

cedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 12028. A bill to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 12029. A bill to prohibit the issuance of any license, permit, or other authority by the Federal Governor with respect to the submerged lands beneath Lake Okeechobee, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 12030. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the U.S. mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain obscene material sold or offered for sale to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 769. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.J. Res. 770. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for

men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 771. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 772. Resolution supporting the establishment of a national cemetery at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. St GERMAIN):

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution relating to an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Enrique Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDE:

H.R. 12034. A bill for the relief of Donald C. Goewey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12035. A bill for the relief of Francesco Parinisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 12036. A bill for the relief of Nevenka Opacic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12037. A bill for the relief of Ali Somay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 12038. A bill for the relief of Stanley Wronski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

140. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Homere Rousseau, New York, N.Y., relative to a proposal for the elimination of air pollution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

141. Also, petition of the Okinawa Teachers Association, Naha, Okinawa, relative to the return of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

142. Also, petition of the Village Assembly, Tomigusuku, Okinawa, relative to the return of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 12031. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rodrigo Tlongson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 12032. A bill for the relief of the Holley Carburetor Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 12033. A bill for the relief of Hector

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE DARIEN GAP, FINAL LINK IN THE PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY SYSTEM

#### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the closing of the 249-mile highway gap between Panama and Colombia is a project of highest emotional value to all Latin American countries. For over 15 years this project has been given top priority over all highways in Latin America by the Pan American Highway Congresses of the Organization of American States. The surveys to close the gap, undertaken by the OAS under the direction of the Bureau of Public Roads, have been financed by a \$3 million special fund, two-thirds contributed by the United States and one-third contributed by all Latin American countries. These surveys are just being completed and the recent breakthrough by the Bureau of Public Roads, which was cited as one of the 10 outstanding engineering achievements of 1968 by the National Society of Professional Engineers, has proven the feasibility of a route 212 miles shorter and \$116 million less costly than that previously designated for linking North and South America. By a formal international agreement signed on May 1, 1969, in Bogotá, the public works ministers of Panama and Colombia gave the highest priority to the construction of this short route.

Since the early 1930's the United States has appropriated over \$170 million to assist in the construction of the Inter-American Highway through the countries of Central America and Panama. Each of these countries furnished at least one-third matching funds, though Mexico constructed their 1,587 miles without U.S. participation. The entire highway, extending 3,100 miles from Texas to the Panama Canal, has been open for 6 years and the final few unpaved miles in Costa Rica are now under contract for asphalt surfacing. However, the highway ends at Panama, and there is no road connecting Central America and Panama with South America.

This Inter-American Highway has been an outstanding example of international cooperation and highlights the importance of major interconnecting highways in a country's development. Without question it has been the most important single factor in the success of the Central American common market. Where only a few years ago practically no commerce crossed between these countries, and the borders were the scenes of armed conflict, now the traffic flow over the highway has broken down the barriers and resulted in rapidly increasing industrial exchange and social integration.

The benefits already evident from the increasing use of the Inter-American Highway could be greatly enhanced by extending it through the Darien Gap to connect with the highway system of

South America. There is sound economic justification for the construction of the highway in Panama and Colombia alone, and the projected advantage to all of Latin America stirs the imagination. As a result this program has unanimous political and emotional support of all the countries of the OAS.

Three years ago the Inter-American Development Bank issued a comprehensive report entitled "Multinational Investment Programs and Latin American Integration," which was prepared by the Development and Resources Corporation of New York—the so-called "Lillenthal Report." This report recommended the closing of the Darien Gap as an outstanding project for highlighting the importance of multinational integration and as being fundamental to Latin American progress. The report pointed out that the Darien project could well prove to be the cornerstone for a new structure of international cooperation in the whole field of transport and communication.

The Pan American Highway Congresses, recognizing the success of the Inter-American Highway, have urged that the Darien program be authorized as a continuation of the U.S. Inter-American Highway Authority under the Bureau of Public Roads. Closing the Darien Gap by following the policies and procedures which have worked so well throughout Central America would result in crediting the overall Alliance for Progress program.

Studies undertaken in connection with the long route, originally proposed in

Colombia, supported economic feasibility on the basis of a 461-mile highway project. The recent breakthrough in proving the feasibility of the short 249-mile route greatly enhances the economic returns since the same benefits will accrue from about half the investment. The present estimate, developed under the direction of the Bureau of Public Roads for the short route, totals \$149 million; \$89 million for 199 miles in Panama, and \$60 million for 50 miles in Colombia, including the crossing of the forbidding Atrato River Swamp. These estimates are based on sound engineering designs and include allowances for engineering, contingencies, and inflation of 25 percent over the 10-year construction period proposed. The detailed surveys are sufficiently advanced to permit initiation of construction from several headings in Panama and Colombia.

In addition to the great emotional and political benefit of assisting in the closing of the highway gap between North and South America, the sound economic benefits include the development of forest products, basic minerals, agriculture, and of considerable importance, the opening up of the Pan American highway system for tourists. While the immediate economic values would benefit Panama and Colombia, it is obvious that the industrial, recreational, and political potentials extend throughout the Americas.

Today, I have introduced a bill, along with my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), to authorize the United States to cooperate with the Government of the Republic of Panama and the Government of Colombia in the construction of approximately 250 miles of highway in these two countries, in the location known as the Darien Gap, to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Pan American highway system of South America. The construction of this highway would be under the administration of the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Department of State, the same as the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and would be subject to the same requirements as those applying to the Inter-American Highway.

Obligation of U.S. funds would be conditioned upon the agreement of each of the two countries to provide all necessary rights-of-way, not to impose or permit the imposition of tolls on the highway, not to levy or assess any fee, tax, or other charge for use of the highway by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles and persons of such country, to continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with treaties and international conventions establishing such reciprocal recognition, and to provide for the maintenance of the highway after it is completed in condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

This bill would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed \$100 million, which would be expended over a period of approximately 10 years to pay two-thirds of the cost of construction of the highway.

REPRESENTATIVE JOE L. EVINS'  
CIRCUIT RIDING CONCEPT PAYS  
OFF

### HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 9, 1969

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) has long been recognized as an outstanding champion of small town and rural America.

Through the years he has fought to assist our smaller communities with their limited resources to participate to a much greater degree in Federal programs of assistance.

Thanks to JOE EVINS and others who joined him in this effort, our smaller communities are now participating in many Federal programs.

Congressman EVINS has also developed and followed through on new concepts with respect to small town America.

For example, he pioneered in the multicounty circuit riding concept of bringing government to the people. At his suggestion and on his recommendation, a circuit-riding team of Federal officials toured a number of counties in Tennessee, explaining Federal programs at regional conferences, discussing local problems, visiting with local officials—truly bringing government to the people and bridging the gap between Washington and local communities.

As evidence of the success of these Partnership for Progress Conferences, specific projects have been developed and approved in this area. The city of Kingston, Tenn. for example, recently received approval of funds to finance a new community center.

Another of Congressman EVINS' accomplishments has been the establishment of the Office of Small Town Services in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This office acts as a liaison between our smaller communities and the various departments in HUD.

This office is the voice of Smalltown America in HUD.

Because of the great interest in our smaller communities, I am placing in the RECORD herewith articles concerning Congressman EVINS' accomplishments in this field.

The articles follow:

[From the Roane County (Tenn.) News,  
May 29, 1969]

#### CITY GETS FUNDS FOR COMMUNITY CENTER

Kingston is going to have a community center, with two-thirds of the financing coming from a Federal grant.

This was announced this week by Mayor Chester Fultz and Roy Bowen, chairman of the park and recreation commission upon notification of the grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The City is getting a grant of \$243,812 from HUD to be used for a neighborhood facility to be designed as a community center.

The center is to be located on City-owned land at the junction of Patton Ferry Road and Race St., near Roane County High School.

Total cost of the project is put at \$365,718 and the provision of the site and other local

services will be included in the City's portion of the cost.

Mayor Fultz and Bowen, who is coordinator of program development for the County school system, said the project is a direct result of a "circuit-riding" trip of Federal agency officials which started at Kingston last June. The "circuit-riding" concept was developed by Congressman Joe L. Evins of the Fourth District.

At the team visit, numerous prospects were discussed in terms of local, state and national cooperation. Several others than suggested still are in discussion stage.

Fultz and Bowen said the next step in the project will be the completion of certain "paper work" and the completion of the final detail drawings by the architect-engineers.

The firm handling the project is Barge, Waggoner and Sumner, which handled most of Kingston's street and sewer projects.

"We are indebted to Congressman Evins for his work in the circuit-riding project," said Fultz. "It has certainly made a big development possible for Kingston."

He also expressed appreciation to Charles Sonneborn, who made the circuit trip as the representative of HUD, and others in that agency.

Kingston's formal application was filed with HUD at Atlanta in March. Fultz, Bowen and several others made a trip there to deliver the application.

Other details as to the center will be announced in the near future.

Evins expressed gratification that the grant had been approved and that dividends were being seen from the "circuit riding" program. He thanked officials of Kingston, who set up the first stop on the tour.

Sonneborn, who is director of Small Town Services for HUD, issued the following statement:

"The approval of the Neighborhood Facilities grant for Kingston shows the value of the circuit-riding concept initiated by Congressman Joe L. Evins. Programs that can remove Federal officials from behind their desks in Washington and take them to the grass-roots are invaluable from both standpoints.

"They give the Federal officials valuable insight into local problems and in providing local officials and information and assistance normally unavailable.

"In the case of HUD, whose delivery system is limited to regional offices and statewide program representatives, it is hoped that the service as provided by circuit-riding teams can reach the local officials and advise on their specific problems."

[From the Rural Electric Newsletter, May 23,  
1969]

#### SMALL TOWN OFFICE TO STAY; NRECA BACKS RURAL HOUSING

Rep. Joe L. Evins (D-Tenn.) has been assured by Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney that HUD will not close its Office of Small Town Services.

Evins, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for HUD, received strong backing from rural electric and other rural organizations in his efforts to keep the office open following reports it would be phased out. He received a large number of telegrams and letters expressing support for the office during hearings on HUD funds.

In its position paper on rural area development last January, NRECA recommended that the office be expanded to insure better coordination among HUD agencies for rural development and to assist rural communities in solving the complicated requirements when applying for HUD assistance.

In testimony last week on HUD appropriations, NRECA's William E. Murray, legislative representative for rural area development, pointed out that a great deal of knowledge and work is required by applicants for

HUD help, and that small towns and rural areas often are at a disadvantage because, unlike big cities, they do not have the expertise or full-time personnel to prepare and follow through on applications.

Murray said that this problem could be substantially overcome by expansion of the Office of Small Town Services, which was authorized last year.

"Presently," said Murray, "the office has a very limited staff and a very limited budget. We would urge that it be considerably expanded so that it can provide effective liaison with HUD agencies, plus advisory and informational services to insure a better delivery system for HUD assistance in rural areas."

Murray expressed support for full funding in fiscal 1970 of the new home ownership and rental mortgage interest subsidy programs.

He said that if the goal of a decent home for every American as reaffirmed by the 1968 Housing Act is to be achieved, "much more emphasis must be placed on meeting housing needs of rural areas."

NRECA General Manager Robert D. Partridge this week re-emphasized that more attention needs to be given to rural housing. In a statement presented Tuesday to the National Rural Area Development Conference on Community Building in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., Partridge said, "If by magic we could rehabilitate all the substandard housing in our urban areas, only one-half of America's housing problem would be solved." He pointed out that rural areas have less than one-third of the nation's population, but 56 percent of the nation's substandard housing.

