once been in charge of monitoring Dr. King's conversation in Atlanta.

Richard Nichols, now based in Valdosta, Ga., testified that the FBI "did not follow regular policy on this particular (King) surveillance." He did not elaborate.

Nichols said two "investigative clerks" recorded the conversations. Then, he said, they either pencilled notes on the contents of the tapes or logged a summary and then destroyed the tape. He said all the King-monitored tapes had been destroyed.

The contents of the four conversation summaries included talks with Dr. King, Elijah Muhammad, head of the Black Muslims; Herbert Muhammad, a Black Muslim and Clay's former fight manager; John Ali, Black Muslim national executive secretary, and Chauncey Eskridge, a Chicago attorney who represents Clay. Eskridge, at the time, also represented Dr. King.

Clay was convicted here June 21, 1967, of refusing induction into the U.S. Army. An all-white jury convicted him after deliberating 20 minutes. Judge Joe Ingraham then sentenced him to the maximum penalty—five years in prison and a \$10,000 fine.

The most interesting of the four FBI-monitored conversations included a 45-minute telephone talk Clay had with Dr. King Sept. 4, 1964. The conversation was recorded in Atlanta and on the Miami end of the line were—alternately—Eskridge, Elijah Muhammad and Clay. Although the conversation lasted some 45 minutes, according to Eskridge who testified in the courtroom later, the summarized conversation consisted of little more than 12 lines.

A RATIONAL APPROACH TO THE ABM

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as the time nears for the Senate to vote on the question of deploying the Safeguard system, it is obvious that millions of Americans are resolving their doubts on this controversial issue on the side of what appears to be the best interests of our Nation's security.

These citizens, though deploring the

expenditure of large sums on armaments, want all the protection our scientific know-how can provide. They are willing when our national security is involved to pay the price to insure freedom.

The Wichita Eagle-Beacon, one of the leading daily newspapers of the Nation, noted for moderation in its editorial policies has endorsed President Nixon's proposal to deploy the ABM. In its editorial of Sunday, June 1, 1969, entitled "Weighing the Evidence Pro and Con on Safeguard," the Eagle has, in my opinion, performed an invaluable public service by helping readers to resolve their doubts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wichita Eagle-Beacon, June 1, 1969]

WEIGHING THE EVIDENCE PRO AND CON ON SAFEGUARD

Certainly the most confusing public debate to arise in America in a long time is that over the proposed Safeguard system of antiballistic missiles.

Perhaps only one thing may be said of it with absolute certainty: Virtually every American wishes it were possible to spend the money involved on various humanitarian purposes instead of on the ABM.

Most of us would rather feed the hungry, heal the sick, repair urban blight, increase the space program, solve the nation's transportation problems, improve opportunities for the disadvantaged, and otherwise address our multitudinous domestic problems—if we thought we had a choice.

President Nixon, after getting the best advice available to him, came to the same conclusion as former President Johnson: That an ABM system is vital to the defense of the nation. Congress is far from being in agreement about it, and there are scientific and military experts on both sides who make the most persuasive arguments.

In an effort to help our readers to formulate their own opinions on this controversial subject, we present today on the right-hand side of this page capsule arguments both pro and con from the best sources we have been able to find—the so-called Kennedy Report presenting the argument against Safeguard, and the National Security Council arguing for it.

As for us, we are reluctantly persuaded that the United States cannot afford to be without at least the beginning of an ABM system.

As former Secretary of State Dean Acheson pointed out to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April, if you have a program in being you can adjust it as necessary—speed it up, slow it down, abandon it. But if you have no program at all and find you need one you are starting far behind the enemy.

The Administration has answered the objections of the opponents of ABM Defense Secretary Laird assures the public that components of Safeguard have been tested in the Pacific and that he knows it will work. He has further said that the Soviet Union's SS-9 missile is equipped with warheads obviously designed to destroy not our major population centers, as was once believed, but our Minuteman ICBM system. Without protection against these Russian missiles, we could be left without this striking power.

Against the argument that Safeguard is useless because it couldn't destroy all incoming missiles, the Security Council answers that the existence of Safeguard would require an enormously multiplied arsenal of more sophisticated missiles before the enemy

would dare attack, and that this in itself would be a deterrent.

Costly as Safeguard would be, it is less costly than being without proper defenses. Surely it is debatable whether for us to have an antiballistic missile system would stimulate or deter the arms race, and there is as much logic on the side that says it will deter as there is on the other.

There are those who would have us delay while we try to negotiate an arms agreement with the Soviets, but this seems to us to be largely wishful thinking. An agreement without surveillance would be meaningless, and Russia has never shown any signs of submitting to that. There is, indeed, one school of thought that holds an ABM system would provide insurance against cheating under an arms agreement, if one were worked out.

Perhaps the most convincing argument for Safeguard is that two Presidents of different political faiths, each using his own advisers and making use of the detailed knowledge available only to Presidents, have concluded that America is not safe without Safeguard. We believe that they are correct.

THEY, THOSE WHO, AND SOME

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member, I assume, of the group now known as They, Those Who, and Some. I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to the Washington Post's analysis of how we fared yesterday at the hands of President Nixon. The editorial, entitled "The President's Commencement Address," follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 5, 1969]

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS

It was a big day out in Denver yesterday for *They and Those Who and Some*—the nameless, numberless enemies of everything right and honorable and strong, who would make fun of our armaments programs, pillory our servicemen, turn their backs on the world and disarm America unilaterally at the first disarming smile or honeyed word from our adversaries. They are plainly a shabby lot, unworthy of the men who settled our frontiers and the men who would set the first foot on the moon and President Nixon paraded them before the graduating class of the Air Force Academy in terms sufficiently grim to make an impressionable cadet turn in his wings.

"It is open season on the armed forces," the President cried, as he warned the new air officers that "on the home front you are under attack . . . your critics at home were never more numerous . . . the military profession is derided in some of the best circles. Patriotism is considered by some to be a backward, unfashionable fetish . . . they believe that we can be conciliatory and accommodating only if we do not have the strength to be otherwise . . . those who think that way have grown weary of the weight of free world leadership . . ."

It was strong stuff, but the President didn't blink. "It would be easy to buy some popularity by going along with the new isolationists," he declared, but he holds "a totally different view of the world . . . 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 . . . 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."

There was more, of course, but not much more that mattered, and nothing in the President's presentation of his own thinking that a quite comfortable majority of Americans would argue with. So, you could say, it was fine, as Commencement addresses go, suitably cliché-ridden, appropriately devoid of content, quite in keeping with the traditions governing such affairs—except, of course, for the fact that the speaker was the President of the United States and the White House had promised a major address on "the role of a great Nation in the world and the role of defense in our society."

And this, it cannot be said too emphatically, the President's speech was not; it was not major, just to begin with, because it offered absolutely nothing new in the way of answers to questions that are genuinely troubling reasonable, rational men. It did not mention the war in Vietnam, or where we are headed there, except to talk about the post-Vietnam scene. It did not mention the ABM or the plans for testing MIRV or the prospects for the arms control talks that were supposed to begin in late spring or early summer. It set up any number of straw men and knocked them askew, conjured up spectres and demolished them; it spoke of a "crossroad in our history" and neglected to point the way; "revitalizing" alliances is a nice idea, but how? It conceded the evils of waste in defense spending but said nothing about how you deal with it. It said things as fatuous as: "The American defense establishment should never be a sacred cow, nor should the American military be anybody's scapegoat." So?

It is understandable, of course, that the President should lash back at his critics; there are plenty of them, and some of them are saying some of the things Mr. Nixon said they were saying. There has been a lot of loose talk about military men and military programs and the military mind, when the heart of that problem goes far deeper—to the efficacy of the natural checks and balances on the civilian side of government. The question is whether the President adds much to sanity and common-sense solutions by assailing the extreme minority among the critics while paying only passing attention to the deep disquiet of a more moderate majority about the war and the growth of military spending and the momentum of the arms race and the future role of this country in the world.

We cannot "conduct a successful policy of peace abroad if our society is at war with itself at home," the President said, in passing, as he declared his "total," "fundamental" disagreement with *Those Who* do not see things his way. It was good, strong stuff, as Commencement addresses go, but it is not easy to see just what it contributed to the problem of a society at war with itself.

PUBLIC OFFENDER PROGRAM IS SUCCESS AT ARIZONA STATE PRISON

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, often a great deal of criticism is mounted in Congress over the ineffectiveness of Government-sponsored training programs. I invite the Senate's attention to one that has worked and is continuing to prove an excellent means of returning rehabilitated individuals to society.

The Arizona State prison vocational rehabilitation program is accomplishing its aim of helping to rehabilitate inmates

so they may find gainful employment once they are paroled. As evidence, I cite this paragraph from a report prepared for me on the program:

One of the most important factors and results of the Public Offender Program is that of those clients placed in training and on jobs, not one has become a recidivist. Also, two inmates at Arizona State Prison refused parole until completion of their vocational training.

Mr. President, the fact that some prisoners think so highly of the training they are getting in prison to refuse parole until they have completed the training seems to me to bear effective testimony to the worth of this effort.

I wish to commend all those associated with this success story and ask unanimous consent that a report prepared for my use be printed in the RECORD together with a newspaper article written by Mr. Vince Taylor.

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

REPORT FOR SENATOR FANNIN

Since its inception in January, 1968 the Public Offender Program for the State of Arizona has developed into an outstanding example of cooperation and effort between various agencies.

The agencies involved, namely: Department of Corrections, Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Central Arizona College and Eastern Arizona College have combined their resources to provide vocational training for the inmates of Arizona State Prison and for the boys at Fort Grant Industrial School. Training is provided in the fields of welding, auto mechanics, drafting, sheet metal, diesel mechanics, printing, body and fender repair and business receptionist for the women inmates.

There are four schools presently functioning at the Arizona State Prison and seven schools at Fort Grant Industrial School. Space limitations have restricted the number of trainees at the prison to a total of forty-eight. The vocational schools at Fort Grant are presently training a total of thirty-seven boys.

Future plans call for an expansion to a minimum of six schools at the prison and perhaps ten at the Industrial School.

A new building to be used exclusively for vocational training will be constructed during the year of 1969 at Arizona State Prison. The cost of construction will be shared by Vocational Rehabilitation and the Department of Corrections. By pooling state funds of the two departments additional federal monies become available for construction for the purpose intended.

The Department of Corrections is actively investigating the possibility of using the Job Corps camps, which are to be closed in Arizona, for the purpose of vocational training, education and conservation.

The Public Offender Program of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation also accepts referrals from other law enforcement agencies and the State Board of Pardons and Paroles. The number of clients in the caseload by month will indicate the magnitude and scope of the program.

NUMBER OF CASES BY MONTH—1968

January	84	July	261
February	122	August	280
March	171	September	294
April	206	October	308
May	229	November	336
June	243	December	351

NUMBER OF CASES BY MONTH—1969

January	363	March	396
February	379	April	418

One of the most important factors and results of the Public Offender Program is that, of those clients placed in training and on jobs, not one has become a recidivist. Also, two inmates at Arizona State Prison refused parole until completion of their vocational training.

Another aspect of the Public Offender Program is development of a plan whereby the courts will refer an individual to Vocational Rehabilitation, and upon successful completion of a training program and job placement, the felony conviction will be stricken from the client's record. This is patterned after the Federal Youth Authority Act.

Also, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is deeply involved in the Drug Addicted Release Program using local hospitals and the Federal Health Centers at Lexington and Fort Worth.

PRISONERS LEARN NEW INTERESTS

(By Vince Taylor)

FLORENCE.—Emphasis upon rehabilitation of inmates at Arizona State Prison here has provided some overtones familiar in civilian life.

"Get involved," urge members of the prison's Outside Trusty Junior Chamber of Commerce (ASPOT Jaycees), one of a dozen or more voluntary activities which have pushed back the walls of prison routine and widened the horizons of inmates.

Between 75 and 80 per cent of the 1,600 inmates at the institution do get involved, in some way, in social, educational, vocational and recreational programs, prison authorities reported.

All such activities are on a voluntary basis. They are available, if the inmates want to participate.

Some, like the "Knowledge Seekers," were started by the inmates themselves. Approximately 60 are in this group which meets weekly to hear talks by people in all walks of life.

"It's an escape into the outside world," a prison official remarked, and then, realizing the implications, added, "figuratively speaking."

Communication with local and world affairs has become increasingly more meaningful for inmates through television, newspapers, magazines, radio and films, said Warden Frank Eyman.

"Why, these guys know more about baseball batting averages or football league standings than the average citizen," he declared.

"The more contact they have with free world people, the better chance they'll have to make it," Eyman said.

Outside contacts are maintained by approximately 100 members of the prison's two Gavel Clubs, both affiliates of Toastmasters International. There are 50 participants in Alcoholics Anonymous, and 25 narcotic addicts are seeking help through Nar-Conon, an organization similar to AA.

Officials said about 25 inmates are interested in chess and they regularly invite statewide participation in tournament play at the prison.

At present, 112 inmates who will shortly terminate their life in prison are qualified for the comparatively new 7th Step Foundation program, administered by former prison inmates who have succeeded on the outside.

The ex-cons, plus interested businessmen known as "Square Johns," provide the link with today's social problems which confront a man as he walks through the prison gates into the free world. Basically, they point out, the seven steps idea is to remotivate a man, to change his thinking so he can better accept the responsibilities and self-discipline he will need after years behind prison walls.

Gratified with the results of such activities, prison authorities admit they were totally unprepared for the response which greeted the start last October of vocational

job training classes in auto mechanics, welding and drafting. For the Women's Division, an office receptionist school was set up.

"We were flooded with inmate applications," a prison official declared.

Combining federal and state funds totaling about \$125,000, the pilot program represented the cooperative efforts of Mrs. Sarah Folsom, superintendent of public instruction; M. W. Holdship, director of vocational rehabilitation; J. R. Cullison, director of vocational education; Allen Cook, director of the department of corrections, and Dr. Don Pence, president of Central Arizona College.

Under the supervision of Warden Eyman and his staff, an old horse stable was converted into a garage for the auto mechanics course, a former dining hall became a welding shop, and an idle classroom was set up for the drafting course.

Each course, for a period of nine months, is limited to 12 students during the initial stages of the program. Officials say its potential is limited only by facilities and funds available.

Jack Dillard, director of education at the prison, calls it a program to develop "salable" skills.

Two students, intent upon completing their course, even requested that their paroles be delayed until they finish. Six others already have jobs waiting when they are released. No less than 150 employers have expressed an interest in the program, parole officials said.

"We could have placed 20 draftsmen this week if they were available," remarked Dale Gibson, in charge of vocational education at Central Arizona College, contractual agent for the program.

Gibson said he had noted "an entirely different attitude" among inmates at the prison in the few months the program has been in effect.

"They want to learn," he said. "Most of them had no work skill when they came here. This represents an opportunity."

Another recent innovation at the prison is a course in computer programming, involving eight inmates who work on assignments from the Arizona Highway Patrol, the Industrial Commission, the Arizona Fish and Game Commission and Maricopa County Technical College. Tapes prepared by the inmates are dispatched to Phoenix to be fed into the agency computers.

Closely allied with vocational rehabilitation is the prison's Institute of Educational Rehabilitation, or IER, where 300 inmates take part each year in classes from first grade through high school.

"Eighty per cent of all inmates are drop-outs or have never had any educational opportunities," according to Jerry Thompson, assistant director of education.

Once they enroll in IER, they are given an achievement test to determine their grade placement or level. Then they progress at their own speed, many completing three or four grades within a year.

"When they reach the 10.5 plateau, equivalent to 10th grade, fifth month, they are eligible to work for their General Educational Development of GED certificate," Thompson explained.

In addition to the supervised academic program, the prison furnishes books to some inmates for spare time study in their cells. Even some of the 13 men now on death row are taking correspondence courses "to keep their minds occupied." Three or four of the condemned men are involved in handicraft hobbies.

Hobby craft work and recreation are a big part of prison rehabilitation, according to officials.

"We feel if you keep the inmate busy you're accomplishing a great deal," Eyman said, adding:

"If a man is idle, he presents a problem. That's why we encourage inmates to par-

icipate in the various activities available to them, to become a part of things. Those who do have a better chance to become involved in the better things of life when they are released."

HIGHWAY SAFETY—COMMENTARY NO. 1

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, of which I am a member, is presently holding hearings on highway safety. Although, plagued by public apathy, this problem ranks among the highest causes of death in our Nation today. Traffic accidents rank as the No. 1 killer of persons 37 years old and under. Fifty-five thousand people lost their lives last year in traffic accidents. This figure does not even take into consideration the vast numbers who are injured, either physically or mentally with the loss of sight and limbs each year. Traffic accidents are causing more than 1,000 deaths of men, women, and children every week—36,000 injuries, and \$200 million worth of economic waste. Since 1900, more citizens of this Nation have died from motor vehicle accidents than in all the wars we have fought, including the American Revolution.

Three years ago, in 1966, this body passed the National Highway Safety Act. The intentions of that act were to provide means by which State and local authorities could deal with problems affecting highway safety. The act also called for the creation of research, testing, and development programs in an attempt to develop new scientific data needed to place the entire field on a thoroughly modern basis.

It is with this last category in mind, that of research, that I direct my attention today.

I feel that it is an accepted fact that through creative and effective research, lives can be saved on our Nation's public roads. Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Roads this morning, stated that presently there is a backlog of more than \$100 million in requests for constructive and important research projects. The sad fact is that only \$12 million was appropriated for highway safety research in fiscal 1969 and only \$15.9 million has been asked for 1970.

I am inserting at the end of this statement a table showing the wide gap between our authorizations since 1967 and the amount of money actually appropriated.

It is clear that our good intentions have not been matched by our performance.

It is my considered opinion that we should appropriate at least as much money as we have authorized for the conquest of this national menace and

very likely the authorizations themselves should be higher than they are. I have labeled these remarks "Commentary No. 1" because I shall be speaking further on this subject.

The table follows:

HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year:	Authorized	Appropriated	Obligated
1967	10.0	4.3	4.3
1968	20.0	7.3	7.3
1969	25.0	12.0	12.0
1970	30.0	15.9	15.9
1971	37.5		

¹ Estimated.

² Administration request.

OIL DRILLING IN LAKE ERIE MAY ADD TO POLLUTION

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, both the Lackawanna, N.Y., City Council and the Erie County, N.Y., Legislature have passed resolutions opposing permission for oil and gas drilling in Lake Erie.

With the pollution problem we already are facing on this great body of water, our people are not at all interested in taking any chance on further complicating the situation.

Following is the text of an editorial broadcast recently by WGR-TV in Buffalo, N.Y., on this matter:

OIL WELL DRILLING—POLLUTION IN THE LAKE

It seems to us just plain unreasonable to assume that drilling for oil in Lake Erie isn't going to contribute to the already serious pollution problem of our lake.

The State of New York is willing to sell drilling rights for a small fee . . . a pittance compared to the cost of rehabilitating the lake, if we ever get around to it.

How can the state on one hand say it's trying to clean up the mess, and then turn around and possibly add to it? Modern technology no doubt would control pollution . . . hold it down, but it doesn't seem feasible to assume that a number of drilling rigs aren't going to contribute to the problem.

Our stand is not one of anti-drilling, it's the same position we've had for years, we're anti-pollution. We haven't even begun to deal with our existing problem, how can we possibly contend with its expansion?

COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL ALUMNI ASSOCIATION'S MEDAL FOR EX- CELLENCE AWARDED TO DEAN WILLIAM C. WARREN

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 22 the Columbia Law School Alumni As-

sociation presented its Medal for Excellence to Dean William C. Warren. As both alumni, students, and faculty will attest, this honor was well deserved recognition of the dedicated service as both professor and dean which Dean Warren has rendered to the Columbia Law School.

An expert on taxation, Dean Warren has served as special consultant to the Secretary of the Treasury and also as a member of the U.S. Tax Mission which drafted a complete tax program for Japan after World War II. During World War II he helped to administer and coordinate aid to the lend-lease nations.

As educator and law school dean, Dean Warren has stressed excellence in education while augmenting student aid funds in order to make it possible for every qualified applicant to have an opportunity for a law school education.

He has constantly worked to improve and modernize the law school, expanding the curriculum and increasing the size of the faculty. Perhaps the most conspicuous improvement that he has brought about is the new Law Building. He worked tirelessly to raise the money necessary for its construction, and his influence can be seen in the architectural design.

I am delighted to add my own congratulations to Dean Warren on the occasion of this honor and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the text of the accompanying citation:

CITATION TO WILLIAM C. WARREN

In the year when William Clements Warren was born, Congress submitted to the States what became the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution, authorizing an income tax. Before Warren reached manhood, the body of statutes, rules and decisions under this amendment was so large as to make it the chief source of contentious problems between the government and the governed. As such, the subject was bound to engage the interest of a lively student majoring in government which young Warren became at the University of Texas in the years 1926 to 1930.

After a year of graduate study leading to the M.A., Warren entered the Harvard Law School. His vigor and appetite for the law were notable, since in addition to his regular work he put himself in peonage to not one but two professors of law as research assistant in taxation. It was then that the virus of pedagogy entered his blood stream, for after graduating *cum laude* and practicing for a short while in New York, he moved to Cleveland where he combined office routine with part-time teaching at Western Reserve University Law School. And on top of teaching he was writing and publishing the first of his many papers on tax and corporate law. They made his scholarly reputation.

At this point, events in the big world took a hand in Warren's career, and did it in a fashion probably not congenial to a mind hitherto bent upon the conservation of assets; war is spendthrift and wasteful. Commissioned a Captain not long after this country's entry into the war, Warren was assigned to the International Aid Division of the Army Service Forces, where he was concerned with the administration and coordination of the needs of forty-seven Lend-Lease Nations. This task brought Captain (later Lt.-Colonel) Warren to the European, North African, Middle Eastern and Mediterranean theatres of operations and called into play the superior

talents for negotiation with which Dean Warren is so richly endowed. With his surplus energies he also assumed the editorship of the War Department's treatise on Lend-Lease. For these outstanding military services, Warren was awarded the Legion of Merit by the United States and the Order of the Crown by the Italian government. And as by-product and bonus of these war years, Warren acquired a firm grasp of international affairs, a continuing interest which was soon to express itself in the expansion of international studies at Columbia.

After leaving the Army, William Warren resumed the practice of law in New York City, but in a few months the teacher in him once again got the upper hand. In September 1946, he came to Columbia Law School as Associate Professor of Law, and the next year was promoted to full professor. His students of those years remember the brilliant analyses of cases and the hard lessons in statutory-construction.

At the same time, the legal expert and mentor followed the Columbia tradition which says that teaching is enriched by things done in the public service. The record of Professor Warren's services to government attests to the confidence in which his knowledge and judgment were held as early as 1942. From that year to 1949, he served as special consultant to the Secretary of the Treasury on fiscal matters. In 1949, and again in 1950, he was a member of the United States Tax Mission that drafted a complete tax program for Japan. In 1954, he was a member of the Van Fleet Mission to the Far East. For years he was Associate Chief Reporter on the income tax project of the American Law Institute. His services to the organized bar are too well known to require more than mention here.

In November 1952, Professor Warren was named Acting Dean of the Faculty of Law; four months later he was appointed Dean. To the Columbia community, the most conspicuous achievements of his deanship is doubtless the new Law Building, to the making of which he brought to bear all his great powers of persuasion—first to raise the money, then to insure its architectural merits. Mere housing was not enough for one with a never-dormant interest in the arts. Dean Warren helped produce the first modern building at Columbia, then conceived and carried to completion the imaginative Revson Plaza with its Henry Moore and Lipchitz sculptures.

Even before the building was under way, more subtle, less visible, things were being achieved. In constant pursuit of excellence, Dean Warren promoted a policy of raising the standards of admission to the Law School and of augmenting student aid funds so that no gifted applicant need be kept away for the lack of money. Under his leadership, too, the Law School curriculum has been expanded to keep abreast of the times; the Law School Faculty has been enlarged and strengthened and its instructional work regularized and facilitated; the number and scope of research activities for both public and private service increased. Almost non-existent when he shouldered the responsibilities of the Dean's Office, the endowment of the various activities of the School has grown through his efforts to impressive proportions. It is hardly necessary to add, for all here present know this, Dean Warren has by the warmth of his personality fostered and multiplied the School's ties with the alumni who, when all is said and done, are the living hallmark of a sterling institution.

By his devoted service to the Law School and to our Association, Dean Warren has become one of us. For years, his effort to advance the cause of learning at Columbia has been our inspiration as well; we have all benefited by his success. It is accordingly our pleasure and our pride to bestow on him our Medal for Excellence.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ADDRESS AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Daily News contains an editorial highly complimentary to the President and his courageous effort to make certain this country is defended. The editorial follows:

CONFRONTATION WITH REALITY

President Nixon is overloaded with problems, many of them tough and delicate. But none is tougher or more delicate and none involves more gambles, more misunderstanding or bigger stakes than the military-defense-peace situation.

This situation is a whole complex of problems, and it was this complex Mr. Nixon faced in his speech yesterday at the Air Force Academy. We think the public, Congress, our allies and our foes should have a better insight into the Administration position than they had before.

The President, it seemed to us, laid it on the line: What we have to do, why we have to do it, what the alternatives are.

"I have no choice in my decisions," he said, "but to come down on the side of security."

To fall in this would be to risk failure in survival.

Without security we could do nothing. We could not promote peace, we could not solve our domestic problems. The weak can only hope and beg. Only the strong can deter adversaries, or bargain with them.

Moreover, if the United States does not stay strong, does not keep geared to the danger that "has changed but . . . not vanished," does not lead in striving for peace—then, as Mr. Nixon says, "the rest of the world would be living in terror."

This, then, is the national policy—as it has to be.

But standing up for a policy is one thing; putting it to work another. Here too, though, Mr. Nixon faced the problems. And one of them is the rising torrent of anti-military oratory in Congress.

Mr. Nixon made plain his fundamental disagreement with "skeptics and isolationists" and effectively rebutted them. And he met head-on the new clique in the Senate which suddenly has loosed a blanket attack on "militarism" with all the generalities that connote.

But even more reassuring was the President's statement that he was not disagreeing with those who reveal waste and inefficiency in defense operations, or who demand clear explanations of military buying policies, or who "want to make sure a new weapons system will truly add to our defense."

Such challenges are responsible and essential.

The military establishment invites much of the political assault it endures by its own shortcomings—by wasting money, by goofing on purchases, by going astray with its planning.

It is just as important for the President to recognize these things as it is for him to defend his Administration against the insinuations of ambitious political fault-finders.

The Defense Department should never be anybody's scapegoat, as Mr. Nixon said, but neither should it be everybody's sacred cow. It is not all virtue any more than it is all sinister.

The President, it seemed to us, was eminently sound in the perspective he applied to that issue.

We are in the midst of another hot debate—whether it turns out to be a "great debate" is uncertain. But the moral and social aspects of our defense posture, as well as the tactical phases, are being aggressively challenged—sometimes wisely and sometimes frivolously.