He said the dimensions of rural America's housing needs are largely unknown and are overshadowed by urban problems. "We realize," he said, "that the urban crisis and the rural crisis are really the same crisis and they cannot be separated or successfully dealt with on a piecemeal, individual or isolated basis . . . The country cannot succeed in one and fall in the other."

The three-day NRECA-sponsored conference, which opened Tuesday, explored "New Techniques in Community Facilities and Housing" in attempts to answer the pressing need for housing and community development in rural areas.

#### CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS' WORK CITED

#### HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the work of one of the most industrious members of the Public Works Committee, of which I am chairman, has been cited by the Longview, Tex., Morning Journal.

The newspaper editorial reviews Congressman ROBERTS' broad interest in many areas of concern to his constituents, but particularly singles out his great and valuable work and leadership in the proper development of water resources.

So that all of our colleagues can know of the high esteem in which Congressman ROBERTS is held by the people of east Texas, I include the editorial from the Longview Morning Journal as part of my remarks at this point:

#### OUR CONGRESSMAN AT WORK

One of the finest examples we know of a congressman at work for his district and for

the best interests of his country is being shown in this Congress by U.S. Rep. Ray Roberts of the 4th Texas District.

We can review here only a part of Congressman Roberts' work, for—to paraphrase an old saying—a citizen's work is from sun to sun, a congressman's work is never done. To Ray Roberts, being a U.S. Representative is full time work.

Mr. Roberts was in Longview briefly Friday and presented the National Safety Council's Award of Merit to the Defense Products Manufacturing Division of R. G. LeTourneau, Inc. He cited the company for "playing an extremely vital role in our defense program" in handling \$154 million in defense contracts, and praised employes and the safety program for having achieved 2,482,972 man hours without a disabling injury.

The visit here was part of a busy weekend schedule of calls in the 4th Texas District—a necessary activity for a congressman who seeks to keep in close touch with the people of the region he represents.

A veteran in the work of Congress, Ray Roberts has shown himself alert and knowledgeable in legislative processes and an effective man not only in the committees and halls of the Congress but also in dealing with other federal agencies in and out of Washington.

The record shows he has not been content merely to attend House sessions and vote; he continuously studies district and national needs and problems, initiates and introduces bills, and works with others for passage of specific legislation touching both local and national conditions.

On a matter of the keenest interest to taxpayers, Rep. Roberts is working with other congressmen in the House and on the Ways and Means Committee to help close loopholes they feel enable some millionaires and tax exempt foundations to avoid paying income taxes.

"When we can close these loopholes we will be able to reduce the tax load on the average taxpayer or make some payments on the national debt," Roberts explains in his newsletter. "In addition, I am supporting the proposal to increase the income tax exemption from \$600 to \$1,000 per person," and he adds that he is hopeful "that we can find the funds for a \$1,200 exemption."

The so-called "Ray Roberts No Work No Eat" bill is a measure the purpose of which he explains this way: "This bill would change our welfare system from a give-away program to a work program. Able-bodied men and women would be required to work to receive federal assistance. It would not affect our elderly or disabled."

Congressman Roberts has introduced another bill of great importance to retired people and other citizens drawing Social Security. Under his bill, a man and wife could earn up to \$4,800 a year and still receive their full Social Security benefits. This would be very helpful to older people now on limited income and plagued by rising living costs.

There is another area in which Rep. Roberts has been active. This is the effort to reduce federal spending as a means of combatting inflation with its higher prices and reduced purchasing power of the dollar.

"We have made some headway in reducing federal spending," he reports. "We placed a mandatory ceiling on federal spending which would slow down the big spenders in their efforts for more urban welfare and foreign giveaways. If we had had a few votes from some of the Eastern big city members of Congress earlier," he believes many of the changes he is seeking could have become law some time ago.

Mr. Roberts believes, and we think rightly so, that these legislative items are among the most important matters now before the Congress—important to the people because they would benefit those who are shouldering the largest tax burden in the nation, the skilled hourly workers and white collar people in the middle income bracket.

Rep. Roberts will be warmly applauded for introducing a bill, H.R. 4203, to make it a federal offense to mail obscene material to minors or to families which have minors in the home. Homes and offices in Longview and East Texas have had their private decency invaded by this flood of pornographic smut, apparently designed to exploit the natural curiosity of children and young people as it deals with filthy sex and perversion and sadistic behavior. The Roberts bill seeks to get around recent Supreme Court decisions and still empower the Post Office Department to protect the public, and he appeals to citizens to support the crusade against obscene material and the President's recommendation to control this tide of smut being sent through the mail.

The Congressman's leadership at the Washington level and his coordinating efforts in the Sabine River Basin flood prevention and development project are well known. He invited the members of the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works to Longview for a public hearing which, with much more recent work in Washington, has resulted in the Sabine project being placed in line for Presidential recommendation for inclusion in the next omnibus Rivers and Harbors improvement bill.

As a member of this subcommittee and as representative of most of the upper Sabine Basin, Mr. Roberts has taken great pride in the work of Chairman Robert E. Jones (congressman from Alabama) and his associate committee members, not only in the broad scope of the public hearing in Longview but also in the thorough manner in which they have followed through in Washington on this important flood control and development project.

These matters are only a few of the many in which Congressman Roberts is concerned and in which he is working in a dedicated and effective manner to bring about changes and improvements. We feel that the people of the 4th Texas District are deeply interested in this kind of constructive work and appreciate the continued efforts of their congressman.

#### WORLD FAMOUS FERTILIZER CENTER AIDS FARMERS

#### HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the Progressive Farmer magazine printed an excellent article on the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority's world famous National Fertilizer Development Center at Muscle Shoals, Ala. The account briefly traces the history of the center and tells of its importance in the development of new plant foods and in the reduction of the cost for plant nutrients.

Although the development of new fertilizer is of foremost importance to farmers, the National Fertilizer Center is of great concern to every person in this Nation because each of us is a consumer of farm produce.

In developing new products and new procedures to make farming more efficient, the center has played a significant role in holding down the cost of farm production and enabling the farmer to market his produce at the lowest possible prices.

The article points out that research work at the center offers great promise

of more impressive achievements in the years ahead.

So that all of my colleagues may know of the National Fertilizer Development Center, I include this article from the Progressive Farmer magazine at this point:

WHERE THE PLANT FOOD SEARCH GOES ON  
(By Fred Myers)

The South can boast that it holds the largest fertilizer research facility in the world. It is TVA's National Fertilizer Development Center at Muscle Shoals, Ala. From this complex of chemical plants and laboratories have come new discoveries, to make the fertilizer you buy today one of the best investments you can make.

The Center is near Wilson Dam, which was built during World War I to supply electricity for the manufacture of nitrates to be used for explosives, but the war ended before the dam was completed. The nitrate plant, built by the War Department, sat idle until 1933 when it was released to TVA for use in a national program to develop new and better fertilizers. Since phosphate was badly needed, TVA hired engineers to modify and operate the plant to produce concentrated superphosphate. Scientists were hired to discover new fertilizer compounds.

Beginning in 1934, the use of high-analysis phosphate was demonstrated on thousands of Tennessee Valley farms and then on farms throughout the South and in other parts of the country. Today the program is broader. In nearly every state, more than a dozen experimental nitrogen and phosphate fertilizers are being tested under farm conditions in cooperative educational programs with colleges.

During the 1950's, new types of fertilizers, new ways of producing and distributing them, and new demands by farmers put pressure on the fertilizer industry to change from its traditional mixed-fertilizer system. But the biggest changes didn't come until the 1960's. Before technology came to the rescue, more than one farmer cursed the dusty, dirty, trash-filled powder which caked in bags and clogged applicators. Now, new manufacturing techniques—many of them developed by TVA—have helped make possible the granulation of more than 90% of all dry fertilizer sold.

The form in which fertilizer was marketed changed most with bulk blending. With this technique, you can make "prescription" fertilizers to solve specific soil fertility problems. In 1960, there were fewer than 300 bulk blending plants in the United States. Now there are more than 4,000.

Those in the fertilizer industry—and farmers—were surprised at the speed with which bulk blending spread. But they have been even more conscious of the rising popularity of liquid mixed and suspension fertilizers. Intensive basic research at the Center—including some dramatic breakthroughs in the 1950's—set the stage for an upward spiral in the production and use of these two types of fluid fertilizer. The rush to fluids shows no sign of stopping, and they offer several advantages. One of the most important is that micronutrients and pesticides can easily be added to the fertilizer mixture and applied at the same time.

With the introduction of fluids, however, came the need for more modern technology. Besides belts and bins for handling granular fertilizers, the industry suddenly needed pipes, tanks, mixers, meters, different application equipment, and information never before needed by the industry. Again, the Center conducted demonstrations, supplied engineering help to companies, and conducted research to find better ways of making and applying liquid mixers and suspensions. And it's still doing these things.

It has also introduced new fertilizers for industry to use in making fluid grades. First came 10-34-0 which was soon replaced by

11-37-0, now commonly used in making high-analysis liquid mixes. A 12-40-0 suspension developed by TVA is being introduced to the industry to make high-analysis suspensions—some containing as much as 50% plant nutrients. Suspensions with an even higher analysis are being tested.

What are you likely to see in coming years? Research at the Center gives two interesting clues. First, there will be nitrogen granules which, because of a coating, will release nitrogen throughout the growing season or even longer. This will be a real advantage to producers of forage or other crops requiring repeated applications of nitrogen for fastest growth and top yields. One slow-release fertilizer—sulfur-coated urea—is already in the advanced pilot plant stage of development.

Second, fertilizers of the future will become even more concentrated. Some compounds, still being studied in the laboratory, contain up to four times as much plant nutrients as today's average fertilizer. Such high-analysis fertilizers will mean the application of fewer tons to get the same crop response. They will also save on freight, handling, and storage costs.

Few farmers 20 years ago would have predicted these things would happen by 1969: That they would have a choice of buying fertilizer by the bag, the truck, or the tank. That granular fertilizer without dust and lumps would be the rule, not the exception. That the leading grade in the South—then 4-10-7 with 21% plant nutrients—would be replaced by 6-12-12 with 30% plant nutrients.

But there's still much to be done. And scientists at the Center will take enough time from their greenhouse, laboratory, and production studies to tell you that the search goes on.

SUFFERING IN SILENCE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are becoming increasingly alarmed by the ever-growing inflation in our country. I am sure that most of our colleagues are hearing from their constituents on this matter, also.

The one group of people that inflation hurts most is the group which is retired or reaching retirement age. Our elderly usually must live on a fixed income which does not go up as prices rise. As a result, they must lower their standard of living.

The following letter was printed in the "Letters to the Editor" section of the Montgomery Advertiser recently. I urge my colleagues to read this letter and give careful consideration to this important matter. The letter follows:

SUFFERING IN SILENCE

EDITOR, THE ADVERTISER:

There are more than 20,000,000 people over 65 years of age living in our country today who have paid into the government insurance or Social Security their dollars when a dollar would buy from 6 to 20 times more than it will today. We are law-abiding citizens who are not asking for any handouts from the taxpayer. All we are asking for is to give us back our dollars with the same value as they had when we paid them.

No we are not asking for \$1.79 a pound steak or \$1.19 a pound pork chops. We have been enjoying chicken at 29 cents a pound but even this went up to 45 cents last week. There are hundreds of items out of our reach.

The fact is we are paying the same for electricity, water, gas, telephone service, clothes and food as the man making 35 to 80 dollars a day. This is the man who governs the prices we all have to pay, and the big demand for help will be with us as long as the government keeps paying handouts to almost half the people of our nation in the form of welfare, rent subsidies and various farm programs.

We are the forgotten people, living on an average of \$100 a month in this highly inflated period. But we are not complaining, we are not demanding or (blackmailing, a more appropriate word). We are not burning or looting. We are not demanding millions from the churches which we know will tear them into splinters.

We are not threatening our mayors, councilmen, governors, congressmen, senators or president. Neither are we boycotting our merchants. However, we do have to spend our little insurance wisely to exist at today's money value. We are living a whole month on about the equal of three days salary of the average American worker.

We pay our sales taxes, our property taxes and insurance, if we are lucky enough to own our homes; and, if not, we pay rent the same as if we were making \$4 to \$10 an hour. Yes, we are from all walks of life: farmers, factory workers, clerks, merchants and businessmen that have paid our income tax and Social Security. We have given to colleges, churches, Boy Scouts, the YMCA and every worthy organization and would like to continue to help financially but it is impossible on our deflated dollar.

Yet we see able-bodied people who have never paid any taxes except sales and gasoline tax and who have never worked a day in their lives drawing a much larger welfare check than our insurance is paying us. They also get commodities and many more benefits to make them more comfortable, healthy and ready to loot, burn and riot if they do not have their way.

Yes, old people can get hungry too but you never hear of a committee from Washington being sent to find them.

We have been tied in with HEW so our insurance money can be used to pay these welfare checks and also to make it appear our insurance is a form of welfare or a handout from Washington, which we rightly resent.

We could organize and carry an election in our country but we do not believe in a block vote. We believe in true democracy.

You do not see our names and pictures smeared all over the front pages of the newspapers or see us marching on television. You do not see or hear of us breaking any laws nor do we intend to for we have too much respect for our country and ourselves. We are not asking for one thing that would not be good for everyone, for we are not a privileged group and are not asking for anything that would not help and probably save our nation: that is, to curb inflation, so that we can have chicken at least for Sunday dinner and peace of mind if someone comes to see us we will have some food to serve them. Our pride and dignity will not allow us to accept handouts.

Think about it and help save our nation from the death of inflation.

GEORGE BLACKMON.

PRATTVILLE, ALA.

THE STEADY PROGRESS TOWARD  
PEACE

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is understandable that Americans of all per-

suasions are becoming weary of involvement in the fate of other nations and that most Americans are anxious that our attention and resources be devoted to the ills of our strife-torn society.

The President was correct in saying that the easy and politically popular thing to do would be to promise an end to Vietnam and all other foreign entanglements. Americans yearn for peace.

Unfortunately history does not give us what we want when we want it.

I congratulate the President for his courage and statesmanship in reminding us that—

The world of our desires remains distant from the world of reality, and it may elude us entirely if we fail to see our present situation clearly and act accordingly.

Now the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam will begin. If conditions permit, the withdrawal will continue. This is a sound beginning. Let us not be so impatient for more instant solutions that we undermine the steady progress toward peace.

#### MINNESOTA FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

### HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to announce that the Minnesota Association of the Future Farmers of America has conferred upon me its degree of Honorary State Farmer at its 39th annual State convention at the University of Minnesota on May 5. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Future Farmers both for the compliment they have paid me and for the excellent work they and their organization perform. The following resolution was passed by the Minnesota House of Representatives. I submit the resolution for inclusion in the RECORD as follows:

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION 27

A house resolution commending the Future Farmers of America

Whereas, the Minnesota Association of the Future Farmers of America will hold its 39th annual State Convention at the Institute of Agriculture, University of Minnesota on May 4th to 6th, 1969; and

Whereas, this organization has a membership of over 14,000 students enrolled in high school vocational agriculture in 270 secondary schools in Minnesota; and

Whereas, members of this organization are contributing to the agricultural economy of this great State of Minnesota through the application of recommended practices in their investment of nearly four million dollars in agricultural programs; and

Whereas, this organization annually conducts outstanding conservation programs such as reforestation, beautification, improvement of wildlife habitat and raising and releasing of over 11,000 wild mallard ducklings and over 35,000 pheasants and also engages in a tree planting program involving over 900,000 seedlings each year; and

Whereas, this organization has participated with the State and National Safety Councils to promote the use of emblems on slow moving vehicles on our roads; fire and railroad crossing safety projects; and

Whereas, this is the only known youth organization conducting a state-wide educational program on health hazards resulting from the use of tobacco, alcohol and narcotics; and

Whereas, this organization has contributed over \$200,000 to charitable activities since 1953 including \$65,000 for a speech therapy building at Camp Courage; contributed over \$2,000 in cash and gifts for mentally retarded; and

Whereas, this organization has contributed garden and carpenter tools for marginal farmers in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and books for agriculture students in the Philippines and Korea; therefore,

Be it resolved that the House of Representatives commend the Minnesota Association of the Future Farmers of America for their outstanding program and significant contributions to the development of citizenship and rural leadership qualities in its members as well as the agricultural economy of the State of Minnesota.

Be it further resolved that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives forward a copy of this resolution to the Minnesota Future Farmers of America organization at the State Department of Education, Vocational Education Section.

Mr. Sathre moved that House Resolution No. 27 be now adopted.

The question was taken on the adoption of House Resolution No. 27, and House Resolution No. 27 was adopted.

#### SCANDAL AT SBA—XI

### HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, my studies of the Small Business Administration under its current leadership have reflected one thing more than anything else, and that is that the SBA needs leadership and management that is vastly better than anything now at hand. I am sure that some of my colleagues have thought that I was only making partisan gestures, but the fact is that the minority membership of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business apparently agrees with me.

I do not wish anything but good for the Administrator of the SBA, personally. But with respect to his performance, I wish for very substantial improvement, and sooner rather than later.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to two newspaper stories from the Washington Post, dated June 6 and June 10, 1969. These articles reflect widespread concern over the quality of leadership at SBA. It is such problems as these articles reveal that lead to scandal, and there has been too much of that already at SBA.

The articles follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 6, 1969]

NIXON IS SENDING WHITE HOUSE AIDE TO PREVENT MORE TROUBLE AT SBA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Conditions at the top of the Small Business Administration have now become so serious that President Nixon is planning to dispatch a member of his own White House staff to a major SBA job in an effort to prevent disaster.

The presidential aide Mr. Nixon has tentatively picked is his special assistant Leonard

Story Zartman, a top-flight expert on minority affairs who is now Daniel (Pat) Moynihan's deputy on the Urban Affairs Council, as general counsel of SBA.

Thus Zartman, a highly regarded former official of the Eastman Kodak Co. in Rochester, N.Y., would become the chief commissar of the huge SBA as Mr. Nixon's trusted agent there.

Under Hilary Sandoval, the Mexican-American newsdealer from San Antonio named to head the agency after a furious internal administration battle, the SBA is acting like a beached whale.

Sandoval is earnest and well-meaning, but has proved to be a strikingly incompetent administrator. His first major error was a series of appointments of Texas-based cronies who have been disasters. (One of them, Albert Fuentes, was fired three weeks ago and almost immediately thereafter was indicted by a grand jury on a charge of conspiracy to defraud the Federal Government.)

Some other top level officials hired by Sandoval have not been fired, but cannot get routine Civil Service Commission clearance in their new jobs. One of these is the present acting general counsel, a Texan of Chinese-American background named Daniel Garbern, who is an old Sandoval crony.

The story of Sandoval's vain effort to put Garbern on the payroll at the \$30,000-a-year pay scale (GS-18) normal for that high position—the top Civil Service supergrade—tells much about the internal chaos rocking SBA. The Civil Service Commission (CSC) has kept Garbern on emergency 30-day status at the GS-15 level—\$19,700 a year—and the unfortunate Garbern is now near the end of his third and last 30-day emergency appointment.

The reason the CSC has refused Garbern permanent status at the top rate is simply that he is unqualified. He came to the SBA from his old job as Corporation Court Judge in El Paso.

"The SBA general counsel ought to have the competence to manage a Wall Street law factory," one congressional critic told us, "and Garbern just isn't near that ball park."

Garbern is not the only top Sandoval appointee who cannot pass CSC muster. Phillip Pruitt, named by Sandoval to head the Office of Minority Entrepreneurship, is also still uncleared for a similar \$30,000-a-year salary.

Pruitt's third emergency 30-day appointment expires on June 14 and indications are that the Commission may not renew it, partly for the same reason that has stymied Garbern.

But there is another complicating factor. Late last year, the Commission authorized three GS-18 jobs for SBA in the field of minority capitalism. Since then, President Nixon's Commerce Department has set up its own minority program and the Commission gave it one of the three GS-18 jobs.

Thus, Sandoval is losing out to the Commerce Department in a bureaucratic struggle for supergrade jobs to push black capitalism.

But even worse for Sandoval's standing within the Administration is his treatment of SBA's holdover Black Advisory Council, named last year to help advance black capitalism. Sandoval fired the Council's Washington representative—the able Walter Cooper, who was on loan from Eastman Kodak and has now returned to his job there—and attacked SBA's black capitalism program as tokenism.

To Republican Congressmen on the Senate and House Small Business committees, this spelled deep political trouble, and they took their complaints privately to the White House itself, stopping just short of demands for firing Sandoval.

Mr. Nixon's response is to leave Sandoval where he is for the time being, thus avoiding a showdown with Republican Sen. John Tower of Texas, who sold Sandoval to the White House in the first place.

Instead of firing Sandoval, the President

will surround him with Story Zartman, a young man who stands high with Republicans on Capitol Hill and is widely experienced in the field of minority entrepreneurship.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 10, 1969]

#### GOP STUDY OF SBA RAPS SANDOVAL

A Republican-commissioned study of the scandal-rocked Small Business Administration levels sharp criticism at Republican-appointed administrator Hilary J. Sandoval Jr., sources said yesterday.

The report, prepared for GOP members of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, maintains the loan-granting agency is suffering from a "management gap," sources within SBA said.

The Senate committee opens hearings on the SBA today.

The agency has been in the news recently on two fronts—first, because of loans granted under previous Democratic administrators to firms controlled by a Mafia loan shark, and more recently, because of the indictment of one of Sandoval's top lieutenants, Albert Fuentes Jr.

The report, which will not be released publicly, takes Sandoval, an appointee of President Nixon, to task for allegedly not giving direction to SBA's career people, the source said.

The report will also focus on "management abilities and programs," including the minority ownership program stressed by Sandoval's predecessor, Howard J. Samuels, the source said.

James Reed, Sandoval's assistant for Congressional relations and public affairs, said he doubts the report reflects the views of most Republican Senators on the Committee.

### THE ECONOMY OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, of Pennsylvania, addressed the AFL-CIO State convention in Philadelphia on June 5, 1969, and presented a report on the economy of Pennsylvania. His remarks are as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER AT THE AFL-CIO STATE CONVENTION

There is nothing more important to Pennsylvania's great labor movement and its leaders than the condition of our economy. A healthy economy means better jobs, better incomes and living standards for all union members.

That is why I have chosen this occasion to present to this Convention a Report on the Economy of Pennsylvania.

I am proud of the advances we Pennsylvanians have been making. There is no question that we still have weaknesses in our economic growth, but most signs point to a growing, prosperous Commonwealth.

It is a fact that for the past two years we have had the lowest unemployment, highest employment and fastest increase in personal income in our history.

The most recent unemployment figures show that the rate in May was 2.6 percent, the lowest for any May on record. It was the same story in January, February, March and April of this year.

We gained 44,900 jobs from March to April for a total number of 4,771,800 Pennsylvanians earning a livelihood. That happens to be

the highest number of people employed for any April on record.

Average weekly earnings were \$125.29 for production workers in all manufacturing industries—a record high for that month.