This is, by and large, healthy and necessary. Our strength is illusory if our policies are not resolute, if the enforcement of policy is confused, if our military system is not sharp and prudent, if our money is frittered away on the impractical or the wasteful.

What is cheering about Mr. Nixon's extraordinary speech at Colorado Springs is that it leads us to believe we have a President who clearly understands all these things, and is prepared to deal with them, who is keeping his cool and holding to his course.

And if this is so, then we can take heart that we may yet plod our way out of the babble of confusion and raucous dissonance which lately seems to have clouded our national purpose and dimmed our common aspirations.

BLOOD FOR HEMOPHILIA WEEK

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a terrible affliction, hemophilia, often requires as many as 3,000 pints of blood per patient. In many families this condition afflicts two and sometimes three members. The resultant financial strain, not to mention the physical suffering, is terrific and becomes a very great burden. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation by the Governor of Arizona, Hon. Jack Williams, which designated the week of May 19 to 23 as Blood for Hemophilia Week 1969.

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

PROCLAMATION—BLOOD FOR HEMOPHILIA WEEK/1969

Whereas, in a number of communities around our state, fellow Arizonans are victims of hemophilia—more than 70, as an example, in the Phoenix metropolitan area, alone; and

Whereas, any one of these victims can have need for as many as 3,000 pints of blood, as the result of a single episode—with a punishing financial burden accompanying the physical burden; and

Whereas, in some families there are two victims of this disease—and, in one case, three—thus compounding an already serious financial problem; and

Whereas, Arizonans always respond, in a spirit of community participation, to the needs of their neighbors and friends; and

Whereas, by becoming donors to the "Blood for Hemophilia": bloodmobile at its visits to five key locations around the Valley of the Sun, May 19-23, Arizonans can display that spirit, and fulfill a serious and continuing need;

Now, therefore, I, Jack Williams, Governor of the State of Arizona do hereby proclaim the period from May 19 through May 23 to be Blood for Hemophilia Week/1969, and do urge and encourage all Arizonans to support the good objectives of this observance by serving as blood donors for victims of hemophilia.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set

my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Arizona.

Done at the Capitol in Phoenix this 2nd day of May in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty Nine and of the Independence of the United States the One Hundred and Ninety-third.

[SEAL]

JACK WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Attest.

WESLEY BOLIN,
Secretary of State.

A CONVICTION THAT COMES FROM THE HEART

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we read and hear a great deal about whether this Nation should be involved in Vietnam. I have been impressed by the fact that our fighting men there have reflected strong convictions in support of that involvement. One such expression came to my attention recently in the form of a letter written to the student newspaper of the Bladensburg High School in Bladensburg, Md. The letter was written by a former student of the school L/Cpl. Bennet W. Dixon, who is now serving with the Marines in Vietnam. By way of further introduction, Corporal Dixon is the son of William J. Dixon, a member of the professional staff of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

At this point I would like to insert this letter in the RECORD since it is an observation that comes from the scene, and a conviction that comes from the heart:

LETTER FROM CPL. BENNET W. DIXON

First of all, I'd like to commend the editor and all personnel involved in putting out the Scroll. While I've been here in Viet Nam, I have found the Scroll a very informative paper expressing "the latest" at Bladensburg High. Being a student at BHS for a short time prior to my enlistment in the Marine Corps, I felt compelled to write in regards to the article, "Teachers Speak Out on Viet Nam" (Scroll, February).

Realizing that the statements published were personal convictions and opinions, to which everyone is entitled, I still felt the need to comment on one statement which particularly stood out in my mind. This statement was under the heading, "Doves of a Feather"—"We shouldn't be in there now. The people don't want us there. The principle is fine, but I don't think the people are worth saving." As a person and Marine I feel we are definitely needed here. And as far as I can tell, the only people who "don't want us here" are the Viet Cong and NVA. And as for "the people aren't worth saving", well, I think that statement is absurd. Any human being is worth saving. Everyone has the right to live and work for his own benefit without the fear of someone coming with hostility and aggression.

I have seen a few of my friends killed over here and heard of many others. They died for a very noble cause. Everyone of us who is over here is willing to make the same sacrifice if the cause arises. The people here appreciate it and thank us for it in their own special way. A smile from the elders of the village, a wave or thumbs up from a five year old as you ride past, all give the

American servicemen a feeling of warmth knowing that we are wanted and appreciated.

I could go on for pages relating my experiences of the past 6 months but time does not permit. One again I thank you for the excellent work you do on the Scroll. As one baby-san might put it—NUMBAH ONE, Scroll. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
L/Cpl. BENNET W. DIXON,
U.S. Marine Corps.

NINE RESOLUTIONS

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Extensions of Remarks in the RECORD for today the nine resolutions which were adopted by the National Association of Pro America at their national board meeting in Tacoma, Wash., on May 2, 1969. I believe that these resolutions deserve wide attention.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES

Whereas for over a century and a half of our existence as a nation, it was recognized that the first ten amendments to the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights prevented Congress from ever interfering with rights of individual citizens of the United States; and

Whereas contrary to the expressed intention of the framers and ratifiers of the Fourteenth Amendment the Supreme Court of the United States has recently misinterpreted the Fourteenth Amendment to limit the provisions of the First Amendment; and

Whereas in pursuance of this unconstitutional assumption, the Supreme Court in 1962 handed down a decision which ignored the first article of the Bill of Rights which guarantees religious freedom, in banning the "Regents' Prayer" from the public schools of New York State; and

Whereas correction of this situation by constitutional amendment is both unnecessary and dangerous since it falsely implies that the Federal Court was acting constitutionally, and will inevitably result in placing federal government in the field of religion contrary to the intention of our founding fathers in the first amendment; therefore

Resolved that the members of the National Association of Pro America, acting as individuals urge their congressmen to exercise their constitutional authority under Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution to remove from the Supreme Court all jurisdiction over cases involving the issue of religion.

THE U.S. FLAG

Whereas the United States Flag Code is frequently violated because of lack of appreciation of the symbolic meaning of our Flag; and

Whereas certain persons have violated the Code and shown disrespect for the Flag by flagrant abuses on the ground that it is their sacred right to misuse the Flag as an expression of protest, and this is sometimes done by desecration or by caricature; therefore

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America urge the Congress to enact the necessary legislation to make any desecration of the Flag as described in the present Flag Code a criminal offense, and

Be it further resolved that maximum penalties be prescribed for any violation of such legislation.

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DISTURBANCES

Whereas pro America prizes the individual's right to reasoned dissent but deplores the abuse of this constitutional freedom; and

Whereas the education of vast numbers of college and university students is being frequently interrupted and curtailed by the fomentation of "sit-ins", "study-ins" and serious riots on campuses,

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America commend the 1968 Congress for its legislative action, requiring the withholding of student loans, tuition grants and scholarship funds from colleges which retain faculty members and/or students who participate in acts of campus violence or destruction of college or university property, and

Be it further resolved that the National Association of Pro America commend the Department of Justice for its decision to prosecute agitators who travel from state to state to promote violence on campuses of educational institutions, and

Be it further resolved that Pro America urge the Congress to use every available means to combat the current situation in educational institutions which does violence to the very nature of education in the United States.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Be it resolved That the National Association of Pro America commend the House of Representatives for voting on February 14, 1969 to retain the functions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities under its new title House Committee on Internal Security, and urge the continuation of a constructive and vigilant study of subversive activities affecting our nation.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

NOTE.—The National Association of Pro America endorses the following resolution which was adopted April 16, 1969 by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution at their Continental Congress in Washington, D.C.

Whereas in providing the Electoral College it was the intent of the Constitution of the United States of America to give American voters the same numerical representation in selecting a president as they enjoy in their representation in Congress, but this objective has long been thwarted by application of the unit rule or "winner take all" of the electoral votes to which a given State is entitled; and

Whereas the State of Maine by its recent action has demonstrated that it is within the power of the States, without Constitutional amendment or federal legislation to eliminate the unit rule, and Maine has now substituted a district plan of selecting electors, under which electors will be chosen by Congressional Districts and will vote for the candidate with the winning margin in the district, with two electors chosen at-large who will vote for the candidate with the popular majority in the State; and

Whereas the District Plan, by giving each voter one vote in his district together with the two votes of the electors chosen at-large to represent the vote of the State would be consonant with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America, in that it would retain the Electoral College and would require electors to represent the will of voters by Congressional Districts as well as the State; and

Whereas the method of direct election would mean abandonment of the federal system of representation, would risk federal control of elections, and would deprive the small or less populous states of the protection now provided by the two electoral votes representing their senators;

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America commend the State of Maine for

adopting the District Plan of representation and voting in the Electoral College;

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America urge the several States to exercise their Constitutional powers; abolish the present bloc system of voting in the Electoral College; and adopt the District Plan, under which the body of electors comprising the Electoral College would represent the votes of each Congressional District and the two at-large votes to which each State is entitled, thereby giving the American voters equal representation in a presidential election.

CHANGES IN THE VOTING AGE

Whereas due to the post World War II population increase and the progressive lowering of the age balance, there is a concerted pressure to lower the present legal voting age; and

Whereas the lower age group is for the large part still in the sheltered sanctuary of their parents, economically dependent, without practical experience in the business world, with little training beyond technology and theory in economics learned from teachers versed only from textbooks; and

Whereas high school and college campuses would not be the ideal area for political campaigning from the viewpoint of the academic purposes of educational institutions and the gravity of the issues involved in an election; and

Whereas the argument that a man old enough to fight for his country is old enough to vote does apply in some cases, but out of eleven million in this age group, less than one million are in the military service and these are trained for the most part to obey orders; and

Whereas politicians taking advantage of the emotionalism and idealism of this proposed new bloc of voters could easily appeal to their special interests detrimental to the nation as a whole; therefore

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America urge all states which have not lowered the voting age to retain the present legal age of twenty-one years, and that the voting procedure be left in the control of the sovereign states, thus limiting further federal centralization.

RED CHINA

Whereas Red China has consistently demonstrated her animosity toward the United States; and

Whereas Red China has refused to conduct her international relations in accordance with accepted diplomatic policies; and

Whereas Red China having seized control of mainland China through an international Communist conspiracy, is dedicated to spreading Marxism throughout the world,

Therefore, resolved that the National Association of Pro America urge the Administration and the Congress to resist all pressure to grant diplomatic recognition to Red China.

SEX EDUCATION

Whereas organized sexologists operating on grants from tax-exempt foundations and funds from the federal government are promoting courses in sex education in public and private schools from the kindergarten through the twelfth grade; and

Whereas some of the officers and directors are connected with pornographic publications; and

Whereas the goal of these organizations appears to be carrying out the declared intention of the International Communist Conspiracy with regard to breaking down the morals of the American children and youth; and

Whereas their programs present premature sex awareness in graphic forms using audiovisual aids, models, pictures, and charts which may result in irreparable psychological

harm, especially since emphasis is placed on divorcing the subject from morality and stressing "situation ethics"; and

Whereas sex perversion, premarital sexual intercourse, and extra-marital intercourse are being presented as permissible in this so-called modern progressive society; and

Whereas the example of Sweden after twenty-three years of this type of education shows increases on a vast scale in illegitimacy, venereal disease, alcoholism, and suicide; therefore

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America oppose sex education in the schools of the nation.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Whereas pro America believes it is the right of an individual to join or not to join a Union; and

Whereas proposed legislation calls for an amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, extending the collective bargaining rights of agricultural employees, which would destroy Section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act, therefore

Resolved that the National Association of Pro America reaffirm its several resolutions supporting the Taft-Hartley Act, and urge Congress to resist all attempts to repeal or modify that part of Section 14b which leaves the authority to the States to decide right-to-work laws.

COUNCILMAN BOB LEAVITT— A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant, a loyal and devoted American, and a longtime close personal friend—the late Robert R. Leavitt, of Crescent City, Calif.

Bob Leavitt's untimely passing at the early age of 41 years once again reminds us of something that he believed in so fervently—"that there is so much to be done and so little time to do it in."

Here was a man who was both active and deeply involved in service to his fellow men, to his community, to his friends and neighbors, and to the country that he loved so greatly.

Bob was born in Klamath Falls, Oreg., but grew up and attended public schools in nearby Medford. He served in the Armed Forces with honor in both World War II and the Korean conflict and, although interrupted by subsequent military service, was employed by the Pacific Power & Light Co. since 1945.

Bob Leavitt was never satisfied with merely "talking about problems." He was best known as an energetic and probing public servant who gave so much of his limited time and boundless energy to the business of "problem solving."

He was a member of the city council in Crescent City, Calif., at the time of his passing last month. Prior to this, he served on the Crescent City Planning Commission for 7 years, with part of this service being as chairman of this commission. He also served as a city council representative on a triagency committee for the development of harbor and wa-

terfront facilities for the county of Del Norte.

Beginning early in life, Bob was active in local civic activities including the Jaycees, boys club, and athletics. In addition, he was a past exalted ruler of BPOE, Elks Lodge No. 1689, in Crescent City, and at the time of his death, was the secretary of his lodge.

Typical of his desire to be active and involved, Bob could not resist the call and the challenge of politics, and it was in this context, that I became personally and intimately associated with him.

Bob first became active in politics through the Young Republicans in our home county of Del Norte. In addition, he served on the county Republican central committee, and in my own campaign for reelection in 1964 I was deeply privileged to have Bob working in my behalf as my first county chairman.

Certainly, I have lost a close personal friend and I feel that loss deeply. In an age when human life is constantly being extended, it is difficult to fully comprehend the tragic and sudden departure of one that you have known so intimately, admired so greatly, and shared with so completely, as I have with Bob Leavitt.

It has been said, and rightfully so, that "a person does not find life worth living; he makes it worth living."

Bob Leavitt made life worth living, both for himself and for those around him—he made it meaningful and exciting. He had intense compassion for people; especially for those who had problems and were in need of help.

It was not unusual then, that he should find interest in and devote himself to public service and community action. His was a life filled with the challenges of our time—personified by the highest qualities of honesty, integrity, and dedication to purpose.

I will always remember Bob as the "can do" guy. To him, no request was too large, no challenge too great, no task too big, no person too "small."

As a city councilman, Bob served the community of Crescent City with distinction. He could always be depended upon to render decisions on the issues and proposals before him, only after careful analysis based on fairness and merit. That was the kind of a man Bob was, and this is the way in which he will be remembered.

I am proud to have known Bob Leavitt, and privileged to have called him my friend. Our lives, our goals, and our dreams were so closely intertwined that at times, I can honestly say that we literally thought and functioned as one person.

I know how deeply and how much this tragedy means to Bob's lovely, faithful, devoted wife, Doris, and their four children. To them, I extend my sincere and heartfelt sympathy in this, their darkest hour.

While all of us who knew and admired Bob Leavitt will miss him greatly, his memory and the contribution he made to his community and the country will live on forever. Bob, your Del Norte friends, including your Congressman, will never forget you.

In mourning Bob Leavitt's untimely passing, I can think of no more appro-

appropriate closing verse than the words of Dandemis:

No man knows but that today's setting of the sun may be his last here on earth. Tomorrow, when he stands in the presence of his Creator, when in a flash, he sees the purpose of life, when he is asked what progress he has made, happy will he be who has exercised the principles of virtue, for he will reap the seeds he has sown during the fruitful years of his visit to earth.

RICKOVER VIEWS ON ARMS DEBATE MERIT ATTENTION

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, there is much controversy today over the expenditure of funds for defense of our country. Personally, I find it difficult to place any dollar value on the defense of the freedoms we enjoy in America. I was particularly interested in the comments of Adm. H. G. Rickover which were contained in James J. Kilpatrick's column this week. Under unanimous consent I submit this column for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I further urge my colleagues to give close attention to Admiral Rickover's message:

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—heedless of 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 outmatched militarily."

UNITED STATES HOPES TO SAVE BANKS FISHING

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the most pressing problem facing the New England fishing industry today is the haddock crisis. Due to substantial overfishing caused by an influx of foreign fishing fleets into the Georges Banks area off Cape Cod, this traditionally rich fishery has been depleted to such an extent that its very survival is in question.

The international convention of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries has convened to determine what action is necessary to save this historic fishery. The U.S. representatives are prepared to ask for a voluntary moratorium on fishing on Georges Banks by other nations, and to limit the amount our own fishermen can take.

One of the more perceptive analyses of this critical situation was recently published by the Cape Cod Standard-Times. I commend this article to the attention of all Members and citizens concerned with the fishing industry, and with the larger issue of proper utilization of our natural resources. For fish, as much as

forests or water, are a vital national resource—and the consequences of heedlessly exploiting these resources are grave.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES HOPES TO SAVE BANKS FISHING

Hopes that the Cape Cod fishing industry can survive depend mainly on the success of U.S. efforts to obtain a moratorium from other nations on fishing the Georges Banks for haddock and cod.

The United States plans to ask Russia, Canada and all other fishing nations to "cease and desist" from taking the haddock and cod while New England fishermen take a reduced catch.

This is the only way the New England fishing industry can survive, and save the Georges Banks fishing from extinction, Ambassador Donald L. McKernan, special assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife under Secretary of State Rogers, says.

McKernan is preparing his case to be put before the International Convention of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries meeting in Warsaw next month.

This fishing industry faces a most critical situation. The Georges Banks fishing ground has shown a great decline in haddock the last few years. Much of this is due to the great sweeps by the foreign fishing industry.

American biologists have suggested that the Banks be closed to all fishing. But fishermen in the area object because they say they would not be able to re-establish themselves without substantial federal aid if and when the haddock became plentiful again.

By reducing their catch during the time the Banks would be closed to foreign fishermen, they could stay in business and wait out the return of haddock to former strength.

The United States not only wants the ban on haddock but on cod too. While experts say cod is plentiful now, they want it included in the ban since cod are taken in hauling in haddock.

The United States is optimistic about obtaining the cooperation of the 14 nations in the International Convention.

The Georges Banks fishing ground is an important source of supply for these nations as well as our own fishermen. All have a vital stake in preserving these historic fishing grounds.

The situation has reached the critical point where everyone must cooperate to save the Georges Banks fishing or it will simply be ruined beyond salvage.

EAST-WEST TRADE AS A WEAPON

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the debate over the practical value of East-West trade continues to wage here in Washington.

A view which I believe to be extremely objective is carried in the Monday, June 2 Chicago Tribune. This editorial also refers to the very timely and constructive article by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN in the June issue of Reader's Digest.

It is obvious that the senior Senator of Illinois understands the issue thoroughly and is not suffering from the illusions which beset some of his colleagues.

The editorial follows:

EAST-WEST TRADE AS A WEAPON

The Nixon administration has wisely decided not to relax controls on trade with the communist countries. The administration's position is that trade concessions should be linked with political reciprocity by the Soviet Union in areas where its influence is in conflict with the interests of the United States, such as Viet Nam, Cuba, Berlin, and the middle east.

This position was disclosed in testimony by state and commerce department officials before the Senate banking and currency committee in favor of extending the 20-year-old export control act, which expires June 30. The same officials opposed a bill by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie [D., Me.] to relax restrictions on controls, which is strongly supported by the Senate "liberals," both Republicans and Democrats.

Sen. Everett Dirksen and Sen. Charles H. Percy of Illinois, both Republicans, are on opposite sides of the question of trade with the communist countries, and the Nixon administration has adopted Dirksen's position. In an article in the June issue of Reader's Digest, Dirksen notes that the Johnson administration, "at a time when the Soviet Union and its satellites were keeping the Viet Nam war going," unilaterally removed from the commodity control list more than 500 items for which special licenses had been required for sale to the communist countries. Altho these items were called "non-strategic," they included rifle-cleaning compounds, propellers, industrial chemicals, crude rubber, and aluminum and magnesium scrap.

The Johnson administration also authorized the export of 35 million dollars' worth of machine tools for an automobile factory which the Fiat company of Italy is constructing in the Soviet Union. Dirksen and other senators protested in vain that the Russians can use the machine tools for the production of armored cars, trucks, and other military vehicles.

Altho the Kennedy and Johnson administrations were obsessed by notions of relaxing tensions by "building bridges" of trade and friendship to the communist countries, the Russians themselves use trade as a cold war weapon. "Trade is an integral part of our foreign policy," says P. A. Chervyakov, a leading soviet economist. Russian oil has been dumped in western markets to expand soviet influence and obtain foreign exchange. While Czechoslovakia is forced to pay 18 rubles a ton, Italy pays less than 8 rubles.

The east-west trade potential is insignificant from the standpoint of the American economy and business profits. In 1968 exports to the soviet bloc were only 216.8 million dollars and imports from the same countries were only 198.4 million. Trade between our European allies and the soviet bloc is more substantial, but the United States should try to persuade them to limit the export of strategic items instead of competing with them for illusory profits.

Actually almost anything the Russians buy in the west is strategically important, because of the backwardness of their economy and their desperate need for western technological assistance. They are abreast or ahead of the United States in weapons technology only because they have devoted a disproportionate part of their resources to it. In a paper privately circulated in the Soviet Union and published abroad, Abel G. Aganbegian, a brilliant young soviet economist, says: "We have the worst and the most backward productive structure among all the industrially developed countries. . . . We employ more workers to do repair work than to produce new machines." Industrial output per worker is one-fourth and agricultural output is one-twelfth of United States production per worker, according to Aganbegian.

It would be a betrayal of our national interest, if not suicidal, to help the Russians catch up with us in technology while they are striving for strategic superiority.

CAUTION DUE ON HOME REPAIRS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are all concerned with consumer protection I am sure my colleagues will be interested in a comprehensive article containing helpful advice to avoid being swindled, which recently appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

CAUTION DUE ON HOME REPAIRS

(By Richard C. Halverson)

As sure as lilacs bloom in the spring, the favorite home-improvement swindles are again blossoming forth.

No amount of publicity seems able to nip in the bud these hardy, perennial home-improvement frauds:

Bait-and-switch, best-selling method of the gyp artist. A sharp salesman signs up a customer for, say, aluminum siding, at a bargain advertised that is too good to pass up.

Then he stuns his customer by confiding that the quality of siding just sold is no good. It will blow away in the first storm, he confesses. But he will kindly let the homeowner switch his order to a good grade of siding that will last. Relieved to get out of a bad deal, the hapless customer buys the line—and may pay \$3,000 for a job worth \$2,000 from a reputable concern.

MODEL SCHEME

Model-home pitch, an easy way to pay \$4,400 for a \$400 roofing job. Follow closely. A salesman got a homeowner to sign a contract for \$2,800 for the job actually worth \$400 by promising to use his home as a model for other customers. For each prospect sold, the homeowner would get a \$100 rebate—guaranteed to total \$2,400.

When the payment book from the finance company arrived, the homeowner was hooked for payments totaling \$4,400, including interest.

Needless to say, the Federal Housing Administration has banned such phony promises—which never pan out—on FHA-financed home improvements.

Gypsy driveway sealer. He just happens to be in the neighborhood with material left over from another job. He offers to coat and seal driveways for \$20 or \$30. But what he spreads may be just used motor oil that gets tracked all over the house. A nationally known gang, the "terrible Williamson family," among others has been working this hoary swindle for decades.

Wandering woodsman, offering low-priced tree trimming. Prized shade trees will take years to recover from his butchering.

Phony termite inspector. After getting into a house, he plants termites to convince the homeowner to pay for expensive spraying.

Roofing gyp. He shows the homeowner a handful of shingles, supposedly blown off his roof. The roofer offers cut-rate "repairs."

\$12 BILLION TAB IN 1968

Homeowners fall for these medicine-man pitches because they "want something for nothing," says Leonard L. Sanders, president of Boston's Better Business Bureau (BBB).

Moreover, "people want to believe other people"—even total strangers—cautions Dermot P. Shea, head of Massachusetts's Consumer's Council. "They turn their backs on

people they've dealt with all their lives and buy from wandering peddlers," Mr. Shea laments.

Homeowners spent a record \$12 billion in 1968 for home repairs and improvements. How many hundreds of millions swindlers suck in each year never can be accurately tallied.

But it's clear they prey on the elderly and women. In one notorious case, a fraudulent contractor scared one elderly woman into spending \$40,000 for bogus repairs to keep her \$6,600 house from "falling down." In just 19 months, for example, her home was painted twice.

In another incredible case, different salesmen high-pressured a woman into signing for two reroofing jobs on the same house.

Despite consumer protection laws, says Mr. Sanders of the BBB, the homeowner still must look after himself. For instance, the federal truth-in-lending law, effective July 1 will give the homeowner three days to cancel a home-improvement contract that takes a second mortgage on his home. But, warns Mr. Sanders, the homeowner often finds out he has been taken only when the finance company payment book arrives 30 days later.

"Investigate before you invest"—a pet BBB slogan—sums up how a homeowner can guard against fraud. In a national survey, the Association of Better Business Bureaus found that an unbelievable 86 percent of homeowners fail to read and understand the home-improvement contracts they sign. And 71 percent could not even be bothered to get competitive bids for a job before signing on the dotted line.

HOW TO LICK 'EM

BBBs give away a checklist on how to deal with a home-improvement concern. It's called "27 Questions for Homeowners." See also the new BBB "Consumer's Buying Guide" (\$1), which contains a chapter on home-improvement tips.

Those rackets would dry up and blow away if homeowners would:

Check the reliability of any contractor with the local BBB, the Federal Housing Administration, and other customers. The FHA blacklist of shady contractors contains more than 6,000 names.

Get several competitive bids.

Make sure the contract spells out the type and extent of work to be done and the quality of materials. Make sure the contract gets in writing any verbal promises by a salesman—especially guarantees.

Consult their bank about financing before signing a contract.

Never pay a salesman or contractor in advance for a job.

Never sign a completion certificate until the work is satisfactorily completed.

SUMMER "WORK-IN" PROGRAM

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention during the past week that the Texas-Oklahoma leadership of the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—has established a definite "battle plan" to shift their major thrust of activities from the college campuses to the factories this summer. I have in my possession, a complete list of defense-oriented plants in a five-State area, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and New Mexico, that the SDS has targeted for student violence this summer.

By State, the list of plants selected are:

SDS SUMMER PLANS EXPOSED

TEXAS

Dallas-Fort Worth area

Baifield Industries (Dallas)—Manufactures brakes for snake eye bombs.

Jet Research (Arlington)—Manufactures explosive detonators.

Space Corporation (Garland)—Bomb hauling and ground support equipments.

LTV (Grand Prairie)—A variety of defense related contracts.

Texas Instruments (Richardson)—A variety of defense related contracts.

General Dynamics (Fort Worth)—A variety of defense related contracts.

Bell Helicopter (Fort Worth)—A variety of defense related contracts.

Houston

Texas Instruments—Sensing equipment and bomb detection devices.

Austin

Tracor—Chaff dispersion equipment to jam radar.

Waco

A. O. Smith—Bomb production.

McGregor

Rocketdyne—Explosives.

Longview

R. G. Letourneau, Inc.—Bombs, bomb fins, and warheads.

Pampa

Cabot Corporation—155 mm howitzers.