Now, let's take a longer view of what is happening.

Since 1965, total personal income increased almost \$10 billion to \$40.1 billion in 1968.

In January, 1963, unemployment was 9 percent. In January, 1968, it was 2.8 percent.

There were only 4.1 million workers in Pennsylvania in January, 1963, last January there were 4.7 million employed—an increase of 605,000 in six years.

Our aggressive industrial development program, through the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, has provided loans for more than 4,000 new plants and plant expansions. An investment of \$193 million by the State has created 123,000 new jobs with an annual payroll of \$591 million.

There are a lot of other things happening in our State to improve the economic climate. The future is bright because our industrial base is becoming more diversified, as shown in a study by my Economic Advisory Council.

Diversification means more growth and better jobs. Major new companies have been attracted and major old companies have chosen Pennsylvania for expansion: Chrysler Corporation, RCA, American Can, Procter and Gamble, Owens Illinois, Litton Industries, Westinghouse, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, U.S. Steel, to name only a few.

In addition, Pennsylvania has launched its own unique program to train the unemployed and underemployed from the ghetto and rural poverty areas.

This program, which we call T.E.A.M., is producing an excellent partnership between labor, industry and government to solve the problem of those citizens who need help to get and hold decent jobs at decent wages.

The first graduating class of T.E.A.M. is now being placed. It was a class trained by operating an engineering union to handle heavy machinery for highway construction. Each graduate was assured of a union card and a job, starting at about \$5 an hour. That's a long way from joblessness.

One of the union officials said recently that an employer told him he would take as many graduates as he could produce.

This is just an example of some of the good things we are doing with our revenues in Harrisburg in partnership with labor and industry.

I cite all this because there is a revolution in attitude going on toward Pennsylvania—especially in the national and international business community. The old Pennsylvania is gone—the Pennsylvania of joblessness, economic stagnation and little growth.

Pennsylvania dares because the times demand daring and courage. We are not waiting in our Pennsylvania for change to conquer us. We are conquering change. We are getting ready for the 21st century.

Take a close look, we've got—

A brand new modern constitution. A brain power program for modern industry. Economic development that is creating 100,000 new jobs a year. A first of its kind Partner City Plan to help our communities cure their housing, transportation, and urban planning ills.

A \$500 million plan to clean our air, water and land; to create new recreation facilities. A commitment to provide a system of education aimed at a quality knowledge for all. A transportation plan that's building more highways and preparing for high speed corridors. Strong laws to insure human rights, equal opportunity in housing, employment and education.

In addition to all this, we are doing everything within our power to make state government as modern as business in providing services to 11.7 million people.

We have established the first Citizens Priority Commission in the United States to help us decide long-range goals and put them in their order of importance so that the money we have available is spent for the most essential needs of all Pennsylvanians.

We have put the computer to work as never before to help our General Assembly, through the Legislation Data Processing Center and to help the executive branch through a new Bureau of Management Information Systems.

We have become the first state to finance its own long range Planning-Programming Budgeting System.

We are the first state in the nation to present a budget with a forecast of expenditures over the next half decade.

And for the hundreds of thousands of public employes in our Commonwealth at the State and local level we are seeking from the General Assembly a law that will give them the right to bargain collectively—a right that is long past due.

All this is not being done without shaking the status quo. We face fiscal problems just like every other state in the nation. But we are facing the reality of these problems with truth and candor. The people know where we stand and where we must go if we are to achieve our goals.

This is our Pennsylvania moving ahead today for tomorrow. We invite anyone with the same desire to join us.

### HOW CONGLOMERATES WORK

#### HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, with all the furor about conglomerates revolving around us today, it might be wise to look at an honest appraisal of this national phenomenon. Recently, I read an editorial in the Franklin Chronicle, an outstanding weekly in my district, and insert it at this point:

[From the Franklin (Ohio) Chronicle, May 8, 1969]

#### HOW CONGLOMERATES WORK

"Important to a capitalistic society. . ."

"crack trouble-shooting teams. . ."

"an improvement in efficiency"

"vigor, imagination"

"meet the developing and complex demands of a changing world. . ."

All of these statements have been used to describe the operation of multi-product, multi-market companies known today as conglomerates.

The conglomerate type of business organization has been with us for many decades. Our economy is actually in the midst of the fourth such major merger movement of this century. As Senator Roman L. Hruska puts it: "Our approach to this matter (conglomerates) may be somewhat more productive if we establish the premise that actually mergers are part of a normal process and that quiet times are the exceptions. In this way, we can stop looking at the merger movement as an aberration."

In today's frenzied concern over conglomerates as a form of business, the fact that they have solid, positive advantages which account for their long existence as an important mechanism of corporate organization and finance, is often being overlooked.

A more stable environment is produced through the opportunity to smooth out and guard against the dangerous economic excesses of seasonal and cyclical fluctuations.

Management of a conglomerate is in a position to shift large amounts of capital where it can be most productively used. This in turn produces a corollary attribute of the fullest possible employment with the least amount of "out of work" time and therefore engenders the highest possible standard of living.

The conglomerate structure helps business to create stability in the face of today's rapidly shifting market and consumer demands. With diversity in many industries, the conglomerate is less vulnerable to adversity in any one industry. New products and services can be brought to the attention of all consumers so that they can buy if they choose.

These infusions of new capital, new ideas and new expertise have in many cases revitalized outdated and sluggish companies and returned them to the economy as a competitor. In these cases a conglomerate can make use of decentralized management in its affiliated companies. This puts decision-making at a grass-roots-level which is most responsive to the needs of the plant and the community. Creativity, individual initiative, and old style entrepreneurship are encouraged by this large measure of local autonomy.

It can be seen then that the movement toward conglomerate business structures has been developing steadily for many years. The population growth rate has exploded, the demands of the consumer have increased, goods and services are multiple and varied, and the form of business has changed to keep pace. The current form, called conglomerate, is no more a creature of a specific time and place than space travel and undersea living—but rather the current representative of a steady progression of building on the past toward the future.

#### PURVEYORS OF VIOLENCE: THE REVOLUTIONARY UNION

### HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the American public should be constantly aware of the threat to our internal security posed by those organizations which are engaged in revolutionary violence. In order to preserve our precious American heritage, groups which are dedicated to the violent overthrow of the Government should be fully exposed and prosecuted under the law. We cannot tolerate in our midst revolutionary groups which advocate America's destruction by force and violence.

An informative article in the San Francisco Examiner of May 19, 1969, by Edward S. Montgomery described the recent emergence of an extremely militant organization called the Revolutionary Union. According to this report, the membership of the Revolutionary Union is "comprised of a select group of Marxist-Maoist leader from within the underground Red Guard, the Students for a Democratic Society, the Resistance, Progressive Labor Party, and similar Communist dominated groups." The article disclosed that the Revolutionary Union maintains chapters in Berkeley, Palo Alto, and San Francisco, Calif. In addition, this group has regularly conducted classes in "revolutionary tactics, guerrilla—sic—warfare and sabotage" and

"training sessions in the use of rifles, handguns, and automatic weapons are held periodically."

Mr. Montgomery, an investigative reporter who has received numerous awards, including a Pulitzer Prize, testified as an expert witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities on June 27 and 28, 1968, concerning subversive activities relating to the San Francisco riot of September 1966.

I insert in the RECORD a copy of the text of Mr. Montgomery's article:

#### REVOLUTIONARY UNION—MILITANTS' AIMS COME INTO FOCUS (By Ed Montgomery)

The long range objective of Bay Area militants was brought into sharper focus with the recent emergence of the Revolutionary Union and last week's rioting in Berkeley and Palo Alto.

A forerunner to a proposed nationwide Revolutionary Party, the Revolutionary Union membership is comprised of a select group of Marxist-Maoist leaders from within the underground Red Guard, the Students for a Democratic Society, the Resistance, Progressive Labor Party, and similar Communist dominated groups.

There are chapters in Palo Alto, San Francisco and Berkeley. Classes are conducted regularly in revolutionary tactics, guerrilla warfare and sabotage. Training sessions in the use of rifles, handguns and automatic weapons are held periodically in a canyon behind Half Moon Bay and in the East Bay hills.

#### LEADERS

Heading up the RU is Prof. H. Bruce Franklin of Stanford, an avowed Marxist-Maoist revolutionary who co-founded the local Red Guard.

Sharing authority with him as an official spokesman is Robert Avakian, Berkeley revolutionary militant who was active in the Standard Oil strike in Richmond and who recently served a jail term for desecrating the American flag.

Another principal functionary of the RU is Steve Hamilton, a campus agitator who was expelled from UC in 1966. Long identified with the Communist-indoctrinated Progressive Labor Party, Hamilton once headed the Medical Aid for Viet Cong Committee and was one of the Oakland Seven recently acquitted of conspiracy. He presently is serving a 75-day jail term for his part in a campus disturbance in 1967.

#### APRIL 3 MOVEMENT

Franklin, whose Red Guard served as the nucleus of the RU, has also been active in the April 3d Movement at Stanford.

At a meeting of some 500 militants in Memorial Church at Palo Alto Wednesday night, Franklin made the motion calling for the demonstration at Stanford Research Institute on Friday.

The attack on SRI, quelled by tear gas, is but one facet of a revolutionary program through which Franklin and his colleagues admittedly hope to reduce Stanford University to an institution run by students and the working class.

#### EXAMPLES

In a recent speech in Washington, D.C., Franklin described an example of revolution within the university and added:

"This is not a description of Columbia University in 1968. It's Lenin's description of St. Petersburg University in 1908.

"When Lenin describes even earlier events, it sounds like the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley and its aftermath . . ."

#### PEKING

At another point, in lauding the revolutionary takeover of Peking University, Franklin remarked:

"In the Cultural Revolution in China, students began struggling for increased admission of workers . . . different class content in courses, radical changes in testing and grading, and student power as opposed to faculty and administration power. As that struggle advanced, they closed down the schools.

"The result is that the universities are now run by the workers . . ."

In the course of an interview last March, Franklin, who has taught revolutionary tactics at the far out Mid-Peninsula Free University, told of his direct ties with individuals recently returned from Red China.

#### REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

He outlined the "need" for an organization which would serve as a cohesive agent for revolutionary leaders and as the forerunner of a revolutionary party with nationwide political power.

The Revolutionary Union, first announced during a demonstration protesting the scheduled induction of Red Guard Chris Milton three weeks ago, represents the first step.

#### POWER TO THE PEOPLE

A statement of principles for the RU, with Franklin, Avakian and Hamilton as the official spokesmen, reads in part:

"We recognize the need for organized armed struggle against the power of the state, and assume the responsibilities of revolutionaries in the preparation of that struggle. The people must be armed, organized under the direction of a revolutionary party serving the working class . . .

"The organized repressive violence of the state (police) must be met with the organized revolutionary violence of the people. Power to the People!"

#### PEOPLE'S PARK, SRI

Several known members of the RU, along with unaffiliated leftist militants, have been active behind the scenes at Peoples' Park, focal point for Thursday's riot in Berkeley, according to police.

With Tom Hayden of the SDS, Avakian and Hamilton have made periodic appearances at Sproul Plaza, staging area for the riot.

Intelligence sources more than two weeks ago learned of plans by RU members and other militants to make People's Park and the SRI in Palo Alto issues which would lead to direct confrontations with police.

NATIONAL FLAG DAY SHRINES, OZAUKEE COUNTY, WIS.—LEGISLATION TO ALLOW THE FLAG TO BE FLOWN 24 HOURS A DAY AT THE SCHOOLHOUSE SHRINE IN FREDONIA, WIS., AND THE FLAG-POLE AND MONUMENT SHRINE IN WAUBEKA, WIS.