El Paso

Braddock, Dunn, and McDonald—Weapons systems evaluation.

San Antonio

The Porter Co., Inc.—Brace bomb dispenser.

OKLAHOMA

Quality Machine Works (Oklahoma City)—Bomb door releases.

Leeds-Northrup (Tulsa)—Hardware for missiles (slide wire).

Quality Machine Works (Oklahoma City)—Bomb door release.

LOUISIANA

Baifield Industries (Shreveport)—Bomb fin containers.

Explosive Devices, Inc. (Metairie)—Bomb cartridges.

ARKANSAS

Batesville Manufacturing Co. (Batesville)—Bomb installation equipment.

Camden Manufacturing Co. (Camden)—Ordnance items.

Ouachita Marine and Industrial Corp. (Arkadelphia)—Bombs.

NEW MEXICO

Hewlett Packard (Los Cruces)—Instrumentation.

Mr. Speaker, SDS leadership formulated plans for their national work-in program in Chicago in late April. In attendance at this convention was Roy Barteo Haile of Texas and his wife, Margie Bolton Haile. Haile, former SDS regional traveler for the Texas-Oklahoma region, currently serves as one of eight members of the powerful National Interim Committee of SDS—the top policy-making body of this student group. Haile also played a prominent role in the national SDS meeting in Austin in late March and has been assigned the top planning role in the work-in program both nationally and in our five-State region. Haile recently indicated that he is personally a Communist, and that many of the top leaders of the national SDS organization share his feelings.

Mr. Speaker, the work-in has as its stated objectives to transfer SDS activities from the classroom to the industrial plants of America. A secret instruction sheet outlining SDS objectives has been distributed nationally indicating "that closing down our schools is not enough. Workers produce and move the goods that are used in war and it is they who are primarily forced to fight the war. They can stop it."

Based on a number of personal conversations with the rank and file members of labor unions who staff the majority of the plants targeted on the five-State SDS work-in plan. I feel that the workers have little patience or respect for those who are trying to destroy America. It is quite probable that violence will erupt as SDS members try to forceably clog our machinery. It is for this reason that I am making this information, received in strictest confidence, public. I hope that it will serve to alert industrial executives to a real danger that they face this summer—a danger that can be averted only by prompt and careful scrutiny of prospective summer employees.

I and members of my staff have conferred with key members of the Justice Department, House Committee on Internal Security, and the intelligence division of the Dallas Police Department. My initial concern was to verify the confidential information received. I am now convinced that Barteo and Margie Haile and other top SDS leaders, have formulated a most ingenious plan to transfer chaos from the college campus to the industrial assembly lines. It is imperative that local police officials, industrial executives, union employees, and the general public be prepared to respond if, and when this devious plan is launched in our five-State area.

DEAF, BLIND CHILDREN TAUGHT IN VANCOUVER

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there are often individual tragedies in life which are greater than the capacity of the victims to withstand. In these cases, a sensitive and benevolent Government has a responsibility to ease the burden.

This was the case during 1964 and 1965 when some expectant mothers were stricken with rubella. Many of their babies were then born handicapped—some both deaf and blind. In reaction to these tragedies, Congress provided meaningful legislation to ease the impact on the affected families and to help these handicapped children toward more meaningful lives.

Elisabet Van Nostrand, a reporter for the Vancouver, Wash., Columbian, has written an exceptional story about this problem which was carried by the Associated Press and printed in many newspapers, including the Longview, Wash., Daily News. Mr. Speaker, I insert her article in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING WITH DEBBIE—DEAF, BLIND CHILDREN TAUGHT IN VANCOUVER

(By Elisabet van Nostrand)

VANCOUVER, WASH.—I met Debbie before Debbie met me.

I watched her and heard her talking to her teachers before she even became aware of my presence at her side in the Washington State School for the Blind in Vancouver. Then we were introduced.

She ran her hands over my face and arms and said, "What's your name?"

She had troubles with "Elisabet." There are too many syllables, and my lips and throat moved too many times for her to quite catch it. She never really did, but she does understand and can repeat an amazing number of rather difficult words.

Debbie is 18 years old. She has never seen nor heard. She used to be one of the very few children in the United States who were born both deaf and blind. Now there are many like her.

The reason is rubella, or German measles, in the form of a virus epidemic that swept the country in 1964 and 1965. A mild disease that usually passes in a few days, rubella often has a tragic effect on children before birth.

Many are born with multiple handicaps, the most common ones rendering them both deaf and blind or causing deficiencies in the heart or mental capacity.

An estimated 20,000 pregnant women contracted rubella in 1964 and 1965. One of the results was up to 2,000 babies born both deaf and blind. About 500 of them are expected to benefit from some kind of education.

These children now are approaching school age, and that's where the Washington State School for the Blind enters the picture.

The institution is one of only seven schools in the country that have departments for children who are both deaf and blind. Most of them are in blind schools, partly because the equipment for the blind is more suitable for the deaf-blind than is equipment for the deaf, and partly because the deaf-blind socialize better with the blind than with the deaf.

While most of the school's present eight deaf-blind children are of high school age, the school now expects an influx of very young children. Washington and Oregon alone have 30 known deaf-blind children mostly 4-6 years old.

But not only Washington and Oregon deaf-blind children will come to the Vancouver school. The state blind school was recently designated one of eight regional centers for such children and will also serve Alaska, Idaho, Montana, North and South Dakota and Wyoming.

In addition, says Supt. Byron Berhow, children from other parts of the country will be accepted, especially if they have relatives in the area.

Only one of the school's present eight deaf-blind children, Debbie, was born with this multiple handicap. "Up until now, there have never been more than about 100 deaf-blind children in school in the whole country," Berhow said.

"Now the push will begin with all these small children," he said. "It's a terrible thing and there are few teachers available. Still, the United States wasn't caught totally unprepared like England was a few years ago."

In anticipation of the many deaf-blind children caused by the rubella epidemic, Congress passed Part C of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, authorized the creation of the regional centers.

The Washington state school received a federal grant of \$156,926 recently to establish one such special regional center for deaf-blind children.

"Federal aid is needed because the problem is simply too great for the individual states to handle," said Berhow, who was a member of a special committee called to Wash-

ington, D.C., to help form the legislation and draw up the guidelines. This work has been in progress for about two years.

By September, the Washington school expects to have about 15 children. A new cottage for 20 boys and girls who are multi-handicapped will be ready then.

"This will be an entirely different project than our present one, because the children will be young," the superintendent said. "We will develop the training program in conjunction with Portland State University. All teachers must have training."

At the present, Mrs. Ruth Richardson is supervisor of the school's deaf-blind department. Two teachers help her. Two more teachers will be added next year, along with teachers' aides and houseparents. The school will also employ a coordinator for the entire program.

Because so many parents are totally baffled by the magnitude of their child's handicap, the children often come to the school as little savages with no knowledge of the world around them. Many have been kept in cribs for years, and the teachers must begin by creating some kind of awareness in them.

Like with all other children, some are smarter than others. Debbie is considered quite intelligent, and she manages extremely well despite her handicaps.

TRIBUTE TO DWIGHT DAVID
EISENHOWER

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, June 6 marks the anniversary of D-Day, that historic moment in history when the eyes of the world were focused upon the invasion forces of the Allied army and the activities of its Commander in Chief, Dwight David Eisenhower. It is fitting that at this anniversary of that landing we again pay tribute to the man who left his mark on history not only as a military leader but as a political leader as well.

But it is perhaps the mark of a man that we remember him more for his human qualities than for the imprint that he leaves on mankind. Dwight David Eisenhower certainly engraved his name in the history of the 20th century—commander of the greatest invasion force ever assembled in the history of man, university president, author, and President of the United States—yet he is best remembered in the hearts of Americans as a man loved by the people.

He was of the very essence of America. Born to a poor hard-working family in Texas, his warm, outgoing personality engendered the friendship, admiration, and trust of those who came to know him. Upon graduation from West Point, he began in 1915 one of the most successful military careers in the history of the United States. To have led the legions of democracy against the armed might of tyranny would have been reward enough for most men but for General Eisenhower a life of public service could not be so easily ended no matter how richly deserved. After a short term as president of Columbia University, he again returned to the service of the United States in the

capacity of commander of the newly formed North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As he had done during the Second World War, he succeeded in welding into a single fighting force the many diverse armies that are part of the common European defense.

Recognizing his talents, the American people called upon him to give yet more of himself to public service. Rising to the call, he spent 8 years providing the American people with that determined, studied leadership ever mixed with a depth and breadth of human understanding that he had so amply displayed in the past. As President of the United States, he placed principle above expediency both at Little Rock and Suez. He sought to maintain democracy wherever it was threatened, whether Lebanon or Berlin. He strove constantly for peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union while maintaining security for the free world. As new nations emerged from old empires, he remembered that America, too, had fought for its independence against empire and consequently he devoted considerable effort on behalf of these nations struggling with the manifold problems that attend newly won freedom.

At home he provided Americans with great leadership amidst crisis. After the Soviet technological successes of 1957, he pressed for and succeeded in obtaining significant Government assistance to education. So that all of our citizens would be equal under the law, he sought and obtained far-reaching civil rights legislation.

It is possible that other men of similar devotion to duty and general excellence might have accomplished some or even possibly all that President Eisenhower did. But in such a case, one would only be recounting deeds rather than telling of a man and above all things, Dwight David Eisenhower was a man that America knew it could look to for leadership, honor, respect, and, from the very depths of his heart, love of everything America has ever stood for.

DOUGLAS SHOULD GO

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the case against Associate Justice William O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, into which new elements of involvement and association beyond the Court are coming to light almost every day, can be boiled down to these specific counts:

First, Justice Douglas violated the American Bar Association canons of ethics and may have violated the Federal criminal law in a letter of May 14, 1969, to Albert Parvin giving advice on legal matters involving the Parvin Foundation and a controversy with the Internal Revenue Service.

Second, Justice Douglas accepted a fee of at least \$350 for an article published in Ralph Ginzburg's *Avante Garde* that

consisted of the worst in hard-core pornography. A full-page picture of Justice Douglas and his article on folk singing were featured in the advertising and general promotion of this magazine with its sordid contents of pictures, poetry, and articles that can only be described as filth. Justice Douglas voted against a 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision in 1966 that upheld conviction of Ginzburg for selling hard-core pornography. There are several other suits involving Ginzburg that are in the appeal process and could come before the Supreme Court.

Third, Justice Douglas has continued his association with the Parvin Foundation despite knowledge as early as 1966 that its funds came from Las Vegas gambling casinos that were well publicized as fronts for notorious syndicate gambling and "skimming" operations. The fronts for the syndicate mobsters would appear to include Albert Parvin, Edward Levinson, Edward Torres, and others according to information obtained through Federal law enforcement sources.

Place these facts against the canons of ethics of the American Bar Association that demand our Federal judges be models of propriety in their private as well as their public lives. It is my opinion that Justice Douglas has violated the same canons that were violated by former Justice Abe Fortas in his relations with Louis E. Wolfson. I believe these facts are accurate, and that the opinions on these conflict of interests and other improprieties are within the context of those facts and reasonable interpretation.

If there are those in the House of Representatives, or if there are friends and supporters of Justice Douglas, who have other facts that are relevant to these problems I would welcome that information if it would change or modify this situation in the slightest. If Justice Douglas, or friends of Justice Douglas in the Congress, have any facts to produce or opinions to express, this is the time to do it.

On the basis of the information now in the public domain this is a grave matter, and I have reason to believe that other information will emerge shortly. If Justice Douglas does not see fit to resign, then the time has arrived for him to give a detailed accounting of all his actions involving financial transactions, and the associations that were the beneficiaries of his legal advice beyond the Supreme Court.

Failing to do this within a reasonable period of time, Justice Douglas should know that he will very likely be confronted with impeachment.

I submit for printing in the RECORD, at this point, the following article from the June 4 issue of the Des Moines Register:

U.S. REPORTS LINK PARVIN TO MOBSTERS
(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Albert Parvin's alleged connections with several notorious syndicate mobsters have become the focal point of the government investigations of the activities of Associate Justice William O. Douglas.

The investigation centers around the fact that Douglas received \$12,000 a year as president of the Albert Parvin Foundation from

1962 until he resigned recently. The Parvin Foundation received the bulk of its income from holdings in a number of Las Vegas gambling casinos, including the Fremont Hotel.

Within the last few days, at least four government agencies have submitted information to several key figures in Congress dealing with the background of Parvin, the operations of the Parvin-Dohrmann Co. and the Parvin Foundation. The Treasury Department, the Justice Department, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the FBI have all compiled reports dealing with Douglas and the financing of the foundation.

TOP HOODLUMS

At least one of these reports reportedly relayed information identifying Parvin, a former Chicago, Ill., man now operating in Los Angeles, Calif., as a frequent associate of such important syndicate hoodlums as Meyer Lansky, Frank Costello and the late Benjamin (Bugsy) Siegel.

Key congressional figures who have been pressing for the Douglas investigation by the Nixon administration said Tuesday that Douglas has become aware of the extent of the government investigations of Parvin's background, and has indicated that he will resign within a few weeks.

It is expected that Senator Paul Fannin (Rep., Ariz.), Senator Carl Curtis (Rep., Neb.) and Senator James Eastland (Dem., Miss.) will speak on the Senate floor before the week is out, stressing the connections between Parvin and gambling figures that go back at least to 1940.

Senator John J. Williams (Rep., Del.) has asked the American Bar Association for an opinion on whether Douglas has violated the A.B.A. canons of ethics in receiving \$12,000 a year from a foundation financed partly by money from Las Vegas gambling casinos.

The reports by government agencies to the Congress stress that Parvin was arrested in the mid-1920s on charges of receiving stolen property. The charges were dropped when Parvin made restitution.

The reports state that Parvin's relationship with Bugsy Siegel, former operator of the Flamingo Casino in Las Vegas, started in the early 1940s. Siegel was slain in a dispute of the management of the Flamingo, and later it was taken over by Gus Greenbaum who, it was reported, had been designated to run the casino by those who had originally backed Siegel.

At some point before 1960, Parvin obtained a large interest in the Flamingo.

In 1960 and 1961 when he established the Foundation and named Justice Douglas the president, the major asset was listed as a \$1.2 million interest in the Flamingo.

Parvin was reported to have become wealthy in operating a firm that sold equipment and supplies to restaurants and hotels.

In 1966, the Parvin-Dohrmann firm purchased the Fremont Hotel from a group of stockholders that included Edward Levinson, Edward Torres and others who were under investigation by the Internal Revenue Service and the Justice Department for alleged "skimming" of millions of dollars in cash from the Fremont casino gambling profits.

The indictment of Levinson and Torres in May, 1967, on charges of filing false tax returns was returned only a few months after Parvin-Dohrmann purchased their interests in the Fremont in a deal that included agreement to pay several million dollars in cash plus \$100,000 a year each for five years to Levinson and Torres.

Levinson and Torres were to continue to run the Fremont for the Parvin-Dohrmann firm, and to have a role in the management of two other Las Vegas casinos—the Stardust and the Aladdin—that were being purchased by Parvin-Dohrmann.

Records filed in the United States Tax Court show that in the last few weeks the

Nixon administration has initiated action to collect more than \$4 million in back federal taxes from the Fremont Hotel Corp. It was only one of several Las Vegas casinos involved in what has been described as a Mafia-directed "skimming" operation.

In the case of the Fremont alone, the tax investigators contend in the period from 1962-64 the Fremont "understatement of gross income from craps (a dice game)" was \$5,324,213, and the casino owes \$4,228,794 in delinquent taxes and civil fraud penalties.

Government agencies have informed key congressional figures that at least \$12 million a year was taken from the Las Vegas gambling casinos in cash. It did not go through the casino books, and no federal or local taxes were paid on it.

Levinson and Torres have been identified as a part of the active "skimming operation," and government sources say they took an active part in sending the millions in cash to Miami, Fla., where Meyer Lansky, identified by various committees as the Mafia's chief financier, arranged for delivery to numbered bank accounts in Switzerland.

The Securities and Exchange Commission is involved in the current investigation of the Parvin-Dohrmann firm through its effort to determine the real purchasers of Parvin-Dohrmann stock from the Parvin Foundation. The purchases were made through the Bahamas and through international money that appeared to have originated in Swiss banks.

NEW AMERICAN POLITICS: ENABLING THOSE WHO CHANGE THEIR RESIDENCES TO VOTE IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments recently made by Hubert Humphrey urging that our registration laws be structured to encourage every American citizen to register and vote for presidential candidates on election day simply by going to the polls and properly identifying himself or herself as to name and residence.

To enable 5 million citizens who were disenfranchised by our residency laws from voting in 1968 to vote in subsequent presidential elections, 62 Members to date have joined Congressman BRADEMANS and myself in cosponsoring introduction of the Residency Voting Act of 1969. It is also encouraging to note that 25 colleagues of Senator KENNEDY joined him on May 14 in cosponsoring introduction of a similar measure, the Voting Rights Amendments of 1969.

I urge my colleagues to consider the former Vice President's remarks with a view toward achieving early enactment of legislation to allow every voting age citizen to cast a ballot for the President and Vice President on election day.

Mr. Humphrey's comments, appearing in the June 2 edition of the Washington Daily News follow:

LET'S ALLOW AND ENCOURAGE EVERY AMERICAN CITIZEN TO VOTE

(By Hubert Humphrey)

Americans take great pride in our nation's democratic traditions, but I couldn't help

wondering during the 1968 presidential campaign why we make it so difficult for our citizens to vote.

The United States is, after all, the best educated and most technologically advanced country in the world. Almost every American has a radio and television set and is kept informed on important issues.

Why shouldn't we let every voting age citizen cast a ballot on election day? I think we should.

But look at the results from 1968. Of 120 million voting age Americans, only 72 million cast a ballot for president. That means 48 million were left out.

President Nixon, who received 42 per cent of the votes cast, actually won the support of only one in every four voting age Americans.

Does this mean Americans are lazy or indifferent about electing their president? I don't think so. But, as a nation, we can certainly do better.

One problem is that we still have a paper curtain of old-fashioned registration and voting laws which keep people away from the polls. The right to vote is a privilege, but why make it so difficult?

Take residency requirements, for example. Every year 20 million Americans move to another state. Many of these citizens are prevented from voting for president until they have lived in their new state for one or even two years. In 1968, five million citizens were disenfranchised by the residency laws.

But these are American citizens, wanting to vote for a national leader. Why should anyone have to live in a state for a year before he or she can vote for president? It may have made sense in the horse and buggy days, but it doesn't today.

We also have a crazy quilt of absentee voter laws. In 1968, six million Americans didn't vote because they couldn't leave work or because they were away from home. Another seven million didn't vote because they were sick or disabled and couldn't get to the polls.

We ought to help these people to vote. Yet, in many areas, citizens have to penetrate a bureaucratic maze in order to cast an absentee ballot.

We also keep many of our citizens from voting by just plain making it hard for them to register to vote. Our political parties expend a tremendous amount of time and energy just telling people how and when and where to register.

In many communities there is only one place to register to vote. It is often an office, tucked away in some county or city government building, with hours of operation that make it difficult for the working man or woman. Is it any wonder that many a citizen grows cynical of government?

In this electronic age, when we are able to keep accurate and up-to-date census and tax lists on computers, we ought to take the burden of registration off the individual and put it on the government.

We ought to do away with the 45 and 60 and 90-day registration cutoffs. We ought to do away with the one and two year residency laws.

Every American citizen ought to be able to register and vote on election day by going to the polls and properly identifying himself or herself as to name and residence.

In some ways, we have done well in expanding suffrage in this country. Since the passage of the voting rights act of 1965, the registration of blacks in the South has doubled. The old barriers of property ownership and sex and race have been struck down.

The next goal should be the lowering of the voting age. Our young people today are the best informed, best educated, most idealistic generation in our nation's history. They want to participate. We ought to let them. I have long supported lowering the voting

age to 18, and it is time we moved in this direction.

Then too, the president and vice-president should be elected by direct popular vote. The out of date electoral college should be scrapped.

Before 1972, let's go to work to get state legislatures to bring registration and voting laws into the 20th century. Let's tear down that paper curtain. Let's live up to our democratic heritage by allowing and encouraging every American citizen to vote.

A BOLD NEW APPROACH TO CURE THE ILLS OF AMERICA'S POSTAL SYSTEM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier today Cook County Commissioner Harry H. Semrow, who was postmaster in Chicago from 1961 to 1966, proposed a bold new approach to the delay and problems of our Nation's postal system.

Few men in this country are as well qualified to discuss the problems of our postal system as Harry Semrow. As postmaster in the biggest post office in America for 5 years, Harry Semrow had a chance to observe first hand the herculean problems faced by our postal system.

Mr. Semrow, besides being the commissioner of the Cook County Board, is in his own right a very successful businessman who knows well the value of a good postal system.

Mr. Semrow has, today, proposed that we separate the first-class mail from bulk mail. Under his proposal we would have the Federal Government continue providing mail service for first-class mail and a quasipublic agency, as suggested by President Nixon, to handle all of the bulk mail including parcel post and third-class mail.

In Mr. Semrow's proposal newspapers would be treated as first-class mail.

I believe that this merits full discussion, and have asked the legislative council to prepare for me proper legislation to implement Mr. Semrow's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is heading for a trillion-dollar economy. First-class mail takes on additional significance and importance when we consider that the advent of credit cards and other billings constitute the very lifeline of our economy.

We must start treating first-class mail on an entirely special basis from all the other material sent into the average home in America if we are to avoid a complete breakdown of our own commerce.

I believe that Mr. Semrow is to be congratulated, and it would be my hope that President Nixon would invite Mr. Semrow to an advisory board to help draw up an appropriate postal system for America.

Mr. Semrow's statement issued in Chicago, Ill., today, follows:

STATEMENT BY COMMISSIONER HARRY H. SEMROW

I take this opportunity to commend President Nixon on his concern over the growing mail service delay in America. What's more, I warmly second his sentiment that in finding the solution—and I quote him—"There is no Democratic or Republic way . . . there is only the right way."

As Postmaster of the Chicago Post Office for five years, one of the biggest and most vital of all post offices in the postal system, I had the opportunity to direct 27-thousand employees to handle 7-billion pieces of mail a year, and in general, to get more than a first-hand view of postal operations. In making an analysis of what the problem is in the postal system, there can only be one conclusion—and that is industry with its heavy outpouring of parcels, advertising gimmicks, magazines, catalogs, and so forth, has crushed the United States postal system and has virtually broken the letter carrier's back! The letter carrier has become a walking general store, delivering soap, cereal, tooth paste, razor blades, and God knows what else! In fact, I recall vividly the time some live alligators were shipped and received at the Chicago Post Office.

The original postal concept was designed for the purpose of delivering what is known as first-class mail . . . letters, business correspondence, and so forth. But over the years the second, third, and fourth class areas have grown to such volumes and extremes that they have stifled the original intent of good preferential mail service.

In addition, the tax payer has been subsidizing the second, third, and fourth class mails over the years, and as an example, I point to an interesting facet of the mail service, and that's first class mail. First class mail has shown a profit since 1926 with the exception of only one year, and while I hesitate to cite figures, I'll just make a few comparisons to point out what is happening to mail costs:

In 1926—1st Class Mail gained \$73,768,786; 2nd Class lost \$83,498,229; 3rd Class lost \$1,763,768; 4th Class lost \$2,959,733.

In 1946—1st Class Mail gained \$143,353,028; 2nd Class lost \$148,128,993; 3rd Class lost \$52,070,453; 4th Class lost \$41,512,248.

In 1967—1st Class Mail gained \$35,023,133; 2nd Class lost \$421,859,903; 3rd Class lost \$441,570,984; 4th Class lost \$190,487,499.

Obviously, we private citizens are subsidizing the mailing costs of big business. If large corporations want to advertise and deliver their wares through the mails, let them pay their fair share.

These figures make it obvious as to where the problem of postal deficit rests. But to even show the inequities in mail, let's cite an example of a typical one-pound magazine that's delivered weekly, millions at a time, at a cost of 6-cents postage, while they use the taxpayer to pay 6-cents an ounce for first class mail, when they virtually both get the same treatment. Let's take a further example: A 4-pound catalog is delivered for 30-cents as compared to the taxpayer's 6-cents per ounce; and if we projected the 4-pound catalog cost on an equal basis, it would amount to \$3.84—and again, they virtually receive about the same delivery service. But enough of the examples. I'm sure the few instances that I have cited give the general idea as to where the true cost of the postal deficit lies.

Again, I congratulate President Nixon on his vital interest in doing something about the postal system, and I totally agree with him that if something isn't done soon, the whole system will collapse—only because as industry grows, so will the crush on the post office, making it more and more difficult for first class mail to get through the big bind. Actually, the post office has become the

shipping department of industry and unless the system is changed, and not just the operating head, we will be in for the same type of service—only worse!

In the spirit of trying to help a very difficult problem (the hopeless snarl that has become our national mail delivery system), I would propose the following:

(A) The formation of two separate mail handling agencies in the United States, one being the existing United States Postal Service, but it would only handle preferential mail and would thereby restore first class service to the first class mail system. This service could continue to be administered by a cabinet member, the Postmaster General, but would limit its service to the following items:

1. First Class Mail.
2. Air Mail.
3. Special Delivery (and really making it special).
4. Registered Mail.
5. Daily Metropolitan Newspapers.
6. Western Union Telegrams (which letter carriers would deliver on a fee basis for Western Union.)

In this proposal for fast and prompt first class preferential mail service, I would propose the elimination of two costly and onerous services performed by the letter carrier:

- (1) the elimination of certified mail to be incorporated instead with Registered Mail;
- (2) the elimination of COD mail which places the letter carrier in the role of bill collector.

(B) The second agency could be called the United States Shipping Corporation or some similar designated name, and it would only handle bulk mail. This new corporation could be administered by the nine-man board proposed by President Nixon, it could establish rates by a 3-man commission proposed by President Nixon, and its assignment would be to deliver the following classes of mail: 2nd class, which includes magazines, newspapers and periodicals; 3rd class which is primarily circulars, advertising matter, and sample products; 4th class mail which, of course, is parcel post.

This new corporation could be given the bonding power to raise whatever money it deems necessary in revenue bonds to set up the system, and if new facilities would be needed, they would be in a position to build them—or the present facilities could be divided to accommodate this new United States Shipping Corporation. The work force, equipment and vehicles as well, could be divided to make the new system almost immediately operable.

Needless to say, the postal planning department would have to exercise great care and judgment to work out the myriad of details in establishing the two separate systems. However, I think the facts are clear. The crush by private industry on our postal system will be impossible to relieve in my opinion under the present archaic system; and if America is to have the type of postal service that it's entitled to, I see no other alternative but to form the two separate divisions.

Mail service in the United States is at a crossroads. It's costing us money and not performing the services we have a right to demand for that money. In addition, it's inequitable, and the mail user then should not be in the position of subsidizing big business. Let them both stand on their own—the individual supporting first class mail and its traditional letter carrier, and business supporting a United States Shipping Corporation. When this is accomplished, we then will have a letter carrier walking with dignity with first class, air mail, and so forth, on time, at a profit, with no possibility of a logjam or a breakdown in the postal system. First class mail never did and never will log a post office.

And so I ask President Nixon to consider two separate mail handling agencies such as I have proposed with the view to accomplishing what America has not had for a long time—a fool-proof mail system. I have also discussed this proposal with my Congressman, Mr. Roman Pucinski, who endorses it wholeheartedly and has indicated to me that he will have it placed in legislative form.

ANOTHER GIVEAWAY?

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Washington Post of May 4, 1969, by M. B. Schnapper, editor of Public Affairs Press, raises significant questions concerning the application of copyright protection to publications prepared at Government expense either by civil service personnel or contractors. I urge my colleagues to read the following article and to consider the points it makes when the question of the Copyright Act is again before the House:

TWISTING OUR COPYRIGHT LAW

Although the Copyright Act expressly prohibits copyright restrictions on the contents of government documents, federal agencies and officials are increasingly circumventing the law through the simple device of authorizing its contractors to do that which the government has no power to do.

Take, for example, the long-awaited report on unidentified flying objects commissioned by the Air Force at an expense of \$525,905. On page IV of the only publicly available copies of the report (*Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects*) is the following statement:

Copyright 1968 by the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by photostat, microfilm, xerography, or any other means, without the written permission of the copyright owner.

In short, you can read the report aloud to yourself but you had better not quote it in a letter or reproduce any portion of it through any known or yet to be devised means of communication—unless, of course, the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado (B.R.U.C., for short) has given you its permission to do so.

It sounds sort of preposterous for a public institution to be discouraging the dissemination of knowledge, especially since schools and scholars are the chief complainants against tight copyright restrictions, but it's perfectly proper if B.R.U.C. is a genuinely legal proprietor. The facts don't seem to bear this out.

If, as statements in the report itself show, it's an official document in every essential sense, it's non-copyrightable and hence belongs in the public domain. It was officially designed to "strengthen the public position of the Air Force on UFO's" (p. 815), officially justified on the ground of being "of great importance in securing public understanding . . . as a further aid to public understanding on the scientific appreciation taken by the Air Force in attacking the UFO problem" (p. 816), officially commissioned (Pentagon press release No. 847-66), officially released (January 8, 1969), and officially funded (Air Force Contract No. F44620-67-C-0035).

How come, then, that B.R.U.C. has—or, rather, seems to have—the right to decide who may or may not quote or "reproduce in any form" any portion of the contents of a

work being privately merchandised by Bantam Books as "The Complete Report Commissioned by the U.S. Air Force"? That has yet to be fully explained by the Air Force or B.R.U.C., but Eugene Wilson, Colorado's vice president for business affairs, has made the following interesting point:

"One of the conditions established by the Department of the Air Force was: 'The University will assure that all editions of the report are protected by a copyright in its name. This includes both the official and the Bantam editions.' The University was glad to accept this condition as we wished to protect the scientific integrity of the complete report against wholesale and indiscriminate excerpting."

In short, B.R.U.C. played ball with the Air Force in order to assure "scientific integrity" via censorship control over the contents of the report. (General C. G. Dodge put the matter more bluntly when he justified the Army's copyright restrictions on its official military histories on the ground that it was considered necessary "to prevent quoting of material out of context" and "sensationalizing.")

What actually occurred remains somewhat unclear, but here's a reasonably close approximation of what happened:

When the University of Colorado team headed by Dr. Edward U. Condon finished the report there was some uncertainty in Boulder and Washington as to how it should be published.

Initially the Air Force made arrangements for publication of the report by the Government Printing Office and dissemination by the Superintendent of Documents. That's the normal way those things are done.

But the Pentagon's public relations people didn't cotton to the idea. Dr. Condon didn't like it either.

A press aide to Secretary of the Air Force Harold Brown complained that the Superintendent of Documents isn't very enterprising in promoting Government Printing Office publications. Dr. Condon could see that; it jibed with his experience when he was the head of the National Bureau of Standards.

What bothered Dr. Condon somewhat more was his aversion to a government imprimatur that might suggest the report wasn't an independent work. Besides he was eager to get the report released before Richard M. Nixon assumed the Presidency. Back in the 1950s Nixon had been associated with attempts to challenge Condon's security clearance. Condon hadn't forgotten that; neither had the Air Force. The Government Printing Office might not get the report out fast enough to avoid the possibility of embarrassment.

Bantam was ready, willing and eager to issue the report on a crash basis provided it was given exclusive publishing rights. A Pentagon lawyer had some doubts about that. The Copyright Act forbids the copyrighting of government works. Section 8 says that "No copyright shall subsist in any publication of the United States Government, or any reprint, in whole or in part thereof." If the government didn't have the right to copyright, it didn't have the right to give Bantam exclusive publishing rights.

An impasse ensued for a week. Back came the same Pentagon lawyer with a solution. Since the law doesn't specifically forbid copyrighting of government works by government contractors, the University of Colorado could copyright the report and turn over the publishing rights to Bantam.

Other problems that arose were easy to resolve. Both the Air Force and Dr. Condon wanted to be sure that Bantam's book and advertising matter didn't say anything that might be inconsistent with the dignity of the report. The assurances Bantam gave were satisfactory. The only substantive material it added to the report was a favorable

introduction by Walter Sullivan, a *New York Times* writer, seen in advance by both the Air Force and Dr. Condon. No Pentagon public relations aid could have written more tasteful copy about the book than Bantam's man.

(Although Bantam and *The New York Times* clearly had an inside track on the report which merits close scrutiny, *Times* attorney Edward L. Smith insists that "All negotiations were completely open and above board and there was no 'sort of deal' with the Air Force or the University or anyone else involving either the *Times*, Bantam, or Walter Sullivan.")

Some questions arose as to royalties and the book's sale price. Since royalties are normally payable to the authors, it was felt that they should go to Dr. Condon and his team. By way of justification it was pointed out that the \$529,905 paid out by the Air Force didn't really cover all their overtime work, but Dr. Condon preferred to avoid any wrangling as to who should share in royalties on a document prepared for the U.S. government. He proposed that the royalties be turned over to the University of Colorado, although the terms of its contract with the Air Force were supposed to have covered all of the institution's expenses.

What is serious here is that a highly improper, legally dubious and potentially dangerous precedent has been set. If it goes unchallenged we can expect other government agencies to follow suit.

THE STORY OF A PROUD PEOPLE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the fine work being done by a group of Indianapolis citizens, who because of their civic mindedness, have joined together to form an organization called the United Southside Community Organization. What they have accomplished in just a few short months is worth noting here.

I include the following article:

THE STORY OF A PROUD PEOPLE

(By Betty E. Sexson)

You can not keep a good man down, so states the old adage and so too, say the people of the near Southside of Indianapolis.

Once a show place sought out by visitors to Indianapolis, the square, known to all as Fountain Square, formed by the intersections of Virginia Avenue, Shelby Street and Prospect Street shall once again claim its inalienable right to live a proud life surrounded by beauty—not decay.

It all began in 1889 when, to quote "The Legend of Fountain Square's Vanishing Lady", the old mule car turntable was abandoned . . . a man named William Mohs contributed \$500.00 for the construction of a fountain. Merchants of the square matched the initial amount and the fountain was placed on the turntable site.

Some thirty years later, one of the merchants strung a rope from his store and attached the other end indignantly to the statue of the lady. The rope supported a large banner advertising a sale.

As the legend goes, a strong wind blew up that morning and the weight of the banner with the wind caused the statue to topple to the ground. The fallen lady remained at the base of the fountain that afternoon and on into the evening.

Some people say it was a weary night

traveler from out of town who paused for a drink at the fountain and carried the lady far away into the darkness of the night. So it was, that the lady vanished and has never been seen since.

Although the Lady had gone, the fountain remained the center of a thriving business and proud residential neighborhood. In 1924 a new and more appropriate statue replaced the once proud Lady. The pioneer family depicted in the new statue stood proudly above the fountain. Once again Indianapolis had a spot of rare beauty to visit. Granted, it was a bit difficult to drive through Fountain Square, since by then the mules and horses had been replaced by automobiles that couldn't negotiate the intersection quite as easily as their 4-legged predecessors. Nonetheless no one seemed to mind slowing down to admire the beauty that stood as a symbol of a proud people in the center of the intersection.

The community continued to grow. Beautiful homes were built by people who wanted to be a part of this community. Churches continued to build, not only buildings dedicated to God, but large congregations dedicated to carrying out God's work. Business establishments continued to expand until Fountain Square became what now would be known as a shopping center.

The stores stayed open until 9:00 on Friday night and Fountain Square was the Great White Way of South Indianapolis. The streets were crowded with shoppers, the drug store soda fountains were the young people's gathering places, and always around the base of the Pioneer Family stood groups of friends just enjoying the beautiful confusion of people. Any trip to Fountain Square was incomplete unless you stopped to toss a coin in the Fountain and make a wish.

By the 1940's there were three theaters at Fountain Square. Any one of which would have rivaled the beauty of a "downtown" theater. There wasn't a vacant store building any place in the business district.

World War II came to Fountain Square as it did everywhere else. The boys left to fight for their country and suddenly the happy Friday night crowds at Fountain Square became a bit more solemn. The gaiety at the soda fountain was replaced by lost and lonely young people. Never, though, did it occur to anyone not to continue to live as nearly a normal life as possible. Perhaps the residents worked even harder at keeping their homes and their yards beautiful, there was so little beauty in their world.

By 1950 the world had settled back into some semblance of a normal life and so, thought the near Southside, they too could look forward to the normal routine of their lives. As progress was changing the profile of the nation its sharp chisel was at work in Fountain Square too.

More people had more cars and could get more places more quickly than ever before. Business began to suffer from lack of customers, it was more fun to visit the new, out-lying shopping centers. Crime began to increase and businessmen suddenly found themselves installing safes and burglar alarms they had never before needed. Older residents passed away and young people began the great migration to the suburbs. Homes formerly lived in and loved by owners became rental property, and the former pride of home and yards began to disappear. One by one the theaters and businesses closed their doors. The final blow to the pride of the near Southside came in 1954 when the transportation authorities deemed it necessary to redesign the Square. The dark day arrived and once again a proud lady, her pioneer husband and two children were placed on the sacrificial altar of progress and vanished from Fountain Square. This time it was not done in the shadowy darkness of night and there was no mystery surrounding its disappearance. It was loaded onto a truck and taken a little farther south to enhance

the beauty of another public place. The Pioneer Family now stood in the Conservatory at Garfield Park.

Neighborhood decay is kin to the decay of the human body, very often it is neglected until the pain becomes so severe you must seek help. The 1950's faded into the 1960's and the sickness of neglect ate away at the one time proud and beautiful Fountain Square area. The streets and alley were neglected and became almost impassable the homes cried out for repair, the yards became rubble heaps and the people became helpless, hopeless, forgotten. The State began buying property for the proposed inter-state highway, and added to the already almost insurmountable problems were abandoned houses that became festering places for ever more heinous crimes and a haven for drunks and arsonists. Gradually small voices became loud enough to be heard as neighborhood groups began to form. From Washington Street to Pleasant Run Parkway, from White River to Sherman Drive people stood up to speak. They were heard, but they just weren't listened to! Always it was the same answer, "We'll fix the streets and alley, we'll tear down the houses, we'll help you on the Southside when we get the money, when we get the manpower, when we can work it into the schedule."

In late 1968 a united voice quietly began to form. By March 1969 that united voice became loud and the United Southside Community Organization was officially organized as the help the near Southside so desperately needed.

Neighborhood civic leagues became a part of U.S.C.O. and together help has come to the Fountain Square area. People are once again repairing their homes, cleaning up their yards, the streets and alleys are being repaired, the abandoned houses are being torn down, business establishments are coming to life, parks are being repaired and reopened, the pride of the near Southside is blooming again. Like flowers that lay dormant all winter and suddenly burst forth proudly with the first warm days of spring, so these people too, once again raise their heads proudly as they begin to look around their neighborhood.

The rebuilding of an entire section of a large city cannot be accomplished in a few short months. It took nearly two decades to make a slum-ghetto area out of a once proud and thriving neighborhood. It may well take a decade for Fountain Square and its surrounding areas to recapture a part of their former beauty but a start has been made.

A symbolic milestone will be reached with a two day celebration June 13th and 14th. As once again the proud Lady and her family will be returned to their rightful place and the Square will once again become Fountain Square. On June 13th the Pioneer Family returns to the intersection of Virginia Avenue, Shelby Street and Prospect Street.

This is the story of a proud people and their struggle back to their inalienable right to live in a decent home, in a decent neighborhood, surrounded by beauty—not decay, hope—not despair. It can be done, it will be done, for the story of Fountain Square proves it.

RHONDA FREY THANKFUL FOR
ELECTRICITY

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we live in an era when going to the moon is a subject of casual and sometimes nonchalant conversation among our young

people. We have progressed so far and so fast technologically in recent years that we are inclined to take for granted many things we have not always had which are so vital to our very existence.

My young constituent Rhonda Frey, of Lyons, Nebr., took occasion to stop and think about the importance of electricity in our lives. Her conclusion—"Electricity is an invaluable blessing" Her essay on this subject won for her a trip to Washington under sponsorship of the Nebraska Rural Electric Association which annually conducts a youth tour to Washington.

Rhonda's essay, "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community," will help all of us to gain a better appreciation of the value of electricity in our daily lives and to this great Nation of ours, and I recommend it to my colleagues, as follows:

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN
OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

The day is in its infancy. The sun has not yet shown itself but there is a stir about the house. Dad rises and stumbles in the darkness to the kitchen. On a shelf he gropes for a candle and matches. Upon lighting the candle, he takes it to Mom. In the dim light and cold air they dress.

Back in the kitchen, Mom lights other chimney lamps to supply light until the sun shows its face. Dad dresses warmly to go out and do the chores.

In the blowing snow, Dad trudges to the new bin. He opens the door to the bin, scoops by hand the grain into a wagon, and drives to the bunks to feed the cattle. He finds an ax to break the ice in the cattle tank. After he carries feed and water to the ducks, Dad returns to the house.

Meanwhile, Mom has awakened the children and begun breakfast. As she searches for a can opener, she cuts her finger on a knife. After taking time out to doctor her finger, she opens a jar of fruit. She places the jar with a platter of cold meat, butter, and bread on the table. Because the milk must last indefinitely, it will be rationed carefully throughout the day. All the while she shivers as she moves through the cold air; if only there were fuel to heat the house!

John and Billy come downstairs slowly so their candle won't go out. They put on their coats and sit down at the table. By now, Dad is in from doing chores and the family eats a cold breakfast together.

The day goes slowly. Mom can't do the dishes because she must save the water; she does the mending by hand; she can't bake because there is no fuel; she sweeps to keep warm. Dad busies himself by catching up on his reading. The boys spend their time arguing until Mom makes them sit down to read a book but sitting so still chills them. The snowstorm lets up, so she sends the boys outside to let off some steam.

Never had a day gone so slowly. The minutes seem like hours, especially since the clocks had stopped. Finally the sky darkens again. Sighing with boredom, everyone is glad to have the day over.

Nobody changes into his night clothes, since it's so cold. In the quiet depression and cold of the house, the blankets are dug from the storage room. Just as Mom spreads on the last blanket, the lights suddenly go on.

Dad hurries to inspect the furnace and turn on the heat. Silently, Mom and Dad are thankful the electricity blackout didn't last any longer than it did.

This imaginary situation can and often will happen, even in the year 1969. Electricity, often taken for granted, can't fully be appreciated until one has had to spend even a few hours without it.

Electricity, whether rural or not, is an invaluable blessing!

THE PRESIDENT OF ZAMBIA SPEAKS
ON THE PROBLEMS OF SOUTHERN
AFRICA

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the situation which exists today in southern Africa is a tense one. Black Africans of this particular region are truly beginning to assert their just demands for the right to rule themselves and determine their own national directions.

The first years of independence are never easy for any developing nation, but the Republic of Zambia is faced with all those problems unique to emerging African nations, in addition to bordering on areas governed by hostile colonial and white supremacist governments.

Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, the President of Zambia, has been instrumental in the steady economic and political progress which has been made by Zambia, and his leadership has helped Zambia to remain relatively stable, despite a potentially rich, but as yet underdeveloped economy, and hostile neighbors. His performance as President has not only benefited his own country, but has been an outstanding example to all black people of this troubled region.

I believe that President Kaunda is eminently qualified to speak on the problems of the area, not only by virtue of his position, but also because he is able to relate the desires and aspirations of the people to the problems of leadership and examine them in a practical manner.

His Excellency, Rupiah Banda, Zambian Ambassador to the United States, is another articulate voice for the black peoples of southern Africa. His representation of his country in the United States has furthered American understanding of his nation's problems, and has helped the representatives of many nations to grasp the importance and urgency of the crises which confront Zambia and other young African States. It was Mr. Banda who first brought this interview with Dr. Kaunda to my attention. I have asked that this article be placed in the RECORD with the hope that it will help bolster my colleagues' understanding of the situation which faces the people of Zambia, as well as all the black peoples of southern Africa.

EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA,

Washington, D.C., April 8, 1969.

Dear Friend: I trust that you will find the attached copy of an interview by *U.S. News & World Report* with Dr. Kenneth D. Kaunda, President of Zambia, both interesting and informative. It contains clear outlines and clarifications of our Government's policies relative to Zambia's neighbours and to the protection and encouragement of foreign investments.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

R. B. BANDA,
Ambassador.

[From U.S. News & World Report]

RACE WAR COMING IN AFRICA?—INTERVIEW
WITH ZAMBIA'S PRESIDENT

LUSAKA.—Q. Your Excellency, what matters do you consider most urgent for a new and developing country such as yours?

A. I would say, first and foremost, that, in a country like Zambia, you need political stability, because only if you have this would you really have the opportunity to implement your other plans, which involve mainly the fight against mankind's enemies—poverty, ignorance, disease and hunger.

Q. Do you have any problems with respect to political stability in Zambia?

A. Well, we have had our spate of strong tribal factions. Then, last year we had general elections within our political party, and these created a number of ill feelings. Inter-provincial feelings were greatly aroused. But I'm glad to say that we are definitely getting over these, and I think as time goes on we will be able to surmount them.

Apart from that, we have serious problems with the minority regimes all around us. We have the Portuguese in Angola and Mozambique, east and west of us, and we have the Rhodesians and the South Africans. These people do not accept our approach to life—which is a nonracial approach, nontribal—and this is a source of concern within our community, because these people do not like the apparent stability here. These are our major problems at the moment.

Q. With respect to the racial situation in southern Africa, what is the situation that Zambia faces geographically, since you have a landlocked country?

A. This is a problem to which I have been trying to draw the attention of the Western world at various meetings. I feel that perhaps I have not succeeded in this direction, but not because I have not explained it. My colleagues in the party and the Government have tried to do the same, but they are not succeeding either.

This is how I see the problem:

Here we have South Africa proper, South-West Africa, Rhodesia; we have Angola and Mozambique. Now we must see this in the context of developments in other parts of the world. To expect Africans in Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, South-West Africa and Rhodesia to continue to remain docile under minority rule is not being realistic at all. History the world over shows that, no matter how long it takes the time does come when people refuse to be subjected to that type of rule.

The latest example is the one in Czechoslovakia, where we have had this uprising against great odds; even against these odds, the people have still spoken out. You had the Yugoslavs in 1948, the Hungarians in 1956, and now the Czechs in 1968. It's a long time in between, but they have spoken out.

Now, I have no reason to believe the people in Czechoslovakia are different from Rhodesians. They may have experienced this type of rule for a longer period, but still the feelings are the same.

Q. What meaning does this have for southern Africa?

A. We see in Mozambique now an uprising against the Portuguese after four centuries of Portuguese rule. In Angola, it is the same thing. Three years ago, no one would have convinced me that the people in Rhodesia would be doing what they are doing now, and yet, here they are, the people in Rhodesia are fighting it out. Unlike Czechoslovakia, we have here a potentially explosive situation racially. And not only does it have this racial setting, but it also has the potential of being an ideological confrontation.

Now, the people of the West have refused to help freedom fighters; they have refused to equip them to fight their own battles. I know from experience that the freedom fighters have gone to them and the Western nations

have said, "No, we can't"—naturally, because of their capital investments in southern Africa. This leaves these young men and women with no choice at all but to go the only area where they will be supplied, namely, the East.

So, as they go there to train in the use of these various weapons, as they go there to solicit help to get these weapons, you can rest assured that out of a hundred, 4, 5, or 6 will come out convinced Communists, and so here is the beginning of ideological conflict. And yet the minority groups in southern Africa proclaim from the rooftops that they are defending Christian values, Western values, Western civilization; that they are combating Communism. And yet, by their own behavior, they are inviting Communism.

Zambia has more than a moral interest in this because we know only too well that, geographically, we have 290,000 square miles, with a population of 4 million scattered over the country. We know there are freedom fighters who pass through Zambia. There's nothing we can do about that. I wish we could help them, but we are not capable of helping them. So they go out to train. They go out to get these various weapons, and this alone is for Zambia a danger to her security, but there is nothing we can do about it.

Q. Do these guerrillas pass through Zambia on their way down to Rhodesia and South Africa?

A. Certainly. Going out and coming back to their own country, they pass through Zambia, and this is a problem because it means that the Portuguese in Mozambique, the Portuguese in Angola raid us, kill our people, take some away, and all on the pretext that we were harboring freedom fighters. They know only too well that this is not true, but they've got to use some excuse to satisfy their own minority regimes, so this is a danger to Zambia.

Apart from the moral involvement, we, of course, have a very selfish interest in this. If we could solve this problem peacefully, it is the only thing we would like to do. But is it possible?

Q. How long do you think the Africans in these countries will remain docile? How long will it be before real trouble breaks out?

A. The Portuguese troops in Mozambique have been pushed aside from a good area, which is now in the hands of the freedom fighters, the nationalists, and it is the same in Angola. It is just the beginning—it started seven years ago, in 1961, and the nationalists now are in full control of some areas.

Q. You have been quoted as saying there is a serious danger of racial wars breaking out along the line of the Zambezi River. Specifically, how do you see such a thing coming about?

A. Well, let's look at it now. I'll give you some examples of where the Portuguese have bombed our villages. Surely, the only thing that stopped us from retaliating was that we were unable to at the time, and it is only a matter of time before we can retaliate heavily. And this is when the Portuguese will call upon the South Africans to come and help them, and there you are—a very dangerous situation.

Q. What are you asking the outside world, the big powers, to do about all this?

A. The big powers have an obligation to us and the rest of humanity.

First of all, you must realize that when we speak of the big powers we speak of the West because, as it is now, Russia has no more right to condemn the West as imperialist. They must condemn themselves now as imperialists, too, because if they feel strongly about the people in Rhodesia—the black people—I feel the same way about the people in Hungary, the people in Czechoslovakia, and Russia is just another imperialist power to me. It will take a long time to recover from this shock—and a shock it was.

I never believed that a country that called itself a socialist country could do that.

To come back to the subject: The Western countries must really influence South Africa, and Rhodesia so that they can develop a system there which involves what all of us regard as the cardinal point, that is, participation in their own government by all the people all over the country.

Q. Are you talking about majority rule?

A. Yes, and if this could come about it would be the answer to the problem. I know of no African leader who has said, either before or after independence, that he wanted to drive away all the white people. But the white must accept the will of the majority of the people.

Q. In connection with Zambia's building up its defenses, there has been talk that you are going to buy missiles from the British. If this is so, would you have the personnel to operate them?

A. We are still approaching a number of governments, both in the West and in the East. Before we make our purchases, we obviously must get the best deal, so as soon as we are ready we will make the purchases, but I can't say definitely where we will get them.

Q. Will you need foreign technicians to operate them?

A. This will be one of the provisions in making these purchases—a training program for Zambians. This is obviously something Zambians themselves must handle.

Q. With respect to Rhodesia, do you feel that situation will be resolved peacefully and, if so, in what manner?

A. I would say first of all that Rhodesia has been and still is a British colony, and therefore is primarily a British problem. If the British Government had wanted to settle that problem, the world today would not be suffering from it; it is because of the refusal of the British Government to do so that the whole of southern Africa is now on fire.

Now, when you ask me what should be done, I would say that much depends on the willingness of Mr. Wilson [British Prime Minister Harold Wilson] to do the right thing, and to me this means only the use of force. If Mr. Wilson doesn't use force now, force is going to be employed anyway, with wide repercussions.

WHY SANCTIONS FAIL

Q. Do you think, then, that the Rhodesian situation cannot be solved peacefully?

A. I can't see how. Economic sanctions, for example, are coming too late, as is usual when big powers are involved. If the measures that are being taken now had been taken earlier, there might have been some hope.

Let us understand that the aim and objective of the sanctions exercise is not just to make sanctions bite economically. It is to bring down a rebellion—a rebellion against the Queen of England, a rebellion against the British people, their Government and, indeed, a rebellion against humanity as a whole. I would say it's a very sad thing. I really feel that mankind has been betrayed by the British Government's inaction.

Q. Since the British seem extremely reluctant to use force against the Rhodesians, then what happens?

A. The thing I fear—racial war. It's inevitable unless, of course [Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian] Smith himself has a change of heart.

We are not saying that majority rule should come tomorrow. We are saying they should lay down the foundation for majority rule. Indeed, we ourselves would discuss this with our nationalist friends in Rhodesia and say, "Look, chaps, you've got to take time over this one." But, as long as Smith categorically states that there is no question of majority rule in his lifetime, then, of course, he's inviting trouble. Then the African people will say, "All right, if this is the case, then we are prepared to die for our independence."

Q. When you say you would not expect majority rule for Rhodesia tomorrow, would you apply that to South Africa as well?

A. Yes, certainly. It can't come tomorrow. That's not being realistic.

Q. And the Portuguese territories as well?

A. For the Portuguese territories, if they were willing to accept Africans in government, I would say that even tomorrow it would be settled and, in fact, the Portuguese would gain a lot more from their giving way to African majority rule. The same for Rhodesia, of course.

South Africa is the only exception here. It is a much more complicated situation where you have 3 million whites and 15 million in other racial groups. It is a much more serious problem there.

Q. In view of the situation along the Zambezi River as it stands now, are you optimistic or pessimistic about future developments?

A. Short term, I'm pretty pessimistic. It's a very gloomy picture, indeed. But I emphasize only short-term.

Q. What do you mean by short term?

A. I mean peace in southern Africa in 3, 4, or 5 years' time. I can't see that coming at all. I think the time will come eventually when Rhodesia will no longer be ruled by a minority group. The same for Angola and Mozambique. South Africa is a most difficult problem, but these others, I think, are going to be solved. There will be a big change in this part of the world 3 to 6 years from now.