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday will mark the 54th annual observance of Flag Day, a day commemorated by Presidential proclamation since 1949. This year, President Nixon called for the national observance of Flag Day stating:

Our flag is a fragile but infinitely strong piece of cloth. What that piece of cloth stands for we all know. What we sometimes forget, however, is that it is precisely because those things which the flag represents are intangible that we need a flag at all. . . . Our ideals we can honor with our words and

deeds; our flag must be honored by an essentially spiritual reaction to a visual stimulus.

The principles of government and human dignity which our flag represents should be reaffirmed by all. Hunger, despair, and discrimination, though, obscure the flag's meaning to many tens of thousands of Americans. We must never tire in our efforts to make the principles for which our flag stands a reality for all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fitting that as Flag Day approaches we not only reaffirm our faith in the flag and that for which it stands, but also honor Dr. Bernard J. Cigrand, a Wisconsin educator whose untiring efforts around the turn of the century led to the first National Flag Day being declared by President Woodrow Wilson on June 14, 1916.

In recent years the National Fraternal Flag Day Foundation, a nonprofit corporation established by Wisconsin fraternal societies, has carried on the work of Dr. Cigrand. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to insert for the RECORD a statement issued by the National Fraternal Flag Day Foundation, describing the work of Dr. Cigrand and the efforts of the foundation to honor his achievements and to encourage the observance of Flag Day:

**NATIONAL FRATERNAL FLAG DAY FOUNDATION**

Over three quarters of a century ago, a 19 year old, \$40 a month schoolteacher, stirred by a deep love of the American Flag, held the first Flag Day exercises in a little country schoolhouse located near Fredonia, Wisconsin. Bernard J. Cigrand, who later became a professor of dentistry and a college dean, began a lifelong crusade on June 14, 1885, to honor the adoption of the Stars and Stripes by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777.

Thirty-one years later in 1916, his devotion to the Flag was rewarded when June 14 was declared as National Flag Day by President Woodrow Wilson, who said, "the Flag has vindicated its right to be honored by all nations of the world and feared by none who do righteousness." In 1949, long after Dr. Cigrand's death, Congress and the President of the United States proclaimed the Flag would be displayed on all government buildings on June 14 and asked the American people to join in the observance of the Flag's anniversary.

What has happened to the little country schoolhouse where Dr. Cigrand conceived his patriotic idea? It has been purchased and restored to its original appearance and condition by the National Fraternal Flag Day Foundation, a non-profit corporation established by Wisconsin fraternal societies most of whom are members of the National Fraternal Congress of America.

Each year, traditional flag-raising ceremonies are held at the tiny Wisconsin schoolhouse, highlighting the week-long observance of Fraternal Week, sponsored by the National Fraternal Congress of America. Honor salutes are given the Flag and Dr. Cigrand by marching units, drum and bugle corps, bands, Boy and Girl Scout troops, veterans' groups and fraternal societies' representatives. Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious leaders also take part. Anyone attending this annual event can see the original desks and books used by Dr. Cigrand's pupils, along with the original flagpole in the schoolyard where the first observance took place over 75 years ago.

The "father" of Flag Day, which is now the symbol of Fraternal Week, has left behind a lasting inspiration to today's and tomorrow's Americans. It is the aim of the National Fraternal Flag Day Foundation to im-

mortalize the ideal of Dr. Cigrand by continuing to maintain the cobble-stone schoolhouse, located in Ozaukee County, in its original condition and to make it a National Shrine for the purpose of honoring the Flag. It is hoped to perpetuate this National Shrine as a "must" for every Wisconsin tourist.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today which would allow the National Fraternal Flag Day Foundation to fly the flag 24 hours a day at two shrines located in Ozaukee County, Wis. The first is the schoolhouse shrine in Fredonia, Wis., where Dr. Cigrand first held Flag Day exercises in 1885. The second is the flagpole and monument shrine in Waubesa, Wis., which honors Flag Day and Dr. Cigrand.

Legislation is not needed to allow the flag to be flown 24 hours a day, but in the past such legislation has been passed to pay special tribute to those people and events which symbolize our Nation's heritage. Dr. Cigrand and his crusade to honor the adoption of the flag by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777, deserves such a tribute.

**THE NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT**

**HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, congressional investigations perform a very valuable and effective service to both Congress and the American public. Generally, they occur because public response to a national problem is so strong as to seek the assistance of Congress. It is entirely fitting and proper that appropriate committees of the Congress address themselves to these petitions for relief.

This was precisely the situation when the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I am privileged to serve, conducted hearings in March. The purpose of these hearings was to explore the causes of recent sudden and drastic increases in the cost of construction lumber products. The investigation was most instructive. During the course of the 5-day hearings, it became evident that the Federal Government itself was a contributor to the price situation by being at least partially responsible for an inadequate timber supply.

The testimony of the lumber and plywood manufacturing industry was particularly persuasive to me in that it revealed the effort which private owners are putting into the management of their forest lands to increase the yield. They have approached the problem scientifically and have produced remarkable results in the interest of the American consumer.

My interest in this aspect of modern forest scientific management was, of course, enhanced by the fact that Dr. Bruce Zobel at the North Carolina State University, at Raleigh, is one of the foremost researchers in the highly productive area of genetic selection as a factor in improving timber yield.

Dr. Zobel delivered an address not long ago at the 1969 annual meeting of the American Pulpwood Association on the "Third Forest," the manmade forest, which is entirely germane to the problem we face today. I include his statement at this point in my remarks and commend it to the attention of every Member of this House. All of us who are familiar with hybrid corn, super-rice, and prize cattle as a consequence of proper selection and breeding will, I am sure, have a revelation when we have completed reading this piece about "supertrees" and their significance to the American forest system.

The statement follows:

A shortage of both pine and hardwood timber in parts of the Southeast now appears to be a very real possibility. Not a famine, but shortages! For a long time this region has been regarded as one of "unlimited wood reserves." In the past, local shortages have developed but they have been of short duration, and tight situations have tended to return to normal each time. This outcome was to be expected because the Southeast had large timber reserves in relation to its wood-using capacity. Practically all the forest land was potentially commercial, at least from the standpoint of accessibility—for the terrain is favorable—and from the standpoint of suitability—for the soils generally are strong enough to produce marketable products of the right species. These favorable factors have tended to give some industry leaders a false impression about the ready availability of future wood supplies. But there are several elements that make this rosy outlook deceptive, and planning for future needs is urgent.

**FALSE IMPRESSION ABOUT AVAILABLE WOOD SUPPLY**

1. The first major element is labor quality and labor supply. Mechanization is clearly a very substantial part of the solution to the labor problem; and in the Southeast, with so much level to gently rolling terrain and relatively rock-free soils, it holds high promise of success. But complete freedom from labor is obviously not possible even with maximum mechanization. If the timber can't be harvested economically, it really is of little importance how much wood we grow.

2. Equally well known is the current economic situation associated with a value assessment of the woodland resource that in the short-term view has made rapid liquidation of merchantable timber on company holdings look financially attractive. If this were limited to isolated cases it would not be particularly serious, but nearly every industry is indulging in it, often without assuring that a proper reserve of young timber will be available that will attain merchantable dimensions by the end of the liquidation period.

3. Tree length (long "log") harvesting has "forced" concentration of logging into the larger and older timber stands to more fully gain the economic advantages from mechanization. Stands of this character are rapidly being depleted in many areas of the Southeast.

4. Misinterpretation of published inventories has frequently occurred. The total growing-stock data have been interpreted as being available for management or harvesting.

5. The conversion of timberland to fields, pastures, ponds, reservoirs, lakes, and other uses is currently proceeding at an accelerated pace. Especially dramatic is the increase in converting the best site, those most suitable for hardwoods, into farmland.

6. A considerable portion of today's inventory of timber from farm woodlots is not available, especially the older, larger stands

from the more substantial landowners not engaged primarily in forest production. Additionally, much timber now being harvested is from what might be called "one-shot logging."

7. More and more land, especially prime hardwood lands in the Piedmont and mountains, is being reserved primarily for recreation and "conservation" purposes, usually with plans for seriously limiting further cutting.

#### WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

How can we combat the forces that continue to gnaw away at the available land and growing stock for forest production per se and continue to provide for the ever increased timber needs? It is obvious that the productivity of timberland must be improved by all possible methods. The right kind of site preparation tailored to site quality will help, as will better and more complete utilization. Future intensive management will use trees that grow faster, have better form, more uniform woods, higher resistance to disease and greater adaptability to adverse conditions of site and weather; it will also include fertilization in the situations where the forest manager deems the practice prudent and profitable. No single practice is enough—all methods must be employed if the greatest increase in productivity is to be achieved.

I am pessimistic about obtaining any really significant yield increase in the Southeast from timberlands in the hands of small landowners, at least in our time. Clearly the bulk of increased timber production must be developed from the timberland acreage under large industrial ownerships and to a more limited degree from publicly owned forests.

Propaganda about means of increasing wood yields sometimes implies that the greater the yield the greater the financial return. This implication is erroneous, for biological systems also encounter the law of diminishing returns. At some point in intensive forest management short of maximum physical production, the greatest net return for each dollar expended will be obtained. Our main problem then is to find out what costs can be tolerated in each intensive management operation to assure greatest net return on the invested dollar.

#### SITE PREPARATION IMPORTANT FOR PINE PRODUCTION

Intensive site preparation is important. Unfortunately, it is most expensive on the best sites, especially on the moist ones where it is a "must." Often we are asked the questions, "How much can be spent for site preparation?" and "How much will KG-blading, windrowing and bedding, 'buy' in contrast to no blading, no windrowing, or no bedding?" These have only tentative answers. My opinion is that intensive preparation, including bedding, will pay well for pine on the better, moist sites and is essential for planted hardwoods. For drier pine sites, investment in the most intensive culture may not give the most economic returns; however, neither experience nor study has persisted long enough to provide solid "actuarial" information on these questions.

Fertilization is currently much on the forest manager's mind. Under some circumstances, especially on sites where vital nutrients are lacking, it is essential, but in other situations it is often strictly secondary. In the Coastal Plains wetlands, for example, fertilizers are no substitute for control of soil moisture. The current concentration on adding chemical constituents to the soil to improve site quality seems strange in the historic context of past studies of site that have demonstrated the dominant role of physical characteristics and the interrelationships of water movement and moisture retention in determining growth capacity of the land. There is no question that if maximum increase in growth from the

use of fertilizers is to be achieved, a combination of proper site preparation, including soil supply, plus use of receptive trees is required.

In recent years, tree improvement has received a lot of publicity and not without some justification. In some instances, gains for characteristics such as disease resistance have been spectacular. Yield improvement has been much better than expected; some early tests have produced growth of two to three cords per acre per year (two to three tons of dry wood per acre per year) at only 7.5 years of age.

When all the improvements are added together, a clearer picture of the future tree develops. It will be more uniform, with fewer defects; and if handled correctly, silviculturally, it will make harvesting and manufacturing operations much more efficient. Wood will be more uniform. Facilitating quality control operations and resulting in a better end product at a lower cost.

#### MANAGEMENT NEEDED FOR BEST HARDWOODS

The first and greatest need for improvement of hardwood production is simply the application of more intensive forest management. This improvement will not come, however, until industry is sufficiently convinced of the need for hardwood that it is willing to invest in the silviculture necessary to produce it. Hardwood is currently considered a cheap source of raw material. With the kind of care necessary for proper establishment and growth of natural stands or plantations, except perhaps on the very prime sites, hardwood as a raw material source will no longer be cheap. Hardwood fibers will cost even more when it is necessary to grow the trees on marginal or nonhardwood sites. Where natural regeneration is used, clear-cutting plus the removal of cull trees is essential to obtain relatively good stands of the most desirable species. When planting is done, maximum site preparation, including bedding, will be necessary.