Q. Will there be a lot of bloodshed in the meantime?

A. I'm afraid so. I fear that very much indeed.

Q. Why does Zambia seem to have fewer tribal problems than many other countries in Africa?

A. I think it's because we had a long time of struggle against so many forces—first of all, against the colonial government; then we had to fight against the federal government [Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland]. All these things managed to really bring us together and, of course, we have always been conscious of the fact that we had to make a united nation.

Q. What is your country's relationship with the United States? Do you feel that the U.S. has some understanding of the problems that Zambia is facing?

A. If I may begin with the last part of your question:

Well-informed circles in the U.S.—Government circles—understand very sympathetically, but perhaps the majority of the people would not understand our problems, and one cannot blame them. To them, Zambia is a faraway country with very little importance apart from the fact that it produces copper, like the Americans do.

I think I can also say that there has been a very strong lobby among "right-wing" groups in the U.S., as in Europe, which are trying to fortify the minority groups in southern Africa. This they have worked at very effectively. All the same, generally speaking, I would say we have had a great deal of sympathy from the U.S. Government.

Q. Does the current racial situation in the U.S. have any impact on American relations with Zambia?

A. While it does affect us adversely in the sense that we feel strongly against racialism anywhere in the world, at the same time we are conscious of the fact that, unlike the minority regimes here in southern Africa, the U.S. has certainly declared policies which it is trying to implement, trying to build up multiracial society. So we do make a distinction. We realize that you are going through certain strains and stresses of a racial nature, but at the same time we realize that, in principle at least, you have set yourself certain goals which are noble.

HOW UNITED STATES HELPS ZAMBIA

Q. Is the United States doing much to help Zambia's development?

A. There are two or three forms of help. First is direct U.S. Government aid, and this is being done mainly at the regional level in Africa, which we would like to encourage. We have our own region here—east and central Africa.

Then there is participation by private enterprise in various development schemes, participation by the business world.

And then there is the World Bank, which is still considered a predominantly American institution, guided by the U.S.

Q. To go back to the question of race relations: How would you describe such relations within Zambia, where you have a substantial minority of whites and other non-Africans?

A. We follow here a multiracial approach to our problems. We have these minority groups: I would say between 65,000 and 75,000 white people here now, 22,000 of Asian origin, and a number of what we call "Eurafricans"—the offspring of black and white or Asian and white or brown and black parents. These are our major racial groups who have come from outside.

In terms of whether they are wanted here, basically we say we accept all human beings who want to make a home in Zambia and who will make a useful contribution to the growth of the country at the social, political or economic levels.

Q. Must they become Zambian citizens?

A. Either way, we have no objection, but we say first of all that because of our employment problems we cannot just open our door wide; otherwise we just create more problems. Because of this, we cannot ultimately allow to enter everyone who wants to come here, but if it is a person with a clean record, someone who has something to contribute, he is welcome.

I am not just speaking in terms of technical know-how and things of that nature, but of anyone who can contribute, in his attitude toward life, toward the growth of the nation, possibly without having any skills at all.

Today we have a good number of miners in the copper belt, very good people—white people—but at the same time, there are a number of them whose orientation is toward South Africa and Rhodesia, and these are the people who create problems; these are the people who cause the racial conflicts which arise from time to time.

So, I would say that, in general, we accept our fellow men not only because of their technical know-how, but because they are human beings like us.

At the same time, we are conscious of unemployment problems in our country.

Q. In view of the controversy over Rhodesian independence do these white people whom you speak of here in Zambia constitute any real danger to the country?

A. Certainly. We have had a number of arrests since 1965, so I had to produce for the country and for overseas consumption a White Paper on these people. First, when we arrested them we used to deport them, but we realized we were just giving ourselves a bad name by doing that, because they would go out proclaiming themselves heroes who were being discriminated against on a racial basis.

Q. What did they do to be arrested?

A. They were spying for Rhodesia and South Africa. When we rounded up one lot, I decided to issue a White Paper which outlined precisely what their activities had been, and this helped a great deal and put the minds of certain people at rest, people who thought we were just being racial.

Q. Is that situation under control now?

A. It's under control, but, as you know, spies are very difficult people to deal with the world over, and we are only a young country and our facilities are limited.

Q. Can you do without the skills of these people? Can you replace them, or are they indispensable?

A. Most of them, unfortunately, are indispensable. I don't know whether this is common knowledge or not, but at the time of our independence in 1964 we had only about 1,200 boys and girls who had gone through secondary school, and only about 100 university graduates. Among these, we had one engineer and a handful of doctors.

When I recall this, it pains me greatly because this was the richest British protectorate, or colony, and yet educationwise we were the least catered for by the British, and this makes it very difficult for us to do away with the services of people who otherwise are racist. We can't. We must run the mines, and our lack of technical education means that we have to depend on expatriates in the technical field.

We are trying now to establish technical-education facilities for our own people, but it obviously is going to take a long time before we can get desired results.

Q. Does this current lack of local skills apply outside the copper industry—in other fields and in Government?

A. It certainly does. It's true in private enterprise, in small business, in industry, the public sector.

Q. How long will it be before you are able to educate enough Zambians to do these jobs?

A. It's difficult to speak in terms of time, really, for Zambia with its copper industry is highly industrialized. All of our industries need many people, and Government itself needs plenty of manpower, so it will take much time.

Q. Is Zambia basically a rich country?

A. Potentially, yes, but not in terms of exploited wealth, which is a long time ahead. Very often, when people look at the figures of copper production, they think we are doing very well indeed, but in fact when we look at the rural areas, which concern me a great deal because they were neglected in the colonial days, we realize that we cannot improve them as quickly and effectively as we would like to.

Q. Do you have any substantial resources apart from copper?

A. The agricultural potential has not been exploited. We are just beginning.

Q. Do you have lots of good land?

A. Certainly—good cattle land—and I think we could also do a lot of work in terms of groundnut [peanut] production, cotton, tobacco, maize [corn] and various other food lines. Which means we would be able to diversify from complete dependence upon copper.

Q. How great is your need for development capital, and in what fields is it needed?

A. We have been doing quite well, I would say, up to this year. But unless outside help comes, we are bound to run into difficulties between 1971 and 1973, before the breakthrough comes. We will need help principally in the agricultural industry. This is not to say we don't value the copper industry and other industry. We do, and we are trying to find more deposits of various minerals. But, in the main, we must concentrate on agricultural development.

PROTECTION FOR INVESTORS

Q. Are you taking steps to encourage private investment in Zambia?

A. Yes. We're about to go through with our Foreign Investment Act, which will safeguard foreign investment from being nationalized without due compensation. As soon as this is done, I think we will have to advertise the fact overseas, so that people will have no need to fear Government intervention in industries here.

Q. Do you have a problem common to new countries of making sure that impressive increases in national growth rates, which Zambia has been recording each year, are spread more evenly among the people?

A. We have, really, two countries in one—the urban areas and the rural areas. The

urban areas have been doing quite well, comparatively speaking, because of the copper industry, which has made it possible for other industries to grow up.

But the rural areas are a great worry. In most cases, our people are still where the colonialists left them. So we need to get the support of these rural people in order to aid their development. I'm all for a welfare state, but with the people's own participation. The people must build it, not the Government for the people.

Q. Do you have any plans for Government participation in the copper industry?

A. None whatsoever. We'll leave that one in private hands. We can't afford it. We can't manage it.

The copper companies, in fairness to them, asked us when we took over the Government whether we would like to have something like 30 per cent interest, but we said "No," we'd let them continue as they were.

NUCLEAR POWER IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 years, the Congress has wisely financed and encouraged the development of atomic power for peaceful uses, particularly the development of civilian atomic powerplants. Many years ago, this body decided that such a program was in the national interest. Our reasons, among others, were that a new, competitive energy source would benefit all people of the Nation, particularly in the high-energy cost regions, it would help conserve the remaining fossil fuels and it would help us meet our enormous demand for more and more electricity.

However, for the past few years, a small band of people has been parading around the country charging that the Congress and the AEC are threatening the life and limb of every man, woman, and child in the Nation by permitting construction of nuclear powerplants. I imagine that many Members of this body have received letters from constituents who are concerned about the information they receive from this antinuclear group.

For the information of those Members, I am inserting in the RECORD a report on a conference in New Hampshire recently, which focused on the topic "Nuclear Power—Benefits and Risks." This conference was significant in that it marked one of the few times when the antinuclear people have appeared on a program with the technical experts on atomic energy whose opinions they so readily dispute.

The article is from the June issue of Nuclear News magazine, which does not profess to be impartial but which is at least informed and intelligent on the subject. The article follows:

IN PURSUIT OF PUBLIC AWARENESS

(NOTE.—Conservationist conference presents "both sides" on nuclear power; debate fizzles as Novick walks out after his speech is called "grossly incompetent and irresponsible" by Wright.)

The New Hampshire Governor's Confer-

ence on Natural Resources has become an important annual event in New England, and the 1969 program had so much of the makings of a real donnybrook that all previous attendance records were shattered. These conferences are sponsored by conservationist agencies and groups,¹ and the current program planners decided it would be a very good year to talk about nuclear power. When they carried their idea to Governor Peterson, he reasoned it was a suitable topic, but he insisted that "both sides" be presented. The outcome: "Nuclear Power—Benefits and Risks," Concord, N.H., April 23, 24.

WORTHY OPPONENTS

The program committee apparently had little or no trouble in lining up the debaters for the negative team. They were familiar with the Stratton Mountain Conference held last fall in Vermont, and they knew that their neighbors had turned to an organization called S.I.P.I., which had provided ample ammunition for the symposium. The New Hampshire group made contact with S.I.P.I. through its Field Director, Walter Bogan, who booked Sheldon Novick (author of "The Careless Atom" and associate editor of the S.I.P.I. magazine *Environment*) for the luncheon speaker and Dean Abrahamson (College of Medical Sciences, University of Minnesota, and recent opponent to the Monticello nuclear plant—*Science*, Mar. 7, '69, p. 1043) and Clarence Carlson (Conservation Department, Cornell University and member of The Citizens Committee to Save Cayuga Lake—*NV*, Mar. '69) to give papers on the risks of nuclear power plants.

Those who were to debate the affirmative were selected later (about two weeks before the conference), and they were chosen by the Public Services Company of New Hampshire—owner-operator of the Newington nuclear plant to be built near Seabrook, N.H. Reportedly, the utility officials were critical of the programming and particularly of Novick's position as luncheon speaker. A move was made to replace him with Rep. Craig Hosmer (R., Calif.), but this threatened to topple the whole conference so it was set aside. The nuclear people also balked over the conference technique employed at Stratton Mountain, where Theos J. Thompson, carrying the ball for nuclear, was first on the program and was followed by the antinuclear (S.I.P.I.) speakers. No opportunity was afforded Thompson to rebut publicly or to refute any of the arguments subsequently presented. To overcome this objection, the New Hampshire committee planned the first day's program for formal presentations and set aside the second day for three separate group discussions, each to allow debate among panel members and questioning from the floor.

The nuclear organizers, whetted by the opportunity for a free and open debate before a very interested and concerned public and for a confrontation with Novick, were able to find an unusually strong and competent debating team—even on short notice and in the face of conflicting conferences. For the affirmative: Jim Wright (manager of the Westinghouse Advanced Reactor System—disarmingly mild mannered, but a tough and incisive debater); Morton Goldman (vice president and manager of Environmental Safeguards, NUS—possessor of extraordinary credentials and experience directly related to public health and safety and a straightforward manner of presenting detailed facts

¹ Trout Unlimited; Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests; New Hampshire Committee for Better Water; New Hampshire Rural Areas Development Committee; Cooperative Extension Service; New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development; and New Hampshire Fish and Game Department.

and figures); containment and construction expert, William Patterson (vice president EBASCO Services); and finally AEC lawyer, Howard Shapar (assistant general counsel for Licensing and Regulation).

DANIELS OR DAVIDS

At the beginning of the conference, the nuclear debating team may have felt a bit like martyrs before the lions: A table in the entranceway to the conference room was well-stocked with the classical anti-nuclear literature—some of the articles even had the most frightening passages underscored. (Missing from the collection: Theos J. Thompson's scholarly review of "The Careless Atom," published by the Atomic Industrial Forum in its special March issue of *INFO*.) The auditorium was filled to capacity, and the name tags identified the attendees as state officials and legislators, housewives, businessmen, and representatives of such organizations as League of Women Voters, Audubon Society, New England Wild Flower Preservation Society, and Trout Unlimited. A large contingency, apparently from the Park Service, wore uniforms and side arms.

But the Daniels at the beginning may have had some cause to feel more like Davids at the end—a point in time at which they stood fast as dedicated professionals ready and willing to talk on any facet of nuclear power and to answer any question—including those from a very calm, petite, and low-voiced lady judge from Brattleboro, Vt., who was concerned about a strange set of leukemia cases and was worried about radioactive materials becoming lost along the roads; a worry enhanced, no doubt, by some of the literature handouts.

On the other hand, Abrahamson and Novick left before the second day's debate, and the embarrassed program planners were forced to announce to a packed room, "Due to circumstances beyond our control . . ." Abrahamson had informed his hosts on the first day of a legitimate conflict at his hospital, but with Novick it was another story. Already peeved about arriving in Concord at 2:00 a.m. in a rainstorm and finding no room in the hotel (see Editor's Memorandum) and cross with the planners for first not informing him fully on the program—the debate, in particular—and second because they simply gave him an airline schedule (and didn't book his return flight). The local organizers said Novick was accompanied by his press agent, Bogan, and they had relayed everything to him expecting that he would take care of the details. As a consequence, Novick chose to book a noon flight out of Boston on the second day, which necessitated a 9:00 a.m. departure from Concord—the debate was scheduled to start at 9:30.

CONFRONTATION

Novick announced his imminent departure at a press-conference breakfast, which prompted Jim Wright, seeing he was going to miss the opportunity for an open debate, to maneuver for a direct confrontation. He told the press that many of Novick's statements made in his luncheon address and in his book are "totally erroneous," and he proceeded to question the objectivity and responsibility of Novick's publishers and sponsoring institute.

But there was no confrontation—Novick did not respond.

RADIOLOGY

Although thermal effects came in for some legalistic discussions, particularly by New Hampshire lawyer Peter Shapiro, who was rehearsing his arguments for presentation before the U.S. Supreme Court, the primary focus of the conference was on potential radiological hazards from the floor on the second day, this is a real area of concern among the New Hampshire citizens. This seems to be a shift in emphasis on the part of the con-

servationists (if not by the public), and it has been suggested that the opponents of nuclear power have homed in on radiological safety because the AEC cannot exclude these arguments from its public hearings as it has been legally able to do with thermal effects.²

Both Wright and Goldman gave impressive arguments and detailed statistics on the minute amounts (less than 1% of permissible limits established by international radiological standards) of radioactivity discharged from a nuclear power plant and told of the rigorous monitoring programs and control measures in effect to protect the public health and safety, but Abrahamson and Carlson countered that the minute quantities are additives and that the total future effects cannot be accurately calculated at this time. Both antagonists came out strongly in favor of nuclear power, but they argued that the technology is now available to preclude any radioactive or thermal discharge into the environment—both points were challenged by the protagonists. Concluded Abrahamson and Carlson: the price in dollars must be paid now for preventive measures.

NOVICK

By a strange coincidence, Merril Eisenbud, professor of environmental medicine, NYU, and director of The New York City Environmental Protection Administration, appeared on the Today Show on the morning of the conference's first day, and, among other things, reported that more radioactivity goes up the stack of a coal burner than from a nuclear plant. This became a keynote item to which several conference speakers returned on numerous occasions, but none more dramatically than Novick during his luncheon address.

"Talking about quantities of radioactivity coming from a coal stack is missing the point," said Novick. "Man may be in worse shape standing in the plume of a coal plant than he is in the plume of a nuclear plant, but, if you blanketed the earth with soot, the background radiation would not change from a coal plant. You are just moving material. With nuclear plants the problem is different because you are creating radioactivity and increasing the background."

Novick's address centered generally on two themes: The "incestuous" relationship between the AEC and the JCAE (Ellen Thro, NN, May '69); and the maximum credible nuclear accident—a condition under which he postulates his favorite horror-thriller, the "China Problem."

Using the Atomic Energy Act as his take-off point, Novick spoke of the unique federal agency it created with a monopoly to develop, promote, and regulate the nuclear industry and of the JCAE—"Senior men with a unique influence in Congress." Across the years, he said, "strange and disturbing things" have happened: "The AEC and the JCAE have begun to merge and blend and to change their identity; for example, JCAE staff members seem to come from the AEC, and AEC Commissioners from the JCAE staff." With a relationship such as this, he said, one cannot expect the government to re-evaluate itself, and he cited as an example the current budgetary manipulations to cut back on government spending in which "peaceful uses of nuclear energy came off with more money than it started with." He concluded that this is what happens "when the government controls its own activities."

Novick stressed that he is in complete agreement with his opponents that a nuclear reactor "cannot explode," which is contrary

² Indeed, radioactive discharge has not always been thought of as a problem. In the early days during the Ravenswood hearings, when asked how much radioactivity would be discharged into the East River the classic answer was "not enough."

to what his own magazine publishes (see box) and, as Goldman later pointed out, to what his publishers say in their book promotion campaigns. Explosion or no explosion, Novick postulates a nuclear accident called the "China Problem," which happens with loss of coolant: "Within 5 seconds the fuel rods will burst and some will shatter; within a few minutes the entire mass will melt into the bottom of the reactor, where the radioactive decay from the residue continues to put out heat. Pouring water on the dense lump won't do any good, and you get the 'China Problem,' where the molten lump will melt through the bottom of the reactor and on down to China."

He said that reactors are operated by people and that people make mistakes, and he asked the question: "Do we have confidence that every contingency has been foreseen and every consequence forestalled?" He concluded that we do not, and he turned again to the AEC-JCAE, which, he said, are insulated from outside pressure. As an example of this last claim, he said the New Hampshire conference was the first time the AEC has appeared on a panel with its critics. As a parting admonition, he warned his audience: "It is imperative that we do not abandon decision making to those charged with promoting the program."

REBUTTAL

Some of Novick's statements were to be challenged later: Howard Shapar referred to the numerous public hearing rooms in which the AEC has faced its critics and under conditions permitting cross examination—"the best known method for getting out the truth." An AEC representative has calculated that the current AEC budget, cut by some \$78.6 million, can be compared with the previous budget as follows: In Johnson's last budget, the AEC's defense portion was 52%; in Nixon's budget, the AEC defense portion is 53%. Stated another way: "Peaceful uses of nuclear energy came out with less money than it started with."

But the dynamics were provided by Wright, who had trouble containing himself as a head-table guest during Novick's address, and after the luncheon he was swarmed upon by the press seeking a rebuttal. Calling much of the talk "grossly incompetent and irresponsible" and warning that Novick should be read and heard with "extreme caution," Wright reiterated nuclear safety records, criteria, and implementations, and, on the matter of environmental effects, he returned to the main theme of his formal paper to say that the economic advantages are not nuclear power's most important attribute—the main benefit is that nuclear power is "least damaging" to the natural environment. Nuclear power, he said, is the first major exception to "man's lack of foresight in his long series of progressive steps toward a better world," because matters of environmental effects and safety standards were anticipated before commercial nuclear power came into being.

RATIONAL PLANNING

After all was said and done, it was really the home folks who scored the major points (with perhaps the exception of a young man from the coal industry who stood up and told the people from New Hampshire that they were going to need every kilowatt they could come by, be it from nuclear, coal, or whale oil, which, panelist Goldman quipped, "would also have some effect on the ecology!")

In a formal paper during the first day, William Tallman, president of Public Service Company of New Hampshire, warned that if there are any more delays on the Seabrook plant schedule there will be a serious shortage of electricity in New Hampshire around 1974. He said his utility is not pioneering in nuclear (Yankee-Rowe, Connecticut Yankee, and the nuclear submarines were cited as

proven precedents), and he stressed "we too live in New Hampshire, and we want things to be right." Perhaps the biggest boost for both Tallman and nuclear came in his introduction by Mrs. Jean L. Hennessey, housewife and member of the New Hampshire Committee for Better Water, who chaired one session. As a conservationist, she said, she had always been led to believe that utility executives are all some kind of devil dead-set on destroying the wonders of nature. Then she ticked off the conservation programs on which she has served with Tallman, and she admitted that she was forced to introduce him as a leading citizen with an established record of concern for the conservation of natural resources.

Finally, it was anchorman R. Frank Gregg, chairman, New England River Basins Commission, in the final paper of the day, who brought things into the most rational framework. Without fuss or fanfare and citing such documents as "Considerations Affecting Steam Power Plant Site Selection" by the U.S. Office of Science and Technology (NN, Feb. '69) and the Statement on Thermal Power Plant Siting prepared by his own commission, he called for deliberate and rational planning on power requirements and commitments. In conclusion, he urged the conferees to rely on the knowledge of distinguished professional people and to be careful lest they be deprived of nuclear power because of some emotional and questionable claims that are being put forth.

EPILOGUE

Two weeks later, Paul Bofinger, forester for the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests and head of the conference planning committee, told *Nuclear News* that he considered the conference a real success. "Many people," he said, "have told me that they sure know a lot more now about nuclear power than they did before."

He also admitted that he had heard quite a few critical remarks about Novick's failure to appear before the public discussion.

LOUIS BACHRACH OF THE BRONX

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago this Saturday, one of the most beloved men in my home community passed away. Louis Bachrach was a staunch and active support of the Bronx Boys Club, and it was in that capacity that I came to know him, but the boys club was only one of many organizations to which he devoted his great energies and talents. Probably the one organization that was closest to his heart was the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, N.Y. Louis Bachrach was chairman of the home's Bronx division, and among other activities organized a remarkably successful dinner and journal each year. His breezy and affectionately humorous way of presiding at the dinner was unforgettable.

By unanimous consent I include herewith two brief remembrances of Louis Bachrach with which I wholeheartedly and warmly concur. The first was prepared by his lifetime associate in business and in innumerable good causes, Abraham Gurevich, and the second by the officers and board of directors of the Hebrew Home for the Aged:

On December 7, 1968 Bronx County lost a distinguished citizen, Mr. Louis Bachrach. He was a resident of the Bronx for fifty years, and for almost forty of those years he served as Treasurer of Security Mutual Insurance Company of New York, the only insurance company with a Bronx Home Office, and one of the outstanding business organizations in Bronx County.

Louis Bachrach was known throughout the Bronx as a man of personal wit and charm, and was an ardent worker and contributor for all worthy charities and causes such as the Bronx Boys Club, the United Jewish Appeal, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, the Akiba Hebrew Academy, the Jewish Theological Seminary, the American Jewish Congress, and in particular, the Hebrew Home for the Aged at Riverdale, which was his pet charity.

He had lived in the Kingsbridge community of the Bronx for many years, and was one of the founders and builders of the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center.

This short man with a big cigar, flavorful accent and kindly wit, could enliven any fundraising gathering by his unique capacity for public speaking. Largely a self-educated man, he had the practical knowledge and keen ability to get things done. His was a rare talent for all forms of opinion and a genuine acceptance of people, as well as a deep sense of social respect for his own family and extending to every member of his community.

Mr. Louis Bachrach will indeed be missed by everyone in Bronx County.

Louis Bachrach came from Russia as a boy of 12 and settled with his parents in Harlem. He was soon working at odd trades to earn a livelihood for himself and his family.

In 1929 he was one of the principal organizers of the Security Mutual Insurance Company of New York. He was associated with the Company as its Treasurer for 40 years.

Largely self educated, Mr. Bachrach devoted 65 years of his life in this country and until the day of his death to a host of civic, religious, educational and charitable causes and agencies. He had a full appreciation of the importance of serving the community as a serious dedicated worker.

He was wise in the ways of this world. He was kind and considerate, fully aware of his responsibilities to his fellow man. He acted out these responsibilities in a way that resulted in productive projects benefitting the community and all the people in it.

It was characteristic of him to walk in the ways of his sainted parents. His mother of blessed memory was one of the founders in 1917 and an early supporter of The Hebrew Home for the Aged of Harlem.

Louis Bachrach was a loyal son, devoted to the ideals of his mother. From the time that she helped found the Home, until the day of his own passing, Mr. Bachrach helped to build and maintain the institution. It now shelters and cares for 560 elderly residents in beautiful modern facilities set in an 18½ acre private park overlooking the Hudson River.

He served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Home. He was a Vice Chairman of its New Building "Foundation Fund", and an Honorary President of its Bronx Division. For seven years, he led the Bronx Division as its President. In this high office, he established new fund raising records, producing large sums of money for its New Building "Foundation Fund".

He was a prominent member of the Building Industry League of the Bronx. He was to have been the Guest of Honor of their Annual Dinner, the evening of the day he passed away.

Among his other communal activities was his leadership of the fund raising campaigns of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, the United Jewish Appeal and the Israel Bond

Drives. He was actively identified with the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Boys Club of the Bronx, the YMCA, Akiba Hebrew Academy, the Jewish Theological Seminary and the American Jewish Congress. He was a founder, builder and former Officer of the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center.

For all his good works, Louis Bachrach will be long remembered. His devotion to the welfare of his fellow man will forever remain a blessing. He is missed in the councils of all the organizations and causes he served so well. His sense of humor and most of all his loyalty and devotion to his friends and associates and to the things that he held dear were an inspiration.

UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP: KEY TO HEMISPHERIC SOLIDARITY IN TODAY'S FAST-CHANGING WORLD

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important elements in America's foreign policy has always been our close relationship and spirit of cooperation with our sister republics to the south.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am particularly aware of the vital necessity to maintain an attitude of mutual cooperation between ourselves and our good neighbors in Latin America.

So, I was especially pleased to read two outstanding statements recently on the subject of hemispheric solidarity and its meaning in today's world of rapid change and often turbulent conditions.

These statements were made by Dr. Misael Pastrana-Borrero, Ambassador of Colombia to the United States, and contain a most thoughtful discussion of the problems and opportunities we face as we strive together for a true partnership for progress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the Ambassador's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY DR. MISAEEL PASTRANA BORRERO AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN IN HIS HONOR BY THE PAN AMERICAN SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE COLOMBIAN-AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MARCH 14, 1969, AT NEW YORK, N.Y.

If I am not mistaken, it was Benjamin Franklin who, justifying his shyness when speaking in a foreign language, stated that in so doing "he could only express half of what he was thinking, and people only understood half of what he said." I have always tried to bear this in mind, or, I should say more sincerely, that my lack of knowledge of English forces me to do so. Today I have taken this risk, considering that for many of those who generously honor me with their presence, it is better to understand half of my thoughts than to miss them altogether.

The subject of international cooperation through economic aid, notwithstanding the fact that since the end of World War II it has been the central point of the dialogue between industrialized and developing countries, continues to maintain equal if not greater urgency. Because it is true that, after these past twenty years of trial and error, there is so much confusion, ambiguity and misunderstanding about this noble

policy, that it is worthwhile to analyze and seek out the real causes, in order to be able to measure more precisely the extent of its effects.