It is indicated that the most economic hardwood silviculture consists of harvesting by clear-cutting, removal of culls, and natural regeneration. Regeneration of desired species by this method has been satisfactory whenever reasonably good stands existed before the clear-cutting. However, vast acreages of prime hardwood sites are so "beat up" from past mismanagement that expensive site preparation and artificial establishment of desired species may be required. These measures all add up to expensive wood.

The future intensity of hardwood management for pulp production depends on the need for this type fiber. When the need has been low, the policy of many companies has called for planting pine wherever it will grow, leaving the most difficult to manage (although often productive) sites for hardwood. In many areas the most easily operable hardwood land of sufficiently high productive capacity has been preempted for pine production. Intensive management for short rotation crops of about 10 to 15 years appears as one possibility. As of now the most promising species for this purpose is sycamore, but in some areas ash and sweetgum are showing good potential. Growth of short rotation hardwood fiber will require maximum site preparation, probably fertilization, and certainly use of improved growing stock. Such stands will produce very uniform trees and be ideally suited to harvest by mechanization.

#### TRUE TREE FARMING AHEAD

Trees produced under intensive forest management will be small, relatively uniform and grown under management conditions, such as bedding, that may make harvesting more difficult. However, overall they will be ideally suited for mechanization, whatever terrain and trafficability of soils pose no restrictions. As time goes on I feel we will plant at wider spacing, assuring that

each established tree remains alive and will be merchantable at time of thinning or harvest cutting. Mechanical thinning becomes more feasible, with greater uniformity, less diseases, and better formed trees in the plantation, obviating silvicultural thinning with its primary stress on selectivity and maximization of mean annual increment on the choicest boles.

Wood from the future pine tree will be more uniform, but when short rotations are followed it will have shorter cells with thinner walls. Moisture content will be high (about one-third greater than old trees), and yields per unit volume solid wood will be considerably lower and very much lower per unit green weight. The trees produced will have a high proportion of juvenile wood, which amounts to about 50% in stands 15 years of age or less. There will be a larger proportion of bark and the small size trees will make necessary the development of small, mobile, relatively inexpensive harvesting equipment.

Intensive management and extensive use of monocultures will make future stands more susceptible to climatic catastrophes such as ice or wind, and imported diseases and insects will pose a greater problem. Because of their young age and stand density, practically no seed will be produced. The intensity of harvest, short rotation and good utilization and frequent use of heavy machinery for management operations may pose problems of site deterioration and may make soil amendments more important. Many of these factors suggest the value of somewhat longer rotations.

Mr. Speaker, the careful work of genetic selection and hybridization of our most valuable timber resources is, despite its appeal, only symptomatic of the overall effort of private forest industry enterprise in stimulating maximum production from every acre of land in their care.

They have engaged in other forest management practices such as fertilization, aerial reseedling, thinning, cultivation, and salvage which are astonishing and highly productive. This is the reason why the private forest lands, representing less than one-fifth of the softwood timber inventory of the Nation manages to surpass the productivity of the three-fifths of the inventory managed by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. It is a fact that the Federal timber lands produce only one-third of the Nation's softwood timber harvest annually, while the much smaller private industrial lands surpass that production.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to overcome that imbalance. We can do it only by providing the Forest Service with the financial means to match and even surpass the regenerative capacities of the private lands. I believe that the means is available to us in the National Timber Supply Act which I submit for House consideration today. I am aware that many other Members of this distinguished body are already on record as advocating passage of this identical bill. They include those members interested in housing, those concerned with fiscal responsibility, and those who want to promote the concept of efficient management of our national resources. This diversity of support is, I believe, a harbinger of glad tidings for our Federal forests. I believe this bill will pass and I am convinced that its passage will enable the application to Federal lands of

the most advanced kind of forest management which will pay dividends to our Nation forever.

I urge all of my colleagues in the House to examine this National Timber Supply Act and, whether their district is rural or urban, to support it for the greater good of the Nation.

STATEMENT RE INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1936

**HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would provide that before the Federal Communications Commission could lift an incumbent's license and give it to another applicant it would first have to find that the incumbent was unqualified to stay on the air. Only then would other applicants for the facility be considered.

I am joining the sponsorship of this legislation in an effort to curb actions of the kind recently taken by the FCC which could endanger the stability of broadcast license holdings. I point to recent FCC actions in entertaining the request of outside applicants for a broadcast license at the same time the current holder of the license is seeking a renewal. There is a danger that every broadcasting station will face costly proceedings to defend its license repeatedly against outside applicants.

I feel that legislation is urgently needed to insure the continuation and growth of radio and television broadcasting service.

ARE WE ALREADY TOO LATE?

**HON. TOM STEED**

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma's largest daily newspaper, has expressed concern at the state of our naval armament in the following thought-provoking editorial:

ARE WE ALREADY TOO LATE?

The Communist conquest and domination of the entire world has been the unswerving ambition of the Soviet Union since the days of Lenin. Russia now has an army more powerful than any three other nations combined. All it needs to attain its goal is a navy which can overwhelm the navy of the United States.

With this in mind, for the past several years, Russia has vastly enlarged its ship building capacity and this year will turn out 28 new submarines to the United States' one or two.

At the present time, Russia already has 250 attack submarines compared to the United States' 105. Of this number, 100 are missile launching submarines compared to only 41 of the United States. Of surface to surface missile carrying ships, Russia has 25 and the United States has none.

Of mincraft, Russia has 300 and the United States only 86. Of missile patrol boats, Russia has 150, the United States none.

Of destroyers, the United States has 177, of which 163 are more than 20 years old. Russia has 86 destroyers, all of them less than 20 years old.

Of the attack submarines, 60 of the 105 in the United States are more than 20 years old. All of Russia's 250 are less than 20 years old.

At the present rate of construction, within four years Russia can have more than three times as many attack submarines as the United States and they will be armed with bigger missiles than the Polaris and their estimated range is 1,500 miles.

For years many of our defense experts have talked about intercontinental missiles to be launched by Russia from within the Soviet Union.

Apparently very little thought has been given to the fact that Russia, in a few years, will be able to place 50 missile attack submarines off our Atlantic coast, another 50 within the Gulf of Mexico, another 50 in range of our Pacific coast and all could be commanded to discharge their missiles at the same second of time, aimed at every military airport, every naval base and installation and at every electric power station of size in the country.

Russian missiles could strike every one of our metropolitan cities and create a nationwide panic. We would have no means of defense, other than our submarines, if located near Russia.

The defense of the United States could be paralyzed within 15 minutes and the United States could become a Russian satellite.

No other country in the world could oppose the might of Russia and Russian commissars could take over the governments of any or every nation. China would be the only likely nation to offer resistance and that would be futile, for Russian hydrogen bombs would destroy China's nuclear bases and could destroy any Chinese city.

It is likely that in addition to the submarine armada, Russia would place in orbit a half dozen space ships loaded with hydrogen bombs of which one could be orbiting over the United States every 15 minutes and their bombs could be dropped on any desired target at Russia's pleasure.

President Nixon might be the last elected president of this country.

For the last eight years, our defense department has concentrated its attention and spent its money upon Vietnam. It soon may have to give additional attention to North Korea. Both North Korea and North Vietnam are supplied by Russia with abundant weapons and ammunition and tactical experts to supervise their warfare.

It is to Russia's advantage to keep the war going in Vietnam and start another in Korea. It probably will not permit North Vietnam to accept a peace settlement.

Only one thing will deter Russia from taking over the United States through submarine warfare, and that one thing would be such a powerful navy and submarine force of the United States that it could do damage to Russia equal to the destruction it caused in the United States.

A number of our military leaders recognize the doom that awaits us but for fear of alarming the public have spoken only in guarded terms.

The ABM safeguard system might be able to shoot down 80 percent of intercontinental missiles from Russia, but the other 20 percent could destroy us. It would afford no protection against submarine missiles. It is so much simpler for Russia to attack us by submarine that the use of intercontinental missiles would be only supplementary.

If the United States had as many as 65 nuclear powered submarines equipped with

Poseidon missiles and maintained most of them within target range of Russia's vital cities and military installations, Russia would be unlikely to attack our country.

A crash program to enormously increase our naval strength and merchant marine, regardless of cost, appears to be the only deterrent to a capture of this country by Russia.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL MEETS THE PRESS

**HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, Postmaster General Winton M. Blount appeared on the television interview show, "Meet the Press." He was questioned closely by some of the television network's outstanding reporters on the subject of the administration bill on the Postal Corporation.

This interview showed the Postmaster General at his energetic best as he presented the case for the Postal Corporation. I believe that the contents of this interview should be studied carefully by every Member of Congress as this is one of the most serious problems which the Congress will face this session.

Under unanimous consent I submit this statement for enclosure in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE PRESS, JUNE 8, 1969

EDWIN NEWMAN. I'm Edwin Newman, and this is Meet the Press.

ANNOUNCER. Meet the Press, now celebrating its 21st year on television, and winner of every major award in its field, is a public affairs presentation of NBC News.

NEWMAN. President Nixon has recently proposed to Congress, sweeping reforms of our postal system.

Our guest, today, on Meet the Press, is the Postmaster General of the United States, Winton M. Blount.

We'll have the first questions, now, from Paul Duke of NBC News.

DUKE. Mr. Blount, since taking office in January, you have repeatedly indicated you believe the postal service is on the verge of collapse in this country. Just how close to collapse are we?

POSTMASTER GENERAL BLOUNT. Well, Mr. Duke, as you know, in 1966, there was a total collapse of the postal service in the city of Chicago. This is a major city, where a tremendous amount of mail is handled, and the same conditions exist today that existed in 1966. And this kind of breakdown in the mail service could happen in any city, particularly, the major cities of this country at any time.

DUKE. Well, what are the grim realities? What would a breakdown in service mean?

BLOUNT. Well, I think a breakdown in service would be tremendous in this nation. The mail service in this country touches everybody in the nation. We have almost 200 million customers.

The economic impact of the Post Office Department is tremendous. Just take the Social Security checks, alone, for instance, that go to 30 million people in this country every month. Now, if we had a breakdown in the mail service, that alone would cause tremendous disruption and economic hardship to many people in this nation.

DUKE. Well, what are the main things wrong with the postal service that you've found since you took over your job?

BLOUNT. You don't have that much time on this program.

DUKE. But, could you give us the highlights, the worst things that are wrong with the system?

BLOUNT. Well, there are so many things, that it's difficult to pinpoint just the specific matters in a short period of time, but there are a great number of things.

We don't have control of the principal costs of this Department. As you know, the wages are set by Congress.

We don't have control of the rates charged by this Department. That's set by Congress.

We don't have control of the funds that we generate—we need to generate to build a Capital facilities that we need.

And, all of these things, combined with the lack of continuity of management in the Post Office Department, just make for an impossible condition.

NEWMAN. Thank you, gentlemen. You've just met Paul Duke, of NBC News. The other reporters on our panel today are Don Oberdorfer of the Washington Post; John L. Steele of Time and Life magazines; and Stanley Cohen of Advertising Age.

Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the Meet the Press panel, will be back next week.

We'll continue the questions now with Mr. Oberdorfer.

OBERDORFER. Mr. Postmaster General, you've pledged yourself to take politics out of the Post Office, but some Republicans on Capitol Hill feel that the plans you've submitted are going to end up taking the politics away from them, and giving it to somebody else, namely the Executive Branch.