The truth is that the cold war has ceased to be the neuralgic point in the confrontation between the two sides that struggle for world power and responsibility. Now the predominant fact is the presence and insurgence of two thirds of mankind, that lives in the anguish of misery and that being conscious that its poverty is not inevitable, searches for the transition of a backward society to participate in some degree in the prosperity of the wealthy nations. These aspirations cause special tensions in underdeveloped areas such as Southeast Asia, or the Middle East, or in the process of liberating the colonies in Africa, or in the frequent internal turmoil of Latin America, and it is just in those areas where the crisis explodes more violently and where peace is in danger. And this great gap that divides the nations cannot be maintained without compromising the destiny of the world community.

It is also impossible to form an authentic policy of sincere international cooperation, without establishing reciprocal trust and understanding. The problem of development certainly has a worldwide perspective, but specific proposals for help must be adapted to the peculiar conditions of similar regions, and sometimes each country has to be dealt with individually. For example, in the experience of the Marshall Plan, perhaps the determining factors in the rapid recovery of the Western European economy were the vast human resources and knowledge available there, that obviously do not have equivalents in the developing countries. For the different underdeveloped areas, despite the common denominator of economic backwardness, ignorance and poverty, the confrontation of the problems is different if you look at the huge Asiatic masses, or if you study the process of the African nations that are beginning their journey as free and autonomous states, or if you appraise the group of Latin American nations commonly identified by tradition, language, race and religion.

But, still in the wide range of latitudes between lower California and Tierra del Fuego, where 20 republics exist side by side in an area of 20 million square kilometers, with more than 220 million inhabitants, you will also find clear differences in their social and economic manifestations which also demand special solutions. Next to countries like Brazil, almost a subcontinent with 90 million people, there are others that barely have one or two million human beings. While Venezuela, for instance, has a per capita income of nearly 1,000 dollars, there are many countries with a personal income not greater than 200 dollars. There are countries with ample financial resources due to their international trade and others that hardly have an income of 19 dollars per capita from that source. Other countries have definite lines of contrast in degrees of development, with highly industrialized areas, large modern cities contrasting with sectors submerged in the deepest poverty. Thus, without underestimating universal criteria for foreign aid, it is necessary to consider its individual characteristics to avoid generalization that may lead to irreparable errors.

I have always believed that the controversy created by international aid is due less to its need and justice, than to the instruments used and the conflicts that occasionally occur between the aid giving and the aid receiving nations. Knowing as I do the idiosyncrasy of the North American people, I could never think that there would be a citizen in this country who knowing how two thirds of the world live, without access to minimum conditions of existence, could remain calm or indifferent. In this interplanetary era, with the world tightly knit together by communications, the distances between people participating in a civilization of abun-

dance and people handicapped by the struggle for survival is unacceptable; and it is a situation which demands immediate action because it is a problem for today and not for future generations.

Fortunately, in Latin America we are becoming aware that progress depends primarily on ourselves, that development is a national effort produced by the internal dynamics of a society, and that whatever the sacrifices in economic fields or social areas, it is necessary to set our clocks ahead to make up for lost time without blaming anyone for what is happening to us. Regardless of the difficulties and setbacks suffered by our countries in recent years, there have been improvements that show positive signs of acceleration in our development, and a greater popular participation in our process of modernization. The rate of economic growth from 1950 up to now has been an average of 4.7% per year, approximately equal to the average rate of growth of the majority of the developed countries. A large majority of the Latin American governments, in the same period, have placed special emphasis on education, health, housing, distribution of land tenure, and an increase of economic opportunities searching for greater social mobility. Also, the experience of these years teaches us that if social development is impossible without vigorous economic growth, political stability is unattainable if this growth does not include the improvement of living conditions and a wider participation of the people in the essential national goals. The advances obtained by Latin America in this period have been gained with such a great effort in savings and self-help, that in the seven years of the Alliance for Progress domestic investment in the Hemisphere has been estimated at 150 billion dollars, of which only 6.7% represents contributions from public and private assistance from the United States.

But if there is agreement that development should be sought primarily by the underdeveloped, and that structural reforms cannot be postponed, it is also true that because of our weakness in trade and our accumulated indebtedness, it is not possible to hasten an orderly transformation, avoiding anarchic or violent trends, without continuous assistance from foreign capital. Unfortunately, the tendency in both foreign trade and aid has declined in the last few years. Latin America's share of world commerce has decreased, causing, therefore, an additional burden to our economies. These events indicate that international trade has been used more for the benefit of the wealthy countries than to the advantage of the poor nations.

The Latin American balance of trade has increased its deficit from 1,000 million in 1966 to 1,700 million dollars in 1967, indicating that for predominantly rigid economies, which most of the Latin American countries have, the protectionism of advanced countries contributes to further deterioration. This has happened with the restrictive measures adopted by the United States to improve its own balance of payments, and other steps taken by European countries because of the devaluation of their currencies.

It has been said that the crisis of industrialized countries is immediately reflected in higher poverty in underdeveloped areas and, paradoxically, the prosperity of wealthy countries is not always projected on the poor communities.

It is quite difficult to evaluate correctly the amount of additional capital that underdeveloped countries need to maintain a minimum rate of growth. The Conference of Punta del Este estimated this additional capital need for the Latin American Republics at 20 billion dollars over a 10-year period. The Conference held at Geneva in 1964—stressing the responsibilities of rich nations more than the need of less favored

ones—merely advised the former to devote 1% of their gross national product to help poorer countries. None of these proposals have been carried out. Nor did Ambassador Stevenson's proposal in 1961—ratified by the United Nations General Assembly—to make the sixties a decade of development, attain significant momentum.

It is worthwhile to remember that at the time of the Marshall Plan, foreign aid given by the United States came to 2.1% of its gross national product and barely reaches .7% today. With the highest individual income in the world, the United States actually ranks 8th in foreign aid per capita.

Any partial approximation in the study of International cooperation can prove to be erroneous, emphasizing only one of these alternatives: trade or loans; public or private investment, technical or financial assistance. Foreign aid policy has to be considered as a whole. As far as international trade is concerned, there has to be a revision of the barriers that disturb the exchange of basic products and prevent the entrance of manufactured goods from Latin America to the world markets by means of quotas and other restrictions, as in the case of textiles. Considering the critical period that the emerging countries are going through, with progressively unfavorable terms of trade, it is in the interest of elementary justice to study formulas of preferential treatment, or at least cancel certain discriminations that some regional tariff agreements place against our exports.

As far as financing is concerned, it is obvious that credits which tend to favor a country's own balance of payments, or constitute instruments to open new markets, are not the best for the development of the third world. Economic aid needs not only to be increased in volume, but its condition should be modified to make it more efficient, introducing lower or no interest rates and such terms as to allow reimbursement only after the effort of development begins to produce the desired results. Also foreign aid should not be regarded by developing countries as a means to postpone urgent political and social changes, nor should it be regarded with a mentality of charity or a missionary spirit.

One of the reasons for disappointment and fatigue in foreign aid policies is the way in which lending countries explain it to their own public opinion. The amount of private investment in Latin America is often mentioned—482 millions in 1965 and 461 millions in 1966—but this figure should be complemented by the amount of earnings obtained by American investment in the area, which totalled 1.160 and 1.261 millions in said years. In the overall statistical analysis of aid, military assistance is included, as well as transactions also favorable to capital exporters, such as loans called "credit for suppliers". Usually when someone mentions loans given, little is said about reimbursement.

Since the beginning of the Alliance for Progress, total disbursements in loans from the Government of the United States to Latin America amount to 5,853.8 million dollars, while repayments reached 2,141.1 millions in principal, plus 734.4 millions of accrued interest. In other words, 50% of the total amount of those loans were repaid in the same period.

Apart from these figures which sufficiently demonstrate the trend of the aid for both sides, it must be taken into consideration that by contributing to the economic development of the poor nations, profitable markets are being opened for United States commerce, additional traffic is generated for its own transportation system and new activities are offered to commercial banks, thus creating stability that contributes to a better climate for private investment abroad and consequently, easier remittance of royalties and profits. It can be said that every dollar that goes into the economy of a less developed country returns to its lender in the

form of purchases of goods and services. In the specific case of Colombia, every dollar received through United States foreign aid is directed towards trade with this country. But in addition to funds from these loans, 42% of our exports revenue is used in the United States regardless of a chronically unfavorable balance of payments. Thus, foreign aid funds are represented overseas more in the form of industrial machinery, agricultural equipment, fertilizers, construction materials, and other consumer goods and services, than in dollars.

Accordingly, the unfavorable balance of payments that some industrialized countries have registered in the last years is far from being caused by foreign assistance.

It is also important to mention that in the midst of a debate in the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, former Secretary of State Dean Rusk affirmed that about 700,000 persons in the United States were engaged in activities originating from foreign aid programs. Whereas in the Marshall Plan donations amounted to 90% of the available funds, the exact opposite has happened with the flow of loans to Latin America.

Of course, it is also necessary to convey the significance of foreign aid to less developed countries, because it represents an essential means of strengthening the basis of the economic, social and political life of the new nations. Assistance from the Agency for International Development to Colombia's multiple programs has been extremely useful to maintain an appropriate level of imports and by virtue of the counterpart funds in local currency, it has been possible to make higher investments in roads, electrification, housing and agricultural credit and finance projects from the private sector. On behalf of my Government I am pleased to recognize the benefits of this assistance to the success of our programs.

At the end of this century, Latin America will have at least 500 million people. For the United States to be an island of prosperity next to 20 nations in the throes of underdevelopment could be a very serious situation. War against poverty is a difficult strife, because it is not only the fight against it, but the determination not to live with it. It is true that no country has a mandate to protect the world from poverty, but when countries assume responsibilities in a historical moment, such responsibilities cannot be avoided. Isolationism in the face of the problems of Latin America would mean a retreat from the policy of Hemispheric solidarity in defense of our security, our dignity and our common destiny. A policy that the fifth President of this country stated a century and a half ago has bound the friendship of the New World ever since.

This policy requires a great amount of understanding and good-will, of stimulus and impulse. This is the role being fulfilled by the Pan American Society of the United States and the Colombian-American Chamber of Commerce. Among their members I have friends I have known for many years who are well aware of my enthusiasm for the Inter-American friendship. My deep gratitude to them for giving me the opportunity to speak to you with great sincerity that is in ultimate terms the best way to build optimism and hope.

REMARKS OF DR. MISAEL PASTRANA-BORRERO, AT THE BANQUET GIVEN BY THE ROTARY DISTRICT CONFERENCE IN AKRON, OHIO, ON MARCH 27, 1969

The Rotary Club of "El Chicó" in Bogotá, the capital of Colombia, interpreting the sentiments of human solidarity which are the basis of the Rotary movement throughout the world, in November, 1967 called the attention of all the other Rotary Clubs to the serious social, economic and cultural conditions existing in the countries of the so-

called Third World. This appeal evoked an immediate and surprising response from Rotary Clubs in all Continents; from people of all races, religions and ideologies. This worldwide answer showed clearly that the problems of the underdeveloped countries lie deep in the conscience of mankind and are in urgent need of solution. These are also the reasons for this symposium, to which Rotarians from this section of the United States have invited fellow citizens of Colombia—a country beginning its development—for a frank and open discussion across the table to evaluate the instruments of international cooperation before the poverty and backwardness of the neighbor nations of Latin America.

It is impossible at the present time to ignore the facts of underdevelopment which determine the very existence of most of the people of the world, which threatens world stability and peace, because it will be unwise to assume that time alone can bring about changes that can no longer be postponed. One of the explanations for a less vigorous friendship between the United States and the Latin American countries, that perhaps has delayed the total integration of the Hemisphere in all its aspects, is the circumstance that too often our relations in the past have been conducted almost at government level, while industrial groups, labor organizations and civic associations have not fully participated in consolidating this friendship.

It is a fact that in today's interplanetary era the great causes of humanity loom larger than persons or nations, and problems which only a few years ago were confined to a city or a country, today have international perspective. As Archibald MacLeish wrote of the adventure which permitted the earth to be seen for the first time from the depth of space, it is a new concept which must change the minds of men and make them think in terms of "brothers who know they are truly brothers".

One of the fundamental features in the present era is the emergence of the Third World of revolution, underdevelopment and poverty. It is not that poverty is new, for it has been a part of the peoples' heritage from the beginning of history. What is new is the phenomenon which appeared after the Second World War, better described in the words of the Indian Prime Minister Nehru, "the people's awareness of misery and their impatience to be free from it". Of every three men in the world today, two live in poverty and hunger, and the demographic explosion will determine that in the next 25 years the population of the underdeveloped countries will increase more than in the last century. Advanced nations such as the United States, Russia, Europe, Japan and Oceania have 1,050 million inhabitants and the countries in the process of development 2,500 millions. At the present rate of growth, the population of the first group of nations at the end of this century will be only 1,200 millions, while that of the poor countries will be 4,500 millions. And in the same period Latin America, which today has 220 million inhabitants, will reach more than 500 millions, that is to say, two and a half times the present population of the United States.

But in addition to this population explosion of the underprivileged masses, the advances in communications resulting from aviation and electronic technology which have brought people closer together, have awakened at the same time new aspirations and demands. In Latin America we often speak of the "transistor revolution," because our isolated farmers, besides their working tools, have begun to rely on the company of the transistor, which has broken their loneliness and drawn them nearer to civilization, while at the same time it has made them aware of the great gap between their unlimited poverty and the wealth of

other nations. The conscience of this situation thus nourishes the conflicts which frequently give rise to violence and hatred in these regions.

Another disturbing problem is revealed by the statistics relating to food production. Differences in productivity are great: while a North American farmer produces enough food for 44 persons and a European for 12, a farmer in the emerging countries rarely produces sufficient for more than two, and frequently only enough for himself. In the majority of our countries production growth is far below population growth, and it will certainly lead in the course of a few years to a situation which is intolerable in human terms and politically explosive.

Latin America is a unity based upon diversity and in many respects presents conditions different from those of the other underdeveloped regions. Per capita income, which on the average is ten or fifteen times less than that of the United States, is nonetheless higher than the average in most of the African and Asian nations. And although our countries have the highest rate of population growth, they still have fertile areas of uncultivated land, estimated in three and half times more per person than in the rest of the world. We are rich in mineral resources, with the exception of coal, and we have attained a higher percentage of literacy than other underdeveloped areas. Our population is young; 60% of the Colombian people are under 18 years of age. This makes Colombia a dynamic nation, but also gives rise to problems because this large proportion of young people constitutes a source of tension in its urgent demands for decisive and immediate solutions.

That is why underdevelopment is not only the most important social and economic issue of our times, but also the most important political problem of all times. I believe that notwithstanding the great volume of literature written on the subject, underdevelopment has not been contemplated by the leading citizens of the industrialized countries with the necessary attention to the simple statistical data mentioned, that in 25 years, that is to say, in a generation, 4,500 million people will live in misery, in a world in the midst of conquering the space, in a community of nations which conventional language is that of equality and justice, in which men participate more closely of the knowledge of technical progress and in which old religious and political fanaticisms, that justified the subordination to the more privileged ones, have been broken. This is the most important revolution known to humanity because if it is true that the one in 1789 searched for liberty, in this one men search for economic independence and for the improvement of their existence, even though it might not be for themselves but for their children. They expect to change the frustration of the past into the hope of the future.

Erroneously many political sectors consider that facing underdevelopment is a matter which does not concern the wealthy countries. Most certainly this requires, first of all, a great self effort and the commitment to undertake prompt social, economic and mental transformations, but it also needs a sincere international cooperation. It implies a new war concept (the Third World War, as it has been called), for which it is indispensable to move the forces of all the world community, and specially those of the nations which form the nucleus of the Western Hemisphere, since their values are principally the ones in danger. It is a policy that requires courage, intelligence and passion.

Undoubtedly world trade is one of the spheres in which international solidarity can be more clearly demonstrated, particularly inter-American solidarity. Per capita value of the Latin American exports has greatly decreased since 1950, precisely at a

time when it required a larger volume of income in order to acquire the necessary capital goods to accomplish industrialization plans and the technification of agriculture. 90% of Latin American imports are paid with proceeds from exports, thus the importance given by our Governments to foreign trade, since the improvements in this area make us less dependent on foreign aid.

Therefore, after the Trade Conference held in Geneva in 1964, the main concern of the underdeveloped countries has been to find adequate mechanisms to increase their resources through foreign trade. The deficit of Latin America's balance of payments amounted to 1,000 million dollars in 1966 and 1,700 millions in 1967. For example, the value of Colombia's coffee exports in 1953 and 1954, totalled 490 and 550 millions respectively, while last year this value barely reached 350 million dollars. This means that in the same 15-year period we accounted for a lower income from external trade, while our population grew from 12 to 20 millions. The truth is that our deficit in exports is far greater than the amount of loans we have received; loans, of course, in the greater proportion reimbursable.

Latin America has insisted in ending discriminations against their products, especially the preferential systems of the Commonwealth and the European Common Market; but it also hopes for the elimination of trade barriers affecting its commerce with the United States. It must be borne in mind that 50% of the export-import trade of the Latin American countries is with the United States, since their purchases in this country exceed 4,500 million dollars annually. The elimination of artificial barriers is a way to help our economies to become self-sustaining, at the same time offering the United States the expansion of its own markets. Latin America needs to diversify its exports, since the majority of these countries depend to a great extent on two or three products and some times only one. This diversification must be achieved preferably with those manufactured products utilizing raw materials and a high volume of employment. Such products represent today only a small percentage of the total exports of the zone. A commercial policy of this nature cannot be carried out without preferential treatment.

In the same manner, Latin America has been endeavoring to obtain agreements to stabilize, at fair levels, the prices of certain traditional basic products, without stimulating anti-economic production. The success of the Coffee Pact, to which the United States have efficiently contributed and which determines the economic conditions of 14 of the 21 Latin American countries, constitutes a clear demonstration of the soundness of a producer and consumer joint policy designed to prevent the cyclical prices of an article. It is sufficient to say that for every cent dropped in the price of a pound of coffee, Colombia loses 8 million dollars yearly.

Latin America is perhaps the area of the world with closer cultural, religious and language bonds, and with a very similar development process. Notwithstanding these circumstances, the interregional commerce is almost nil, since it only reached 10% of the total volume. This is due to the fact that the exports of the Latin American countries are more competitive than complementary, for lack of currency conversion and a great deficiency in transports and communications. In 1961, the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA) and the Central American Market were formed. This has brought about a 30% increase in trade, in comparison with previous years. At the Conference of Chiefs of State of Punta del Este in 1967, decisions were taken to accelerate the integration of the 20 American Republics beginning in 1970, to be completed in 1985. Should

this effort prove successful, it will benefit not only our 20 countries, but also the United States of America.

Notwithstanding the importance of trade, as we have already stated, it alone is not sufficient to help the poor countries to meet their minimum development goals. A coordinated action in trade, aid, private investment and sound economic development is demanded, with the effort of the countries themselves as the central point. Against the belief of many, Latin America has not been the most favored area in the United States aid programs, regardless of its geographic and political proximity. During the Marshall Plan, per capita aid in the recipient countries was 20 dollars, while presently in Latin America it reaches only 2.73 dollars. 90% of the assistance given to Western Europe for its reconstruction were grants. As for Latin America, 90% of this aid represents loans, given under similar conditions to commercial credits, both as to terms of payment and interest rates, with the result that today more than 50% of what is received in aid must be used for capital and interest reimbursement. While in 1946 the United States assigned 2.1% of its gross national product to foreign aid, 0.7% of this product is assigned today.

But the balance of payments crisis of the lending countries has determined that the assistance be a "tied aid"; in other words, it must be invested in the purchase of goods from the same country, which makes it more burdensome, since estimates have shown that the cost of such aid is 15 to 20% higher than the one given without such obligation.

I do not want to enter into an academic discussion as to the real value of aid for the recipient countries, and the real value of the burden for the giving countries. Aid is motivated by humanitarian goals, economic interests and the desire to avoid tensions and world disorder. In the last few years such aid has represented not more than 7% of Latin America's public investment; but this percentage is essential to maintain an adequate rate of growth and the necessary imports. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that for the industrialized powers the future expansion of their markets is closely related to an increase in the consuming capacity of 1,800 million human beings, living in the underdeveloped world.

In 1823 the then President of the United States called upon Latin America for a collective defense of this Hemisphere against the threat of imperialism from abroad. This policy of solidarity against possible extraterritorial aggression has sometimes encountered difficulties which have caused conflicts and unfriendliness due to erroneous interpretations. Latin America has always shown its loyalty in circumstances of real danger for this Continent. Such was the case during World War II in our fight against totalitarianism. We also did it during the Korean War, when Colombia, responding to the United Nations mandate, sent many of our young men to fight and die there. And we did it again during the missile crisis, when the world was on the brink of destruction. Robert Kennedy in his posthumous book "The Thirteen Days" comments on this event: "During the Cuban missile crisis, however, when it was an issue of great importance, when the United States was being sorely tried, those countries came unanimously to our support, and that support was essential". "It was the vote of the Organization of American States that gave a legal basis for the quarantine. Their willingness to follow the leadership of the United States was a heavy and unexpected blow to Khrushchev. It had a major psychological and practical effect on the Russians and changed our position from that of an outlaw acting in violation of international law, into a country acting in accordance with twenty allies legally protecting their position".

Between Latin America and the United States the factors that unite us are far greater than those that separate us, because we are not only a part of the same portion of the world, but we have been inspired by the same tradition of love and respect for human liberty and dignity.

President Madison, upon designating the first representative before the recent liberated world from Spain, outlined to him his principal objectives as follows: "To promote the most friendly relations between the inhabitants of this Hemisphere as having all a common interest, and as lying under a common obligation to maintain that system of peace, justice and goodwill which is the only source of happiness for Nations".

After 160 years these orientations should be maintained, if we want to strengthen the ties of friendship between our peoples. Identical purposes also inspire the thought and actions of the Rotary Clubs before these contemporary problems. This common obligation for peace, justice and goodwill is what has really moved our friends from Akron to convene this splendid Conference and offer us their known and traditional hospitality.

On behalf of Colombia, I thank you.

PROFESSOR CAMPBELL OF DARTMOUTH UNIVERSITY COMPARES UNIVERSITY AND CORPORATION

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Prof. Colin Campbell, of Dartmouth, recently published a fascinating article in the Wall Street Journal. In this he compares the modern university structure with the organization of the modern business corporation. He shows how active student participation as demanded by some of the radicals is simply impractical.

In the course of making this demonstration he probes very knowingly into the fundamental structure of the universities. Overdiversification—conglomeration is the current fad-word to describe what I mean—is often a great problem. He reports, most disturbingly, that "Only about half of some university budgets are now used for instructional purposes." The rest is for research and, in some cases, I have noted, which he does not mention, to maintain large staffs whose sole purpose is to seek Federal funds.

I offer Dr. Campbell's excellent analysis at this point in the RECORD and recommend it highly to all readers of the RECORD:

COMPARING UNIVERSITY AND CORPORATION

(By Colin D. Campbell)

Two distinguished authors have recently criticized the organization of our universities. Jacques Barzun, a former dean of the faculties and provost of Columbia University, has written that our universities are suffering from "bankruptcy, paralysis, and futility." Irving Kristol has said that "no one any longer has a clear notion of what a 'university' is supposed to be, or do, or mean."

Like most large business enterprises, universities are corporations. They have charters, and trustees who are similar to corporate

directors. The trustees select the president—the chief executive of the organization. Can universities' organizational problems be attacked in the same way that business corporations typically solve theirs?

To some persons the selection of the board of trustees is, a basic source of difficulty. Suggestions for change usually include selecting trustees either from the faculty or the student body. In a business corporation, this would be analogous to selecting directors from representatives of either its employes or its customers.

A TRUSTEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

Selecting trustees from the faculty could result in even more attention to research and less to the instruction of students. Also, trustees, as their title indicates, are responsible for the proper use of the bequests received from donors, just as corporate directors represent the interests of the stockholders. Since a university's resources may be used for current expenses or saved to provide further income in the future, a conflict of interest could arise: Faculty members would usually benefit most by expanding current expenditures. In addition, those faculty members, elected to the board could presumably benefit their departments at the expense of others. The struggles for representation might be intense and bitter. Such arrangements would probably factionalize the faculty and involve them in time-consuming activities other than teaching and research. Decisions on how to distribute the institution's resources among its various activities are probably best made by an executive who is responsible to an outside group of trustees, rather than to the faculty.

Some of the problems with student trustees would be similar. Consider the question of raising the tuition. Students might prefer to have increases in operating costs paid for by consuming the university's endowment—but this would not be in the interest of future students.

Students' concerns are usually matters decided by faculty committees rather than trustees. Also, students lack experience for the kind of financial and legal decisions that trustees make. Trustees, like corporate directors, usually meet only once a month. They do not, and probably should not, take part in setting up the curriculum, selecting the faculty or administering student discipline, just as corporate directors do not plan production processes or hire employes.

University trustees and corporate directors are usually selected in quite similar manner. Some university charters provide that trustees be self-perpetuating. In the "modern corporation" with its large number of stockholders and no one stockholder having a controlling interest, directors are also self-perpetuating even though stockholders go through the motions of voting. In other universities, an alumni committee nominates candidates for trustees, and those receiving the most alumni votes are selected.

Professor Barzun believes that excessive diversification is the source of much of the disorganization in higher education. Universities have become research centers, with an assortment of institutes financed by both the Federal Government and private foundations. They also organize technical assistance teams for foreign countries, participate in faculty exchange programs with foreign universities and administer programs to assist underprivileged urban groups.

Some universities have ceilings on student enrollment to avoid excessive size and disorganization, yet many new non-teaching activities have been added, and in these universities the shift away from strictly educational functions has been most rapid. Only about half of some university budgets are now used for instructional purposes.

Diversification has some advantages, but it undoubtedly creates strains on management. The "multiversity" loses the economic

advantages of specialization. In business organizations, competition and the profit motive prevent carrying diversification too far: Inefficiencies would lower profit and induce owners and managers to simplify the organization. In non-profit institutions, checks on excessive diversification are undoubtedly weaker. Current attitudes of most educators favor expansion and growth. As Dr. Barzun has emphasized, universities are expected to participate in the solution of social problems. Nevertheless, decisions to expand into new areas must be approved by the trustees, and where errors have been made the fault is theirs.

THE LIMITS OF POWER

Professor Barzun also believes university administrators are ineffective because of their limited power over the faculty. This is blamed partly on "tenure," under which a faculty member cannot be discharged except for misconduct or failure to perform his duties. Both government agencies and business organizations face similar, but less rigid, limitations. Lack of control over the faculty is also blamed on the highly competitive market for professors. Most administrators are unwilling to try to influence their better faculty members because they fear that this might cause them to move elsewhere. Business firms have similar problems. Wherever labor markets are competitive and persons are free to choose where they wish to work, an employer is under pressure to provide pay and working conditions similar to those found elsewhere. However, the market protects universities also in their role as employers. Faculty members need not be paid any more than they can get elsewhere.

Both universities and business corporations still retain their most important technique of controlling employe performance—determining salary increases. A dean can reward those who support his policies and penalize those who do not. The resulting power of deans and department chairmen is substantial—despite the claims about the preponderant power of the faculty.

To the leaders of the student power movement, the principal reform needed is student participation in the organization. This proposal is neither realistic nor practical. Taken seriously, it would mean including students in the deliberations and voting of at least a dozen committees. In most universities, the important decisions concerning selection of faculty, courses offered, degree requirements, requirements for the major, student discipline and student admission are made by its faculty committees. Serving on these committees takes time and is difficult. Much of the work is routine and unexciting. That students would be willing to take on such duties is hard to believe. Many full-time students would not be able to do committee work.

Student committee members would not be subject to the same kind of organizational discipline that faculty members are. If student representatives did not perform their tasks conscientiously, the administration could do little about it. In contrast, the overall evaluation of a faculty member's performance is based in part on his contribution to such committees.

Of course, students are the persons served by universities and they should be given the best kind of education possible. But to improve education, student participation is probably no more necessary than consumer participation would be in the management of a business firm. Consumers typically get the kinds of goods and services they want even though they have no voice in the management. This is because firms that produce those goods most desired are most successful.

ATTRACTING STUDENTS

To survive, a university must attract a sufficient number of students. Unfortunately, the competition between private universities that must charge tuition and state universities where the tuition is nominal does not

operate effectively. Even if state universities had less to offer, they would probably attract some students away from the private universities.

Significant competition also exists among the various academic departments. Faculty committees may formally decide what courses are to be put in the catalog, but unless students are willing to enroll in them their decisions will not mean much. There are few institutions that can afford courses or professors who cannot attract a reasonable number of students. If a department becomes unattractive, enrollment drops, students shift to other majors, and the department will be required to reduce its staff. The typical department will almost always react by improving its offerings.

The principal way to improve the quality of education is to induce students to want better education. This is not an easy task, but it is one of the purposes of Mr. Kristol's suggestion that all students pay the cost of their education either from their own funds or by loans from the Government. If students were required to pay the cost, one would expect them to be more discriminating about the kind of education they got.

EXPRESSION OF TRIBUTE TO CHINESE COMMUNITY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution which was recently adopted by the Council for Civic Unity in San Francisco with regard to the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration.

The resolution, with which I am in agreement, accuses Secretary of Transportation Volpe of failing to recognize the contribution of the Chinese in the building of the transcontinental railroad during remarks at the Golden Spike Centennial Celebration on May 10 in Promontory, Utah.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we recognize the historical achievements of the many races, religions, and cultures which make up our great Nation. For too long now we have been negligent in giving credit to Americans of various nationalities and in acknowledging their efforts in bulding this land of ours.

It was sad indeed to learn that Secretary Volpe carelessly omitted to mention the work of the Chinese-Americans in the laying of the transcontinental railroad. It is this type of insensitivity which leads to discrimination and bigotry instead of understanding and brotherhood. I certainly hope that in the future, President Nixon's appointees as well as all public officials will respect the cultural enrichments that minority groups have provided to our society.

The resolution follows:

COUNCIL FOR CIVIC UNITY, SAN FRANCISCO,
CALIF.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the lack of recognition of the contributions of the various ethnic, religious and racial minorities that have built this country has been a contributing factor in bringing us to our present state of civic disunity, mistrust and polarization, and

Whereas we feel that the omission of mention by Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe of the contribution of Chinese immigrants to the building of the Transcontinental Railway at the recent Golden Spike Centennial Ceremony is another example of this lack of recognition and of the subtle racism that cripples our nation, and

Whereas the President's Commission on Civil Disorder prophetically warned in March of 1968, "To pursue our present course will involve the continuing polarization of the American community, and, ultimately, the destruction of basic democratic values", Therefore be it

Resolved that the Board of Directors of the Council for Civic Unity express our gratitude to the Chinese community for its contributions to the building of the West and for its continuing contributions to the enrichment of our Society, and be it further

Resolved that we express to the Chinese community our sorrow at the lack of recognition given to them in relation to the whole Railway Centennial Celebration and specifically the Volpe speech, and be it further

Resolved that the staff of the Council of Civic Unity be instructed to express to Secretary Volpe our disfavor at his harmful, if inadvertent, lack of respect shown to our Chinese community.

REA ESSAY WINNERS IN NEBRASKA

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, annually a statewide essay contest is sponsored by the Nebraska Rural Electric Association on "What Rural Electrification Means to Me and My Community." It is my privilege today to insert in the RECORD, the winning essays of six of the State winners who reside in my congressional district. Later on this month these winners, along with others from Nebraska, will travel to Washington to see their Government in operation as part of their prize for submitting winning essays. The REA, through "lighting the farm," has contributed greatly to the progress of the American farmer.

The essays follow:

INFORMATION

(By Rebecca Reeker, 15, Sophomore, Battle Creek High School, Father, Gene Reek, R. R. 2, Meadow Grove, Nebr.)

(Contestant sponsored by the Elkhorn Rural Public Power District, Battle Creek, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION TO OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

Time changes many things. In the space of less than thirty-five years, the Rural Electrification System has progressed from an idea in the minds of few, to the advantages for the convenience of many. Long range thinking of our Congressional leaders has now been made to benefit all Americans, and that is especially true of our rural populations.

When Senator Norris introduced a bill into Congress for the birth of the Rural Electrification Administration, did he foresee the future possibilities that all rural residents of his State of Nebraska would someday profit from his actions? Could anyone at that time look ahead to the day when all rural families would live as well, or better, than do their city neighbors?

The progress and growth of Rural Electrification over the years has been tremendous.

The first consumers in our district could be counted in the hundreds, and now the number is slightly less than four thousand. Many of these first consumers used only the minimum amount of fifty kilowatts, and now many of these same consumers are using thousands of kilowatts every month. These families are now enjoying the total benefits of "Electric Living."

The value of electrification in our homes is now hundred-fold. Adequate lighting is indeed a blessing for all. The work saving and time saving conveniences to the housewife are numerous. Washing, ironing, cleaning, and cooking were once tedious and time consuming chores. Now, automatic washers, dryers, ironers, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, and timed and automatic burners and ovens make these tasks pleasant completed easily and quickly, therefore adding more leisure time for family enjoyment. Radios, television, stereo sets, and electric organs are now common forms of entertainment for farm families. Electric heat, air conditioners, humidifiers, and dehumidifiers help to make our homes more comfortable. Small appliances add to our daily easy living, such as: razors, tooth-brushes, can openers, knives and knife sharpeners. Our Mothers will indeed praise these gadgets.

The agricultural workers surely appreciate all the advantages of Rural Electrification. From the smallest drills, saws, solder irons; to the massive grain driers, grinders, and mixers, welders, and many assorted motors, the farmers benefit every day from electricity. The water pumps, milkers, and bulk cooling systems make easier the work of the dairy men. Heat units, automatic feeders and waters aid all livestock producers. Electricity makes possible irrigation systems that are automatically timed and regulated.

Rural Electrification has not only benefited our rural residents but our urban residents as well. The job opportunities it has created for manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and storage facilities are many. Today, as never before, do we understand the statement, "Live Better Electrically."

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Lynn Kober, 16, Junior Emerson Sacred Heart School, Father: Don C. Kober, Wakefield, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Northeast Nebraska Rural Public Power District, Emerson, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

A recent survey boasts that more than two million American homes now have electric heat. Approximately one-fourth are served by rural electrification. Statistics show that we, the farmers of America, especially are using more electricity in the Midwest than ever before. Farmers all over the United States are taking advantage of rural electrification more now than in any other time in the history of electricity. What really accounts for this rapid growth of popularity of the REA system?

I often pause a moment to take into consideration the immense benefits we obtain by this system of electrification. I somehow feel that rural electrification means much more than having all the power we need to run our television sets and radios. It means, in my opinion, to have electricity for heating, lighting, water, and other electrical appliances needed to operate the household and farm.

In my own community, the REA is providing the residents with dependable, high-quality service—power vital to the growth of each and every rural community. I've often wondered what our home and community would be like without this ever-improving system of electricity. The great benefits we now take for granted would no longer exist. Farm life would be ever so much more difficult without electricity. We now rely on electricity for

everything from electric toasters to complex milking machines.

If you take a good look at a home, be it on the farm or in town, that is electrically served by REA, you would witness a multitude of household appliances such as toasters, stoves, T.V. sets, irons and refrigerators, which provide ease and entertainment for all of the members of the family. And on a farm, you are likely to perceive many electrical advantages utilized prodigiously by the farmer. Poultry farmers have electrically-powered equipment to feed and water hens and to take proper care of the eggs. The dairy farmer utilizes electricity for his milking machines and other electrical devices. Whereas the rancher has only to flick a switch and get the power needed to feed his cattle, on which his livelihood depends. And the rural electric system supplies all the power needed for farmers to bring in and take good care of his crops. What would these people do without this great necessity of electricity?

The future holds many challenges and opportunities for rural electrification. As the REA advances in technical changes, it will mean more man-power and job opportunities for many people. Industrial development will be getting more attention in the years ahead as rural electric systems help Nebraska move from an agriculture-dominated state into a diversified agricultural-industrial state.

The rural power systems are doing much more for our community. Their leaders are working to help insure improved rural community facilities such as water systems, better schools, more and better housing, improved medical facilities, and orderly community developments.

And so, the REA has become a vital factor in the life of all America. By its benefits, both in our homes and communities, it has hoped to make a better America by starting with the heart of America itself, the rural areas.

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Donna Lynn Walford, 16, Junior, Gresham Public Schools, Father: Wayne Walford, Gresham, Nebr.)

(Contestant sponsored by the Polk County Rural Public Power District, Stromsburg, Nebraska, in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

This is the age in which we hear much about the generation gap. I was amazed when I learned that one short generation ago when my parents were small the Rural Public Power District was just coming into existence in Polk County. One generation ago rural residents were the people who squinted at their newspapers or homework by gas lamps. Wives stood for long hours over the family ironing using either "sad irons" heated over the wood range or gas heated irons. Ice was carried from the ice house to cool foods. Heat for cooking and warming the home was produced by wood and cobs carried in by the basketfuls. Wind-powered mills pumped water which had to be carried in pallfull after pallfull.

Almost as if by magic, electricity has raised the standard of living of the rural people of my community. Hundreds of electric powered appliances make our lives safer, more comfortable and luxurious. Use of these appliances actually adds hours to our day by freeing us of tedious, drudge-type jobs. We now enjoy all the comforts and conveniences that our urban neighbors enjoy, in addition to the pleasure of rural living.

Our generation has a hired hand who helps with the work around our farm home. This faithful servant powers our washing machine and drier, heats our iron automatically. He heats our range neatly and comfortably, refrigerates our food safely and freezes the leftovers to use another time. In the winter our home is heated and humidified comfortably and safely by this hired hand who can also cool and dehumidify on summer

days. He lights our way indoors and out. He powers my electric shears and runs my sewing machine. Why he even dries my hair, brushes my teeth, shines my shoes and dries my nail polish. Our friend pumps water for the livestock, water for the crops and water for my bath. He brings beauty to our lives by lighting our patio, watering our lawns and mowing the grass. He provides us culture and education each time I turn on the radio, television set or stereo. He works for us twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. He never asks for a coffee break and refuses to take a vacation. We have never paid him more than \$38 a month. You can hardly find that kind of hired hands any more. His name is Rural Electric.

You think our neighbors might be jealous? Not at all!!! They too enjoy the services of Rural Electric.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Susan Fosler, 17, Junior, Seward Public High School; Father: Dale Fosler, Milford, Nebr.)

(Contestant sponsored by the Seward County Rural Public Power District, Seward, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Somehow the Rural Electrification Administration never had much meaning to me as a teenager living in a rural area. However, with this essay I found some stimulating accomplishments of the Administration as well as some benefits rural people receive daily from this agency.

A slight review in the history of REA shows that it was established in 1935 by the President of the United States. A few years later Congress made it a permanent agency. The REA is defined as an agency of the Department of Agriculture which finances the extension of electric power to people in rural areas of the United States. This agency does not construct, own, or operate the electric facilities it finances but merely lends the money that enables various companies and associations to manage them.

We now have the background that set up the REA, but just how does the Public Power District of Seward County benefit me? In 1935, only one farm in every ten in the United States had commercial electric service. In the late 1950's, about 95 of every 100 farms had such service. Of these, more than half were served by REA-financed electric systems. I have grown up accustomed to the luxuries electricity provides. I naturally expect to always be able to have a hot bath. An electric tooth brush is now a common implement in any farm bathroom. I'd be lost if I couldn't dry my hair in twenty minutes, and the newest trend—electric rollers is another provision made possible by REA.

I'd hate to have to begin to prepare meals in a rural farmhouse of the 1900's. We have so many conveniences made possible by electrification that we seldom have time to appreciate them all. Fry pans, bun warmers, electric mixers, dishwashers, refrigerators, and freezers make every family completely dependent upon this modern convenience.

When a farm family has daughters no rural home is complete without a sewing machine to help keep up with the newest fashions. A steam iron helps to press professionally, to say nothing of the automatic washers and dryers that help in the process of clothing.

During the past winter months a vaporizer, heating pad, and electric blanket aided even the farmer through the last flu epidemic.

Our family, living in a rural area, several miles from any city can enjoy all the comforts and conveniences of living in a town and yet be free to make our living farming and carry on the type of farm life we enjoy.

A modern farm has more than 400 different uses for electricity. I have named only a few, perhaps the conveniences that are most important to me. Nevertheless, I have discov-

ered just how much the REA has done to help raise the level of living in rural areas. This agency has enabled farm families to run their own farms more economically and efficiently and has given us the many conveniences that had previously been restricted to city dwellers.

I guess all that I can say is thank-you Rural Electrification Administration—for everything you have done to make the farmer's life just a little easier.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Ed Havlovic, 16, Sophomore, Aquinas High School, David City, Nebr., Father: Joseph V. Havlovic, Brainard, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Butler County Rural Public Power District, David City, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Come with me on an imaginary airplane flight and I will show you the value of rural electrification in our homes and community. Fasten your seat belt—we're off!

If you look down to your left you will be able to see endless acres of tall, dark, green corn and ripe wheat fields carpeting the hills below with a mellow gold. Such abundant harvests are the result of electric irrigation systems.

On your right you will notice a modern farm. Electricity plays an important vital role in the maintenance of the farm as well as in the work and responsibilities of the farmer. Electric heating, electric watering, electric air conditioning, and electric lighting systems are necessities to the farmer in raising and caring for chickens and other farm animals. The dairy farmer finds electric milking machines not only economical, but also efficient. Electric milk coolers, separators, and other dairy equipment also aids the dairy farmer in producing top grade A milk and cream. The farmer also finds that electric fences provide the protection of his dairy herd while electric well pumps constantly supply fresh water for all farm animals.

The average farmer also discovers many "do-it-yourself" jobs much easier thanks to electric saws, drills, welders, sanders, lawn mowers, and many other useful power tools.

As you can see most every rural home is served by rural electrification. Electric heating, electric lighting, and electric air conditioning provide the farmer and his family with comfortable living all year long. The housewife finds her housework considerably easier, thanks to electric irons, dishwashers, garbage disposals, washing machines, driers, vacuum cleaners, sewing machines, and food mixers. Housewives are able to prepare meals quickly and easily with electric stoves, toasters, and grills. Housewives are also capable of preserving and storing food for long periods of time due to electric food freezers and refrigerators.

As we continue our "airplane flight" over the many rural farms one notices the many electric power lines and telephone wires that lead to and from the farms. Electricity, as you may have guessed, plays an important role in communications as well! The radio and television are not only entertaining and pleasurable but are also a source in information and communications. The radio and television provide the farmer with informative news, weather forecasts, as well as storm warnings. The farmer finds the telephone most useful in carrying out "business terms" or just a friendly conversation.

Although one may see the importance of rural electrification one seldom realizes the importance of electrification in the community. As we continue our flight, observe in the city, which we are approaching, the businesses and industries. Such modern businesses and industries could not exist without electricity. Electric signs advertise products and business. Electric adding machines, computers, and typewriters greatly aid office workers in doing their jobs quickly and effi-

ciently. If you look below, you can notice the traffic that is constantly weaving throughout the city streets. Electric street lights insure traffic safety as well as city lights during the night.

That concludes our flight; prepare for landing! Made it! Ground at last! I hope by this imaginary flight that you will realize the importance and have a better understanding of rural electrification in our home and community as well. Electricity plays an important and vital role in the work and daily living of all people and this role is ever steadily increasing. As modern inventions progress forward, electrification is ever present serving man in countless ways as it has in the past and will continue to do so in the future. *Electrification is here to serve you!*

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Richard Herink, 15, Sophomore, Leigh Community School, Father: Eugene F. Herink, R. R. #2, Box 43, Clarkson, Nebr.)

(NOTE.—Contestant sponsored by the Cornhusker Public Power District, Columbus, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.)

Just what does rural electrification mean to me and my community? I believe that it means fewer people starving in the world today. It also means that I, as a Future Farmer of America, my father, and all the farmers in my community, have the opportunity of becoming more prosperous.

There are many people in the world starving each day, and if the world's population keeps increasing at the present rate it will be doubled by the year 2,000. Stop and think what this will mean. In only 30 years from now there will be twice as many people to feed each day. Thirty years may seem like a long period of time, but by then the farm youth of today, like myself, will be at the peak of their earning capacity.

To realize how important electricity will be to a farmer in 30 years, we must look back 30 years, and see the great increase in the use of electricity in rural communities. Thirty years ago it was estimated that about eleven out of every 100 farms in the United States had electric service. Today more than 97 out of every 100 farms in the United States is served by electricity. Electrification has improved the living conditions of rural people. Farm families today can enjoy all the modern household conveniences that the people in the city have and enjoy. This was not true when my parents were my age. Because of electricity today, the farmers are realizing a higher standard of living than ever before.

Electricity has increased farm production and has raised the economic development of not only my community but all rural communities served by Public Power Districts.

In the past 30 years inflation has raised the cost of every commodity the farmers use today. The lone exception to this is electricity. In recent years as everything else has risen in cost, electricity has decreased in cost. Electricity has been a leader in revolutionizing farming, at the lowest possible cost. This is one major reason why electricity has helped almost every farm and rural community.

Agriculture is America's largest and basic industry. With more people on this earth than ever before, we need more food than ever before. The farmers in my community and all over the United States are depending upon electricity to meet this demanding need for increasing food production.

Electricity can fulfill this task in many ways. Two of the most important ways electricity fulfills this job in my community is through improved feeding practices and irrigation. These two alone can help the forever rising need of raising more food.

As I evaluate my home and the community in which I live, I realize that electricity has meant progress, convenience, and safety at a very nominal cost.

IT IS FAR BETTER, IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST, FOR THE DEFENSE AUTHORITIES TO "PUT OUT" THE FACTS ABOUT MILITARY SPENDING THAN TO HAVE THEM "FOUND OUT"

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include, at this point, a very timely and constructive editorial that appeared in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram newspaper issue of June 3, 1969, pointing up the essential need for Defense officials to release all the facts about Defense spending.

The article follows:

[From the Worcester Telegram,
June 3, 1969]

LEASHING THE PENTAGON'S SPENDERS

The days are over when the military could have any amount of money for the asking. Defense Secretary Melvin Laird and Deputy Secretary David Packard are clamping down on the sloppiness and waste in defense contracts.

Under new directives, defense contractors will no longer be allowed to submit ridiculously low bids in order to "buy into" a long term military project. And both the contractors and the military services have been warned that unlimited "cost overruns" stemming from costly changes in design will not be tolerated.

If Laird can make his directives stick, there will be no more C5A, F111, nuclear bomber, and defense missile scandals of the sort that have cost this country an estimated \$30 billion in sheer waste over the past 20 years.

The new guidelines are long overdue. So scandalous has been the waste in the Defense Department that it has led to a dangerous crisis in confidence in the American military planning establishment. A group of 45 congressmen has recently signed a report stating that the "military-industrial complex" has become an independent empire practically free of congressional control and threatens to turn the United States into a garrison state. It gobbles up 80 per cent of the national budget, sets foreign policy, starves domestic programs and keeps the world in fear of nuclear war, they say.

That is scary talk. Even though the congressmen are mostly liberals who are opposed to the Vietnam war and the antiballistic-missile system, their warning falls on many receptive ears.

But the situation as it has developed is partly the fault of Congress. Congress should have insisted on taking a closer look at the various major military projects. Instead, both armed services committees have allowed the military to grossly overuse the "national secrecy" argument in regard to defense proposals. By thus withholding information—or concealing their lack of hard information—the military planners more than once got themselves mired in projects that should never have been started without intensive research and discussion.

The Pentagon and the nation are paying dearly for the lack of candor shown by the military. The country today is profoundly suspicious of all Defense Department proposals, to the point where the military security of the nation may be affected, if confidence is not restored.

Like it or not, the Defense Department is essential to the continued survival of America as a free nation. It is not some evil conspiracy of contractors, generals and politicians. But the Pentagon has been far too reluctant to ride herd on its contractors, and it has even tried to cover up blunders of colossal size.

If Laird can clean out the Pentagon, he will be topping Hercules and the Augean stables bit.

PROUD DAY FOR ITALY

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the whole world joined on Monday in paying tribute to the 23d anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic, for indeed this rebirth of Italy is one of the great achievements of our time.

The Italian people have demonstrated their great spirit of achievement when in 23 short years they were able to rebuild Italy from the ruins of World War II to one of the great nations of the world today.

I have in my district many Americans of Italian descent who are a living monument to the impressive contributions that Italians have made to the progress of the world since the very beginning of civilization.

Both the Chicago Sun Times and the Chicago Daily News carried impressive editorials marking the 23d anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic, and I should like today to include these editorials in the RECORD.

These editorials reflect the high respect and the high regard that Americans of all ethnic backgrounds have for their Italian-American neighbors and for the people of Italy themselves.

The huge contributions of the Italians toward the world's progress in science, in drama, in literature, in medicine, and in philosophy itself are an inspiration to all of us.

The two editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Sun Times]

PROUD DAY FOR ITALY

This is a proud day for Italy and for all of Chicago's Italian-Americans. It is the 23d anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic.

The end of World War II left Italy in a shambles. There was immense war damage, hunger and misery. But the Italians, a proud and hardy people, were determined to build a future.

Their first and proudest structure was a new government. In April 1945, the first representative body was given the job of putting together the regulations for the election of a Constituent Assembly. On June 2, 1946, the Italian voters cast their votes for a republic.

Italy's recovery from World War II, its welcome into the Atlantic Alliance by the nations it had fought against, its entry into the United Nations in 1955, are benchmarks of its comeback from the immense damage done by the war. We salute our friends of Italian extraction in Chicago and the people of Italy on this anniversary.

[From the Chicago Daily News]

ITALY: 23 YEARS A REPUBLIC

By a comfortable, though not overwhelming, margin of 12,717,923 votes to 10,719,284, the people of Italy exactly 23 years ago elected to become a republic instead of a monarchy. From the vantage point of this 23d anniversary, the choice was clearly a good one.

Modern Italy—good neighbor and strong ally—has come a very long way since the dark days of World War II—and since the dark years just after the war, when the Communists tried powerfully but vainly to draw the nation behind the Iron Curtain.

Chicago and Italy serve one another in many ways. Our city's cultural debt to the Italian people is great and growing. Modern Italy leans heavily upon Chicago for manufactured goods of many kinds.

But a more personal link is Chicago's people of Italian descent—a proud and sensitive and productive people whose inherited gifts add richness and flavor to this capital of the American heartland.

In their behalf, and in behalf of all Chicagoans, *I migliori auguri alla Repubblica Italiana.*

SOVIET NEGOTIATIONS A TACTIC

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, keeping the American people accurately informed is the greatest challenge to free speech.

Mr. N. Henry Josephs, 40 Wall Street, New York City, former special consultant to the Undersecretary of War, has prepared a treatise, "President Dwight David Eisenhower—Fruitless Efforts for Peace in Negotiations With Communist Russia."

Mr. Josephs' article covers numerous unsuccessful negotiations by President Eisenhower with the Russians—which the author realizes were tactics used by the Russians to gain precious time.

He points out that our leaders were lulled into a sense of false security—while the Soviets were utilizing the time to escalate their armament buildup.

He says:

This tactic has been successfully employed by every head of the Soviet Union ever since.

I insert Mr. Josephs' article in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER—HIS FRUITLESS EFFORTS FOR PEACE IN NEGOTIATIONS WITH COMMUNIST RUSSIA

(By N. Henry Josephs)

I am not affiliated with any organization, I am not sponsored and all expenses are borne by myself.—N. HENRY JOSEPHS.

NEW YORK, May 1969.

"Abroad, in every major sector, we confront a formidable foe, an expansionist tyranny which respects only toughness and strength and still displays little interest in traveling the pathways to peace, with honor and justice. Today, the Communists reach ruthlessly for domination over Southeast Asia and are trying to break our will to foil the attempt. In the Middle East, month by month they move closer to testing our resolution. The same is true in Korea. Constantly they stir new troubles in every area

of weakness they can ferret out in Eastern Europe, in Africa and Latin America. It is one thing to call for a peaceful settlement of this struggle. It is quite another to call for retreat by America. The latter is the best way I know to stockpile tragedy for our children." (August 5, 1968)—Dwight David Eisenhower, Late President of the United States.

GENEVA—1955

In June of 1955 representatives from sixty countries gathered in San Francisco for a week-long celebration commemorating the Tenth Anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations with Dr. E. N. van Kleffens, of the Netherlands, presiding. Dr. van Kleffens made it clear that this was to be a commemorative meeting and invited the representatives assembled in the San Francisco Opera House to limit their speeches to commemorative purposes. This procedure was adopted in order to stay clear of any issues of substance that might offend the Russians.

Molotov, who headed the Russian delegation, was smiling and was most friendly. He went sightseeing and for the first time the Russians mixed at cocktail parties with members of the delegations of the other Nations. Through an intensive charm campaign, they left no stone unturned to win friends and influence people and moved in wherever there was a fertile field which could be exploited to their advantage.

This "charm campaign" encouraged us to agree to a Summit Meeting with the Russians in Geneva. This Summit Meeting was received throughout the world with great optimism and with a sense of hope that peaceful means for co-existence could be found and that wars in the future could, at last, be averted. The meeting in Geneva by the Big Four, United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and France, was held in an atmosphere of friendship. This, the Russians quickly propagandized as the new spirit, the "Geneva Spirit".

At the conclusion of the meeting, President Eisenhower cautiously announced that at the Geneva Summit "a beginning was made and . . . it is just possible that something to the great benefit of mankind may eventually".

Khrushchev, in his usual bombastic manner, said that "The Geneva conference was of historical significance . . . its distinctive feature was the spirit of cooperation and mutual trust".

After Geneva, the Russians continued to beat the drums of the "Geneva Spirit" and, during the four months following, gave garden parties, exchanged special visitors with the United States, invited the French cabinet ministers to Moscow and Khrushchev and Bulganin accepted an invitation to visit Great Britain in the Spring of 1956. They skillfully lulled the world into a sense of peace and security. The French started to talk about reducing military service and the British introduced bills in Parliament recommending reductions in defense costs.