What assurance is there, that even under your corporate plan, the plan for a corporation, a future President, or this President wouldn't name politically minded people to run the Post Office, and we'd have just as much politics, but of a different sort than we have now?

BLOUNT. Well, number one, we provide for a board of directors, composed of nine people. Seven of these will be part-time outside people, appointed by the President, with advice and consent of the Senate.

Now, these seven outside members of the Board, who set the policies, will be charged with the responsibility of running the Department, and will serve staggered seven year terms, so that you would have a continuity of policy; and the specific language in the bill provides that these men will be appointed without regard to politics.

Now, all we're really trying to do is to put this Department on the same basis that other operations in the government operate under, by removing the day-to-day political intervention in this Department.

OBERDORFER. Mr. Postmaster General, when you came into office, I believe you were very unhappy, and perhaps even shocked, to find that there were 21 hundred and 64 postmasterhips in the country which were not filled, because the political system couldn't agree on somebody to fill them. And now, four months later, you've not sent up a single name for a postmastership to replace—to fill these vacancies. Why not?

BLOUNT. Well, we have been setting up regional management selection boards. We have 15 regions in the country, and these regions are going to make the recommendations for the postmasters in these vacancies that you refer to.

Now, we've been in the process of setting up these boards, getting the people to serve them, set up the policies under which they're going to make their selections; and at the same time, we have sent to the Congress a bill to remove the confirmation procedure from the Senate, in order that we can proceed with operation of these boards in the selection of postmasters.

OBERDORFER. Well, can you send up some names to Capitol Hill, so that some of these jobs can be filled, or do you have to wait for Congress to move that bill?

BLOUNT. We can send up the names in the

same way in which it is presently done. The President can nominate, and the Senate will confirm the nominations.

NEWMAN. Mr. Steele?

STEELE. Mr. Postmaster General, you reportedly recently told a friend, or visitor, to your office, that I've developed—this is quoting you—I've developed a reputation as a work politician in Washington, and I gladly accept this accolade.

Won't you really have to be the best politician around town to get this program through the Congress?

BLOUNT. Well, number one, I don't agree that this is quoting me precisely.

I say—I think that the members of Congress are going to have to examine the proposals that we have made, because we're talking about major legislation, and we're going to spend as much time before Committees testifying, explaining our bills to the members of Congress, and I'm quite certain, they will adopt the basic concept that we have submitted.

STEELE. Now, it's generally thought that this bill is in pretty bad shape right now in the Congress. You were very successful as a businessman, and you won most of your fights.

What is the difference in coming here in a political atmosphere, as opposed to the business community, in which you've spent a great deal of time, and with very marked success? What is the difference between these two areas?

BLOUNT. Well, the differences are, of course, that you have to use a great amount of persuasion amongst the members of the Congress in trying to do something as major as the postal reform that we have got before Congress.

We're going to—and, as a matter of fact, it would be wrong if Congress did not spend the kind of time that it's going to take to explain this legislation, examine it, test its concepts, and I'm quite certain that they will. It's an interesting transition.

STEELE. Well, one of the difficulties seems to be some of the leaders of your own party, the House Republican Leader, Gerald Ford of Michigan, said after a recent White House leadership meeting, that our people have waited eight years to get in front of the line on postal patronage, and they are bitter that a Republican White House wants to turn off the spigot before they've even had a drink.

Now, what can you do to change this kind of thinking on the part of your own party?

BLOUNT. Well, the President made this decision at the very beginning of this Administration. It is unfortunate that the Republican party has stood on the sidelines for the past eight years, and watched this Department run politically, and they, naturally, were waiting for the political appointments.

On the other hand, you've got to start somewhere. As the President states, it's always the party out of power that's talking about taking politics out of the Post Office Department, never the party in power. And this is the reason, I think, that the Republican party deserves a great deal of credit for making this kind of decision.

NEWMAN. Mr. Cohen?

COHEN. Mr. Blount, members of Congress seem convinced that there are enough things wrong with your Department so that something has to be done. The question is, what?

Many members, such as, Chairman Dulski, of the House Post Office committee, are willing to support changes, but they want to retain certain of the powers, such as their control over wages.

What changes do you think are indispensable to effective postal reform?

BLOUNT. Well, I think there are several things that are vital to—to major postal reform, which must be done, in lieu of partial reform. I think it'll be a mistake to have partial reform of the Post Office Department.

I think, number one, we have to have a hand in setting our wages through collective bargaining with the unions.

Number two, we have to have a hand in setting our rates through the procedures that we have prescribed in our reform bill.

Number three, we have to have the freedom and ability to seek our own capital funds to invest in new facilities, and the mechanization that's needed.

And, number four, it's vital to have all this done in such a way that you provide for continuity of management.

I'm the fifth Postmaster General since 1961, and if you ran any organization that had a turnover in its chief executive officer that often, it would be in turmoil. And this is a vital necessity in whatever reform packages is finally enacted.

COHEN. Much of the resistance to change is coming from the postal unions. The figures show that the postal unions have done comparatively better than other unions, under the present setup, in that they have been getting larger wage increases than other unions have gotten through collective bargaining.

What do you think that you can offer the postal workers, which would induce them to give up this arrangement that they have with Congress, and to subject themselves to collective bargaining with your corporation?

BLOUNT. Well, the working conditions that the postal employee works in, in most of our urban centers, is absolutely deplorable. The conditions are unbelievable until you go into the post offices and see the conditions under which these people work.

The kind of benefits that are available through this postal reform bill are not available through the Congressional process as the way the Post Office Department is now run. There's no way to get the kind of capital required to build the facilities that are necessary to bring the working conditions for the employees into the condition it needs to be.

But, the labor-management relations are absolutely awful. The labor-management relations are based on an Executive Order by the President, 10988. Now, under this Executive Order, the unions really have—in collective bargaining, have very little rights.

Now, we can sit and say no to our proposal, and they have no recourse. And we propose, under collective bargaining procedures, that they will have, as a final step in grievances, for instance, final and binding arbitration.

This is true in almost every industrial contract that's arrived at in the collective bargaining procedures. It's a vital step, as far as employees are concerned.

NEWMAN. Mr. Duke?

DUKE. Mr. Blount, do you think the postal unions have too much power over postal policy?

BLOUNT. Well, I think that the postal unions, of course, are principally involved with the setting of wages, as far as Congress is concerned, and that's the principal interest that they have. And, I simply believe that that ought to be in the collective bargaining process, rather than in Congressional process.

DUKE. Well, you said a moment ago that you were certain that Congress will adopt the concept of a private corporation to run the Post Office Department, and yet the unions are lobbying very fiercely against this concept, as you know, and it's freely acknowledged on Capitol Hill that your plan is not going to be approved this year.

When do you think the Congress may approve it?

BLOUNT. Well, Mr. Duke, I don't accept what you're saying.

Number one, the statements made by members of the unions, or members of the Congress, or others, were principally made prior to the time that we put our proposal before Congress.

They're now in process of examining the proposal that we have, and we have been meeting with the members—representatives of the unions; we've been meeting with the members of Congress, and I think they all are finding more in this legislation than they thought would be there.

And, as we again attempt to explain the provisions of this bill, and discuss the concepts that we have, with the people that are affected by it, I think you're going to find much greater support than might be evidenced.

DUKE. But suppose the plan is not approved this year. What will this mean to the postal service?

BLOUNT. Well, of course, we are still going to run the Post Office Department in the—but we will have the same kind of restrictions the Department has operated under for decades.

Now, we've had many Postmaster Generals that have tried manfully to do something about this system. Postmaster General Summerfield, who was Postmaster General under President Eisenhower, did great things to bring modern management to the Post Office Department. But since then, we've had a rotation of Postmaster Generals for—one every two years, as a matter of fact, in the last eight years.

And, as you know, Larry O'Brien, who was Postmaster General, came up with a concept for total postal reform, and I think it was a great concept, and we're trying to implement that concept.

There's no really partisan way, or Democratic way, or Republican way of delivering the mail. There's only the right way to deliver it. And that's what we're trying to do.

NEWMAN. Mr. Oberdorfer?

OBERDORFER. Mr. Postmaster General, you said a moment ago, that, in your opinion, it was a mistake to have a partial reform of the postal system.

Does this mean you're taking a take it or leave it attitude toward Congress about your plan?

BLOUNT. Not at all. In my testimony before the House Committee last week—I testified two days—I made it very clear that, while we have drafted this comprehensive legislation in the best manner in which we could, in the time limitations we had, obviously, there are improvements that can be made in this legislation.

There are vital points, however, that must be covered in any postal reform, or, again, I think it would be a mistake, if we don't have that kind of reform bill.

OBERDORFER. Well, there's some feeling on the part of people in Congress, that one of the big faults of your plan, as far as the unions are concerned, particularly, is that it does not provide for a truly compulsory arbitration, because it's up to a wage and labor dispute panel to decide whether something is going to go to compulsory arbitration. The unions say that since they don't have the right to strike, they've got to have a substitute for it.

Would you be willing to amend your plan to provide that the unions could ask for, and get, compulsory arbitration anytime they feel they need it?

BLOUNT. Well, number one, I personally strongly feel that, in lieu of the right to strike, that the employees should have a procedure, a mechanism that would truly give them impartial judgment on the matters that would come on impasse between management and employees. We think our bill provides it.

Now, there are two areas; one the area of a grievance procedure, and we don't spell out all of the details of how you arrive at a grievance procedure in the language of the bill which we have drafted. On the other hand, every grievance procedure that I know about, and certainly most collective bargaining agreements that provide for a grievance procedure, provide for final and binding arbitration as a last step in that grievance procedure.

Now, we would certainly anticipate that would be the case with the Post Office Department.

OBERDORFER. Another point the people object to is that they say that it's a mistake

to take the Postmaster General out of the Cabinet, and to abolish the historic job of Postmaster General, that you're never going to get anybody who is as good as the job requires for the salary that is allowed, unless he has the prestige of being in the President's Cabinet.

Why do you feel that it's necessary for the Postmaster General's job to be abolished, and taken out of the Cabinet?

BLOUNT. Well, again, I think it's vital that we insulate this Department from partisan political politics as much as possible.

Now, the other vital thing is to provide for continuity of management. Now, you must provide for this over a long term, in order to have a constant direction, a constant policy in—which the Department is trying to enforce.

So, I think it's vitally necessary that it—that the Postmaster General be removed from the Cabinet, and that the Chief Executive Officer of this Department be a permanent, long term employee.

NEWMAN. Mr. Steele?

STEELE. Mr. Postmaster General, after your testimony this week in the Congress, one of the chief points of opposition seemed to be a reluctance on the part of Congress to relinquish its powers over the Post Office Department.

Chairman Dulski, of the House Post Office Committee, has introduced legislation which would accomplish a good many of the reforms you speak, but still keep the Post Office as a government department, and still keep the Congressional powers.

Where does this approach fall short? Why do you really have to have a government corporation?

BLOUNT. Well, there are many fine provisions in H.R. Four, the bill that Mr. Dulski introduced. On the other hand, it does stop short of total postal reform, so that I think these things are—we must incorporate all of these matters in a bill, in order to bring about major postal reform.

We want—one reform bill is all we're going to get through Congress. We can't do this thing piecemeal, and I just think it's necessary that we do it all at once.

STEELE. Well, where does the Dulski approach really fall short on what two or three major items that you need?

BLOUNT. Well, it keeps, for instance, the Postmaster General in the Cabinet. And I think that this is vital that the Chief Executive Officer of this Department be removed from the Cabinet, and removed from partisan politics.