But when October came and the Foreign Ministers of the Big Four met again in Geneva to formalize the earlier agreements, the Russians, in their not unusual fashion, made an about-face and Mr. Molotov, the smiling, the amiable one, angrily hammered out a fresh Russian get tough policy.

The New York Times, commenting in its lead editorial (Dec. 4, 1955), melancholically said:

"One of the evidences of totalitarianism in government is the haste and precision with which policies can be changed. When Stalin died, Russia seemed to smile. When Lavrenti Beria, head of the secret police, was shot in December, 1953, some of the terror seemed to go out of Russia. When Premier Bulganin

and party secretary Khrushchev or their representative, Mr. Molotov, smiled at San Francisco in June, or in Geneva in August, a sort of warmth spread around the world. But now these men smile no longer. We look around the world with a sense of dismay since the end of the foreign ministers' conference in Geneva, from which so much was hoped and in which so little was realized."

GENEVA—1959

Man is a chronic wisher for peace and meetings at the summit always revive his hopes that talks can avert war. This is why, four years after the first Geneva Summit, we agreed to meet again at the summit. However, this time we let be known that we would hold another summit meeting only if an agenda was agreed upon in advance. For this purpose, an East-West Foreign Ministers' Conference was arranged to be held early in May, 1959, in Geneva.

This East-West Foreign Ministers' Conference opened in Geneva on May 11, 1959. After forty-one days and thirty sessions, fifty-four speeches (totaling 800,000 words, half of which were uttered by Russia's Gromyko alone) the meeting ended in a stalemate. President Eisenhower, in a secret letter to Khrushchev and as a last ditch effort to break the stalemate, warned Khrushchev that unless some progress was made at Geneva, the United States would turn down an East-West Summit Meeting. In a speech in Moscow, Khrushchev boasted that there will be a summit talk, regardless of what happened in Geneva "since the existing situation urgently requires it", a situation he himself created. (Time, June 29, 1959.)

Khrushchev was right, for in spite of all the Russian intransigence, we invited him to the United States. Thus, once again, we encouraged Communist Russia to continue in its belief that setting up obstacles, not removing them, was the way to accomplish their ends.

CAMP DAVID—1959

On September 15, 1959, at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, we officially received, as our guest, Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

Except for pleasantries usually exchanged on such occasions, nothing significant was said by President Eisenhower or by Khrushchev. Whatever serious talk there was during the brief periods when they were alone, it was labeled as "exploratory". Later, President Eisenhower and Khrushchev after a two hours' talk, issued a joint statement phrased as follows:

"The President and the Chairman (Khrushchev) reviewed the relationship between the two countries and exchanged views in general terms on international problems. They agreed on the general line of their further discussion, which will take place on all these subjects following the Chairman's return from his visit throughout the country. They plan to meet for this purpose at Camp David from Friday evening, September 25, until noon on September 27. The atmosphere of the talk was friendly and frank, with agreement that the discussions should continue in this spirit to seek ways to achieve a better understanding."

At a state dinner given at the White House, President Eisenhower raised his glass to Khrushchev and proposed this toast:

"Now, today, it seems to me that our two countries have a very special obligation to the entire world. Because of our strength, because of our importance in the world, it is vital that we understand each other better. The Soviet Union and the United States must have a common purpose in developing the maximum of fact and truth, so that we may better lead this world, between us, into

a better opportunity for peace and prosperity."

Khrushchev answered:

"The United States and the Soviet Union are too powerful to permit quarreling among themselves. . . . Russians believe their Communist system to be superior," he went on, "Americans may believe the same of their system. But surely we should not bring the quarrel out into the arena of open struggle. It is better to let history judge which system is right."

After his sight-seeing, hand shaking tour of the United States, Khrushchev arrived at Catocin Mountains where he spent three days with President Eisenhower at Camp David. The communist propaganda machine blared out to the World the great "accomplishments" reached at this latest summit meeting, to which they gave the label of the "Spirit of Camp David". In truth, nothing in particular had been accomplished except that it was agreed that a Big Four meeting be held in Paris in the spring of 1960. The communique that was issued said:

"The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the President of the United States agreed that the question of general disarmament is the most important one facing the world today. Both Governments will make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem. . . . With respect to the specific Berlin question, an understanding was reached, subject to the approval of the other parties directly concerned, that negotiations would be reopened with a view to achieving a solution which would be in accordance with the interests of all concerned and in the interest of the maintenance of peace. . . . The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the President of the United States agreed that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiations. . . ."

An editorial in the magazine America (December 12, 1959) evaluated the Camp David meeting, as follows:

"The spirit of Camp David, as we see it, is simply that cozy sense of well-being that has been lulling us to sleep since the end of September (1959). When this euphoria sweeps over the ordinary citizen, he says to himself: 'Relax. There's a rainbow 'round the corner. The Cold War was a bad dream—nothing but a misunderstanding between good guys who should have been pals all along.' When the spirit grips the columnist, he enlivens his prose with bright illusions: Khrushchev visits Red China, but puts a leash on Mao; Moscow permits a few cultural exchanges, and lo, there are rents in the Iron Curtain; the Kremlin approves a few washing machines, and the columnist sees consumer pressures dictating the course of Soviet policy. Sometimes, too, the spirit of Camp David seems to bewitch governmental officials at home and abroad. Then we hear that it is time to build bridges of understanding instead of walls of containment. We learn that the relaxing of tensions is a harbinger of disarmament and that soon we can trim defense costs. We even hear it whispered that accommodation is not appeasement; that we must give a little and that the time is ripe to seek a changed status for Berlin and East Germany. . . . what are the facts, two months and a half, after the chummy palaver in the Catocin Mountains? Moscow stands astride Berlin in the same threatening pose that created the desperate crisis of a year ago. The threat of unilateral action had been deferred but in no sense withdrawn. . . ."

PARIS—1960

The Paris meeting and President Eisenhower's visit to Russia in June of 1960 were agreed upon at Camp David. They were un-

derstood to form together a much desired objective to reduce world tensions and make the Spirit of Camp David a reality.

Consultations were held (April 12, 13 and 14, 1960), in Washington, with our Allies, the Western powers. These consultations and conferences were attended by United States Secretary of State Christian A. Herter and Foreign Ministers Selwyn Lloyd of Great Britain and Maurice Couvre de Murville of France. The talks were joined by Foreign Minister Heinrich van Brentano of West Germany, Howard C. Green, Canadian Foreign Minister and Antonio Segni, the Foreign Minister of Italy.

In the meantime, Mr. Haggerty, presidential press secretary, flew to Moscow and there, with Russian officials, was working out the details of the President's visit. White House Secret Service men went to Moscow to consult with Russian security police to insure the safety of the President's tour. It was agreed that the President would appear on television and radio and would speak to the Russian people, the same as Khrushchev did when he toured the United States. However, the President's tremendous personal success during his historic journey, which took him to eleven nations and three continents, and the warm reception given him on his goodwill tour of Latin America in February and March of 1960, worried Khrushchev and some of the other Russian leaders. They began to show outward signs that they felt that they made a terrible mistake in inviting the President to visit the Soviet Union. The Central Intelligence Agency reported to Washington an item which puzzled our top officials. To commemorate President Eisenhower's visit, Russia was printing materials for magazines containing flattering and friendly pictures of our President and of our country. The Central Intelligence Agency had found out that this advance press run had been ordered stopped.

About the same time, efforts were being made by the Russians to compromise members of the White House Staff who were then in Moscow attending to the details for the President's trip.

"Unbeknown to the West, Khrushchev (or the thinkers around him) was seeking ways and means of avoiding, if possible, * * * the Eisenhower visit to the U.S.S.R. * * * One night, after a hard day's work preparing for President Eisenhower's visit to the U.S.S.R., members of Hagerty's staff had dinner and sought their uncomfortable beds in their Moscow hotel. They had hardly been settled in same, in monastic bleakness, when their phones began to ring. At the end of every line was an English-speaking Russian girl, friendly to the point of wanting to come up and make each man's night more comfortable. Hagerty stayed that night at Spaso House with Ambassador Thompson. When he was informed of the phone calls to his people, he confronted a Russian official at a ceremonial luncheon the following day and boldly accused him of the attempt to compromise members of the White House staff. The official looked blank." (William Randolph Hearst, Jr., Bob Conidine and Frank Coniff in "Khrushchev And The Russian Challenge", page 234).

On May 5, 1960, Khrushchev announced that an American U-2 reconnaissance plane had invaded Soviet territory on May 1, in "an aggressive provocation aimed at wrecking the summit conference" and that it had been shot down and its pilot, Francis Gary Powers, arrested for spying. On May 11, Khrushchev, speaking at a display of the alleged wreckage of Powers' plane and equipment, expressed doubt that President Eisenhower would now be welcomed in Moscow.

George E. Sokolsky (New York Journal American—May 13, 1960) in an article entitled "Why Does Mr. K. Fear Ike's Visit?"

discussing Khrushchev's efforts to stop the President from visiting Russia, said:

"It is beginning to appear that Nikita Khrushchev wants to call off the Summit Conference or President Eisenhower's visit to Soviet Russia or both. * * * The visit of President Eisenhower to Russia in June would bring cheer and goodwill to the Russian people. * * * Khrushchev is doing everything conceivable to break down the will of the Russian people to receive Eisenhower with enthusiasm. * * * Khrushchev's present conduct is making it increasingly difficult for President Eisenhower to go to Russia and the efforts are so persistent and so irritating that they are becoming unmistakable and sharply antagonistic. Khrushchev's game apparently is to get Eisenhower to decline to go. Then the Russian will enter upon a world-wide denunciation of Eisenhower and the United States. If President Eisenhower sits tight, moves according to schedule, Khrushchev may find himself in the embarrassing position of being forced to tell Eisenhower that he does not want him to come."

Khrushchev, although delighted over the U-2 incident, was not yet certain whether it was good or bad to withdraw outright the invitation to Eisenhower to visit Russia. Instead, he mapped out a better plan. He announced that he would go on with the proposed Paris meeting and, on his arrival in Paris, he pledged to "exert all effort to make the conference a success, to enable it to result in the further lessening of international tension, in the consolidation of peace and security of nations."

But, on May 15, in separate private meetings with British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan and French President Charles de Gaulle, Khrushchev said he would not participate in the summit talks unless the United States terminated all flights over the Soviet Union, apologized for its past "aggressions" and punished those responsible for the flights. Informed by Macmillan and de Gaulle of Khrushchev's stand, President Eisenhower told the Allied leaders that the flights had been halted and would not be resumed, but he rejected the other demands.

On May 16, the four heads-of-government met in the Elysee Palace. At this meeting, Khrushchev asked to be heard and for one hour he subjected President Eisenhower to one of the bitterest attacks ever heard. Hitler, in his most despicable moments, could not have used more foul language than Khrushchev did on this occasion. At the end of his speech, he brusquely withdrew his invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the U.S.S.R. Macmillan and de Gaulle pleaded with Khrushchev to withhold publication of the speech and later Macmillan visited Khrushchev and urged him not to wreck the conference. De Gaulle tried to save the Summit Meeting and, after one afternoon and night of harried conferences, he asked that all meet the following morning, May 17, "to ascertain whether it is possible for the summit conference to begin the study of the questions which we agreed should be taken up." De Gaulle, Eisenhower and Macmillan showed up, but Khrushchev went for a ride in the country. The three Western leaders were forced to announce that because of Khrushchev's absence the "planned discussions could not take place".

On May 18, in a hectic two and a half hour press conference attended by nearly 3,000 persons, Khrushchev denounced United States' actions as "thief-like", "piratical" and "cowardly" and called President Eisenhower a "fishy" friend. Most of the newsmen present interrupted Khrushchev repeatedly with boos. Khrushchev boomed back at them.

ONE MORE SUMMIT?

The declared policy of the new Administration in our relations with the Soviet

Union was clearly stated by President Richard M. Nixon when he said that "We are in an era of negotiation and we hope the era of confrontation has passed". I am in favor and I support the President's plans to enter upon direct negotiations with the Soviet Union, in the hope that a system of limitations and control of armaments could be developed by mutual agreement.

However, it is one thing to continue our efforts for peace through renewed negotiations with Communist Russia and quite another thing unilaterally to withhold the development of minimum safeguard systems of our own while giving the Soviet Union further additional time in which to develop and build, which they will undoubtedly do, the kind of weapons that would give them an effective and deadly first strike capability against the United States. It can only be suicidal for us to allow another period of negotiations to further strengthen Russia and weaken ourselves.

Recently, in the Senate it was said, in a derisive manner, that some of us discovered that "Suddenly, the Russians are eight feet tall". Let us be honest and recognize the fact that the present strength of the Russians in missile sophistication and missile inventory did not come about "suddenly". The tactic of negotiations has always been employed by the Russians for the purpose of accumulating military strength. They have, during these past fifteen years, bent all their efforts and spent most of their national wealth to build up and, indeed, did build up the missiles which we now have to reckon with.

Two examples should suffice as a sober reminder of Communist Russia's tactic of employing negotiations to cover up eventual deceit.

During the time period consumed by the Geneva and Camp David talks, the Russians developed and built ballistic missiles which they tested (1960) by shooting some of them in the Pacific, right in our back yard, from a firing pad in Russia, more than 7,700 miles away. In June, 1961, Khrushchev solemnly declared that "the Soviets would resume nuclear weapon tests (only) if the United States resumed such tests." Three months later the Soviet Union, with less than twenty-four hours' notice, broke a thirty-four month moratorium and exploded in rapid succession (September 2, 1961) fifteen nuclear tests, all in the air, and by November 30, 1961, detonated more than thirty bombs, one of them the largest ever detonated by man, a bomb of more than fifty megatons.

The Russians did not "suddenly" become eight feet tall then any more than now. The explosions of the nuclear tests in the air on one day's notice and the detonation of more than thirty bombs of high megaton content took a lot of time in developing, building and preparing for the actual firing. The Russians gained this precious time by keeping us busy in fruitless negotiations.

Stalin said (as early as the Fourteenth Communist Congress—Dec. 18, 1925) that periods of negotiations between the world of the bourgeoisie and the world of the proletariat are necessary to international communism and ultimate world conquest. Such periods offer "periods of accumulation of strength which have great significance for further revolutionary initiatives." This tactic has been successfully employed by every head of the Soviet Union ever since.

Negotiations, yes! But not at the expense of our own security. Not without strengthening our own built-in physical safeguards against deceit or surprise attack. Not without an antiballistic missile system (ABM) of such second strike capability that Communist Russia will not misjudge. For, another summit meeting with Communist Russia may be our last summit.

COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND
PORNOGRAPHY**HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, my district has been flooded with obnoxious pornographic literature. The colloquy in the House initiated by our distinguished colleague from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE) is extremely timely because I have been informed that the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography is due to release an interim report within the next week on the results of its investigations to date.

The Congress made a small error in writing the legislation which created the Commission, because we did not call for a report before January 1970. I will take my share of the blame for that oversight in that I was one of the original sponsors and should have insisted on a cutoff date.

If my information is correct, the Congress is indeed fortunate to have persons serve on the Commission who recognize the gravity of the situation confronting us with respect to the flood of pornographic literature. The Commission is to be commended for its proposed action to publish a report on its activities to date.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the 18-member Commission is meeting this very day to decide on the final contents of the interim report to Congress. My colleagues will be pleased to learn as I was that the Commission is also contemplating the publication of a model Federal statute dealing with the subject of pornography; however, there is some question whether it will be released at this time. I want to go on record as saying that I believe it extremely important that this House have the benefit of the Commission's investigations in the form of that model statute.

Perhaps the Commission is hesitant to make a specific recommendation to the Congress before the deadline. I am sure they feel that more study, time, and exhaustive deliberation is needed before a model statute is proposed. I can sympathize with this feeling—the Commission and the Congress want the right law, an enforceable one that will solve the problem. I submit that the Congress desperately needs the guidance it can receive from the experts on the Commission, and now is the time to obtain that guidance. The Commission's job is not done with the publication of an interim report; the response of the Congress to the model statute may provide new avenues of approach to the problem, but we will continue to need the assistance of the Commission which we created.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Commission will give us the benefit of their investigations and help us find a way to put a stop to this filthy junk which is being sent unsolicited through the mails and which permeates the Nation's movie houses. I am one of those 158 sponsors of legislation which calls a halt to this traffic.

I admit to not being an expert on pornography, and I admit that the deliberations of the Commission on Obscenity

and Pornography could influence my own approach to the problem of writing an enforceable law. I would like the guidance of the Commission now—not 7 months hence. I am sure that other Members of the House feel as I do.

TRUMAN WARD

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 2, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we returned to Washington on Monday to find that Truman Ward, who has been a friend of many of us for many years, had suddenly and unexpectedly passed away. It seems difficult to imagine that his gruff but friendly voice, usually spiced with some quip or cheerful comment, will not be at the other end of the phone when we call his office in the future. Mr. Ward was a familiar face to all Members and their staffs ever since he first arrived in Washington in 1921 and became the Democratic printer. All will attest to his affability and easygoing manner, and everyone will agree that his dedicated and unselfish service will be difficult to replace.

Besides serving as clerk of the majority room, he also served unofficially as a placement officer for newcomers to Capitol Hill and politically displaced staff members. As the majority printer, he worked hard and often under trying circumstances for the Members. He had the singular capacity to work with several hundred Members of the House, each one of whom invariably thinks his own requests are more important than anyone else's, each one of whom invariably expects immediate service. Yet Truman Ward managed to keep all appeased, and all of the printing requirements served.

Mr. Ward belonged to the Capitol Hill Metropolitan Baptist Church where he served diligently as a member of the board of deacons since 1943. He was as devoted to his religion as he was to the House of Representatives. Both the Members of the House and the congregation of the Capitol Hill Metropolitan Baptist Church will miss his presence, his outgoing nature, and his scrupulous integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend to Truman Ward's family and his staff my deepest sympathy.

WHAT IS RELEVANT EDUCATION?

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, out of the confusion and crisis-like atmosphere which surrounds today's universities, it is refreshing to read an article by an educator who has not been stampeded into mouthing the jargon of the radicals and

militants and who is able to take a long look at the kind of education afforded today's students in terms of its "relevance." All too often we have heard only about the complaints of the militant students in terms of "educational relevance." I am pleased to bring to my colleagues' attention the other side of the story.

Dr. William W. Hassler, president of Indiana University of Pennsylvania which is located in my district, has spoken out on the subject of educational relevance in the pages of the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat. I believe his comments will be of particular interest to those seeking a calm and reasoned response to the cries of the campus radicals about today's education. The article follows:

IN MY OPINION—EDUCATIONAL RELEVANCE:
NOW AND LATER

One of the problems of great concern to both high schools and college students today is the question: Is my education relevant?

Much discontent arises when the answer is "no"; when students cannot relate what they are learning to the world about them.

A great deal of the controversy over the role of relevance in education arises from a failure to distinguish between what is immediately relevant from what has long-term relevance. From the standpoint of short-term relevance, there is no dispute about the desirability of including relevant material in the curriculum.

For example, it is inconceivable that today's student should not become acquainted with computers and modern scientific instruments, as well as know the significance of RNA and DNA, air pollution, the population explosion, space exploration, ghetto problems and the world's political situation.

This type of relevant subject matter will make learning more interesting and at the same time help the student make a better contribution to society.

However, near-term relevance involves knowledge and skills which will in general tend to improve present-day society but not radically change it. The lesson of history is that knowledge and learning which have long-term relevance are the types which creatively mold a new society. This means that much of the learning and research that has long-term future implications may be totally useless and irrelevant to today's society.

This principle can be illustrated with numerous examples, but let us consider just a few. Over 100 years ago an Austrian peasant named Gregor Mendel entered a monastery at Brunn. His interest in farming led him to study the hereditary characteristics of ordinary garden peas. For eight years he devoted himself to this study, which resulted in the discovery that he could predict the characteristics of successive generations of "mated" peas. Mendel published his laws of heredity in a local scientific journal which collected dust until 35 years after his death. Then in 1900 Hugo deBries discovered Mendel's article and realized its significance. He and other eminent biologists used Mendel's work as a basis for the development of the remarkable field of genetics which has made possible the marvelous breeding of desirable characteristics in plants and animals.

What had been "useless" research and knowledge by Mendel later constituted the foundation for a biological revolution with immensely practical applications.

Another example of the importance of long-term relevance in education is illustrated by the nuclear studies of Drs. Hahn

and Stressemann prior to World War II at the Kaiser-Wilhelm Institute in Berlin. These two eminent scientists were bombarding uranium with subatomic particles when they suddenly obtained a strange reaction. At the time they were not clear as to its significance, let alone realizing that it had any practical value. However, their mathematical assistant, Lisa Meitner, deduced the fact that Hahn and Stressemann actually had split the atom, formed radioactive degradation products and released tremendous energy.

Being a Jewess, Miss Meitner was exiled by the Nazis, whereupon she fled to Denmark. Here she excitedly told her story to Dr. N. Bohr, the famed Danish atomic scientist who immediately flew to America to alert Albert Einstein at Princeton to the fact that German scientists were on the track of atomic energy. Dr. Einstein in turn sold President Roosevelt on the necessity of initiating a crash program in atomic energy for this country.

Again, it is important to realize that the initial experiments involved in splitting the atom were done as a matter of theoretical interest with no thought of practical applications. But what development could be more relevant to the nuclear generation that succeeded this discovery?

The point I wish to make is that both near-term and long-term relevance are important; the former to the improvement of contemporary society, the latter for the creation of a new way of life.

MILITANT WELFARE—A HARD LESSON IN NONCHARITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 5, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is said to be more blessed to give than to receive—and so aspires the militant National Welfare Rights Organization, who not only want to receive, but also to give—give orders—that is, to the professional welfare workers.

And the sad commentary on this welfare burlesque is that those who are truly in need will be hurt by it all.

I insert a news article as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 1969]

RADICALS' DEMANDS STUN AND POLARIZE WELFARE LEADERS
(By Eve Edstrom)

"... or get off the pot." The full, obscene demand was shouted over a seized microphone last Sunday night as more than 5000 of the Nation's social welfare leaders con-

vened to hear an opening address by their president.

In stunned silence, those who had devoted decades to helping the poor heard themselves called "racist pigs," and "fat cats," and members of the "white imperialistic oppressive society."

"Are we going to have too much self-respect to allow a minority in this world to . . . on the rest of humanity?" another speaker shouted.

The platform had been taken over by dissident students, new organizations of militant social workers, and welfare mothers. Two deep, they lined the vast stage in the grand ballroom in the New York Hilton.

When one of the captive audience attempted to lead a mass walk-out, a human chain blocked the exits. Welfare mothers, under the direction of the dashiki-clad Dr. George A. Wiley, said nobody was going to leave until thousands of dollars were anteed up for more of the poor to attend conference conventions. With that, plastic ice buckets were passed around for contributions.

The temporary ballroom dividing wall had to be removed to free the delegates before the 96th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare could begin. Some three hours late, outgoing president Arthur S. Flemming began his opening address: "An Action Platform for Human Welfare."

But the chaos was not over. Wiley and his welfare mothers had set the stage for others to do their thing during the remaining days of the conference—black social workers, Spanish-speaking people, militant students, an Indian who inveighed against the raping of squaws, and a young girl who shrieked that she was a former mental patient and an ex-drug addict.

After four days of confrontations and conciliations, a delegate sat outside the ballroom where the Conference was coming to a close.

"I said to myself this couldn't be happening to US!" he said.

"What am I going to do? Just say a tired liberal is going home."

There were many like him, people who had come prepared to adopt a platform for bringing economic and social gains to the poor.

They had scheduled workshops to "tell it like it is" and to stimulate a "live" confrontation. Indeed, they were going to discuss the "challenge to the professional—can you train the nonprofessional?"

The nonprofessionals are still laughing. The time for well-meaning words is over, they said. The time for action is now.

The failure to silence the militants was a conscious strategy of Flemming, who also is president of the National Council of Churches and president of Macalester College in St. Paul, Minn., where former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey is teaching.

Despite contrary advice from some of his board members, Flemming wanted to keep the avenues of communication wide open

and, by not stopping anyone from speaking, prevent the possibility of violence.

And so it was with some pride that at the end of the conference, Flemming turned over the gavel to the new president, Wilbur J. Cohen, with the words: "I did not use this gavel once this week—I didn't think it appropriate."

Yet the conference that began with threats being made in public ended with one made in private.

Three representatives of the National Association of Black Social Workers cornered Cohen and one said: "We are going to make trouble for you in Chicago," the site of next year's meeting.

The three were angry with Cohen for giving what they characterized as a "law and order" speech. Cohen never said "law and order" but he declared he opposed violence and threats under any guise.

Nor were Cohen's credentials as a former HEW Secretary and long-time battler for liberal causes sufficient.

Ron Lewis, a Negro faculty member at Berkeley's School of Social Welfare, scoffed: "Did you say that guy was a former Secretary of Health or Welfare of something? No wonder the country is in the shape it is in. He's a negative force. He has no vision. He wants to take us backwards, undo everything we've accomplished this week."

In truth, Cohen's speech was an attempt to temporize some of the decisions that had been made during the week by the polite and patient Flemming.

Wiley, for example, had demanded that the Conference contribute \$35,000 to pay the way for 250 poor people to attend next year's conference. And the conference had agreed.

But that vote must be ratified by a mall ballot which will call for an increase in member agency dues. There already is talk that many members would prefer to desert the conference than "pay blackmail" to Wiley's National Welfare Rights Organization.

However, Wiley's initial success caused others to become bolder.

By Tuesday night, the National Association of Black Social Workers had captured all microphones and listed numerous demands, in their representation on policy-making boards.

The conference again was halted until one of the dissidents cockily announced: "This assembly may now proceed with business due to the fact that the board of directors has pretty much accepted the demands made upon them."

By the time the conference had ended, a radical shift in power to give minorities a far greater voice than their numbers actually warranted was underway.

Of all professions, the social welfare workers should have been prepared for the confrontations that took place. But, as one observer said, they thought they were immune from attack because their lives have been spent helping the helpless.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 9, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let not mercy and truth forsake thee; bind them about thy neck; write them upon the table of thine heart.—Proverbs 3:3

O God, almighty and eternal, Supreme Ruler of men, without whom no nation can be great, no people can be good, make us mindful of Thy presence, eager to do Thy will, and willing to walk in Thy way.

May the light of Thy spirit enlighten our spirits that we may see the truth

clearly, follow it courageously, and live with it confidently, knowing that it is the truth which makes and keeps men free.

Guide Thou our President and all who confer with him that out of conferences may come plans for the ending of war and procedures for ushering in peace. So may it be for Thy glory and for the good of all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 5, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3480. An act for the relief of the New Bedford Storage Warehouse Co.

THE LATE HONORABLE SENATOR GUY CORDON

(Mr. WYATT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)