There are other areas.

STEELE. One thing that puzzles me is, why, of all government activities, should the Post Office Department make money? We don't—it's a government service, and we don't demand the same thing from a foreign aid program, or the State Department, or the Commerce Department. Why the Post Office Department?

BLOUNT. It's not a question of making money. It's a question of operating this Department in the most economical way that it can be operated.

Now, it's just inexcusable that the taxpayers of this country are bearing a billion dollar a year deficit, in my opinion, for the operation of the Post Office Department. We can still provide the services to the people of this country, but we can do it in an economical, efficient fashion.

NEWMAN. About four minutes left, gentlemen.

Mr. Cohen?

COHEN. Mr. Blount, the managers of your postal corporation would be required to pay their way. This puts them under the same pressures that the railroads and the telegraph company has, to close down unprofitable services.

What protection would the public have against the postal corporation that decided to cut out services?

BLOUNT. Well, there are a great number of protections in this regard. We provide for an independent panel of rate commissioners, that is, independent from our operating management. They are selected by, and report to, only the outside directors of the United States Postal Service.

They are charged with protecting the public interest. Any change in service, the operating management would have to propose to this panel of rate commissioners, who would have public hearings, who would make their recommendations to the outside members of the Board, who also are charged with the protection of the public interest, and they will then make what recommendations and change of service that they choose to make.

COHEN. The Post Office does many things besides delivering mail. For example, it and which are said to have saved consumers enforces the Postal Fraud Laws, which are among our oldest consumer protection laws, a hundred million dollars last year.

What assurance is there that a postal corporation, duty bound to pay its own way, will be willing to spend the money that's necessary to give adequate enforcement of these fraud laws?

BLOUNT. Well, there's specific language in the bill that requires that these laws, or the laws on obscenity, the laws on fraud, and all of the other laws that apply to the Post Office Department, will carry over and be effective on this corporation.

COHEN. Mr. Kappel, who designed this postal corporation, said he prefers to have a Post Office operated by private industry, but that no one would want it, in view of the mess that its affairs are in.

Do you feel that the Post Office should be part of the government, even if it gets its house in order?

BLOUNT. Well, I think that we have, as a national policy, providing postal service to all of the people of this country. And this is one of the problems that if you have it in private industry, they would concentrate in the high density areas where it's most profitable, and have a tendency to eliminate other areas in the country.

So I think that it, certainly at the present time, is necessary that we have a nationwide postal system as a part of the government.

NEWMAN. About a minute and a half left, gentlemen.

Mr. Duke?

DUKE. Mr. Blount, some Congressmen, including some Republican Congressmen, say your relations with Capitol Hill are not very good, and this is hurting prospects for the private postal plan.

Is their criticism justified?

BLOUNT. Well, I couldn't make any comment about their own particular criticism. We are trying to meet with the members of Congress and explain to them the contents of our bill, and what we are trying to do, and I think we are making progress with it.

DUKE. Well, the ranking Republican on the House Post Office Committee, Robert Corbett, of Pennsylvania, was quoted a few days ago as saying, he does things and then consult us. I can't tell you one thing he's planning to do.

Is Mr. Corbett correct?

BLOUNT. Well, I would suggest to you that Mr. Corbett introduced our reform bill into Congress. We did have an opportunity to explain this bill in detail to him, as I say to all the members of the Congress, we have had the opportunity to talk with them about it, and I'm very pleased with the reaction.

NEWMAN. Half a minute left, gentlemen.

Mr. Oberdorfer.

OBERDORFER. Mr. Postmaster General, isn't there some way to stop this flood of unwanted mail that most people get, or at least charge decent rates for it, so that you won't get a ton of mail that you don't want?

**BLOUNT.** You've got less than 30 seconds for that answer?

**NEWMAN.** About 15 seconds.

**BLOUNT.** Well, this is a complex question. There is not enough information in the Department to determine whether or not the various classes are paying the appropriate rates. We have an institution of what's called an incremental cost system, which will develop that kind of information.

**NEWMAN.** And at that point, our time is up. Thank you, Postmaster General Blount for being with us today on Meet the Press.

## COLLEGE UNREST

### HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

**Mr. CEDERBERG.** Mr. Speaker, in this month's issue of Nation's Business, noted economic historian and educator, Dr. Robert Hessen, makes a number of very astute observations regarding the campus unrest which plagues our Nation today. His remarks, which rather succinctly summarize the Socialist direction of today's revolutionaries, also give a very adequate answer to the questions regarding the limits to which dissent can go in our society before it ceases to be dissent and takes on the flavor of anarchy. I highly recommend the following article to my colleagues:

In an age of moral crisis, when violence is sweeping college campuses like a virulent disease, the most dangerous error a businessman can make is to believe that he has nothing at stake, that somehow student rebellion can be quarantined.

Campus rebels already have launched attacks against business firms. In the past year, college campuses were the staging grounds for:

A threatened seizure of New York's Consolidated Edison Co., one of the nation's largest utilities.

A plan to send hundreds of "customers" into Macy's where, at a prearranged time, they would stage a mass looting of the world's largest department store.

A protest in the new General Motors Building in New York, with pickets carrying signs declaring: "Expropriate GM profits for a free, beautiful subway system."

The attacks on business, however, have not been confined to threats or slogans. On many college campuses, recruiters for the Dow Chemical Co., which manufactures napalm, have been physically obstructed by sit-ins and body blockades.

An attempt in mid-March to obstruct recruiters for General Electric represented an attack on profit-making as such. At Queens College in New York, GE recruiters were harassed by student leftists who accused GE of "profiteering" by using colleges as the "breeding grounds" to train future scientists and engineers for industry. These attacks on business, however, have thus far been comparatively minor skirmishes.

The rebels' main assault has been against the colleges. The basic tactic is to seize buildings, to disrupt classes and to create a general climate of terror and intimidation. At Columbia, rebels have held hostages, roughed up professors, burned a professor's research notes and looted the files of the university's president. At Brandeis University, they threatened to burn down libraries and lecture halls unless their demands were met. At San Francisco State College, they were urged to carry weapons and an unsuccessful at-

tempt was made to dynamite a college building. And at Cornell University, weapons actually were carried.

Although these campus actions have been extensively reported, the press and TV coverage has not adequately explained the rebels' goals, or analyzed the arguments they use to justify their resort to force. As a result, while most Americans undoubtedly feel the rebels' actions are improper, they do not understand the long-range implications of student rebellion, or know how to answer the rebels' arguments.

#### A NEW AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Socialism is the ideology which unites the leading groups of student rebels. The largest group is Students for a Democratic Society, a loose-knit, nationwide organization which claims over 35,000 members on 250 campuses. Other groups include the Progressive Labor Party, the Young Socialist Alliance, the Youth International Party and the Third World Liberation Front. (In all, the rebels comprise no more than 3 or 4 per cent of the student population.)

Despite disagreements about strategy and tactics, these groups are agreed upon the necessity of a revolution in America to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism. Some hope to transform America into a carbon copy of Mao's China or Castro's Cuba, while others claim to have no particular blueprint in mind. Tom Hayden, a founder of SDS, recently declared: "First we will make the revolution, and then we will find out what for."

The student rebels are trying to establish the principle that use of force is a proper means to achieve their goals. Therefore, they confront the college with "non-negotiable" demands. At the University of Chicago, for example, rebels demanded immediate admission, on full scholarship, of every youth whose family income is under \$7,000 a year, with a \$60-a-week compensation to be paid the family.

Such demands are deliberately arbitrary, so that no matter what response the college makes, the rebels win. If the college yields, or tries to negotiate, that serves as an invitation to the rebels to make new demands. On the other hand, if the college rejects the original demand, the rebels cite that refusal as justification for their use of brute force.

But as Ayn Rand recently noted: "If and when, in any dispute, one side initiates the use of physical force, that side is wrong—and no consideration or discussion of the issues is necessary or appropriate."

The basic goal underlying the rebels' arbitrary demands is to achieve "student power." Backed up by the threat of force, they insist on voting power over the university's budget and curriculum, over the hiring promotion and salaries of faculty, and over recruiting of students. They attempt to justify this goal by invoking a slogan—"participatory democracy." They claim that people have a right to vote on anything that affects their lives, and that students, therefore, should have voting control over the university.

If the student rebels succeed in establishing "participatory democracy," it could become applicable in all areas which affect peoples' lives. Workers, for example, would be entitled to voting power over a company's pricing and production policies, over the salaries and promotions of executives, and over the hiring of new workers. And customers would vote on the prices charged in stores.

The concept of private ownership and control would be destroyed—which is, in fact, the aim of the student left.

The proper answer to the demand for "student power" is that a college is not a cooperative, and that an entering student does not acquire any proprietary interest. (In this context, it does not matter whether the college is private or tax-supported.)

Anyone who enters an institution as a student is bound by its rules.

If a student does not like the administrative policies or the curriculum, he has the same option as the client of any private business or public institution, namely, to withdraw and try to find a more suitable source of the service he seeks.

He has no moral or legal right, however, to cripple or close the college if it fails to meet his demands.

#### A LESSON TO BE LEARNED

If student rebels are permitted to continue their periodic disruptions, the quality of education necessarily will deteriorate. Scientific inquiry and serious scholarship cannot be carried on in an atmosphere of strife.

A number of eminent professors already are leaving our major universities for new posts in Canada and for smaller campuses in out-of-the-way places.

Many faculty members and administrators seem impotent in the face of terror. We are seeing a rerun of the kind of tactics used by Nazi students in the early 1930's, when they intimidated and disrupted German universities.

The fate of Japan's universities also can provide a powerful object lesson to anyone who minimizes the seriousness of student rebellion. In Japan, a nationwide organization of student leftists, the Zengakuren, can and does call months-long strikes.

Last year, Tokyo University did not award any medical degrees, because its students lacked adequate training to qualify as physicians. This year, the university will not award any diplomas or admit any new students in the fall.

The Japanese economy's growth and prosperity has been jeopardized by the crippling of its universities which educate the future scientists, engineers and executives. If student rebels are allowed to cause the deterioration of our colleges, if college administrators respond to aggression with appeasement, we, too, will suffer irreparable losses.

An equally serious threat is that use of force will spread to other groups in our society. If students can seize university property, workers can seize factories, customers can seize stores and tenants can seize buildings.

The attacks on business noted earlier are only trial balloons in the rebels' long-range drive to plunge America into a socialist revolution. They realize they are numerically too weak for an all-out assault on business. This was acknowledged in a resolution passed at the January, 1969, national convention of SDS: "... Students alone cannot and will not be able to bring about the downfall of capitalism." Therefore, the rebels now are actively recruiting revolutionary allies.

#### PROSPERITY? IT'S "ENSLAVEMENT"

Traditionally, socialists have addressed their primary appeal to workers. However, workers have shared in the general prosperity of American capitalism, and thus they value a home in the suburbs more than a place at the revolutionary barricades. This has caused today's leftists to attack the affluence of the working class as a form of exploitation, as enslavement to material goods. According to Prof. Herbert Marcuse, one of the intellectual mentors of the rebels, the role of the student leftists is to teach the workers that they do not need cars or refrigerators or television sets or washing machines. Marcuse declares: "This merchandise prevents the liberation of the serfs from their 'voluntary servitude'."

Since American workers have shown almost no support for attempts to attack business, the student rebels have had to look elsewhere for allies. At its January convention, SDS decided to de-emphasize its opposition to the Viet Nam war and turn itself into "an anticapitalist youth movement."

According to a friendly editorial in *The Guardian*: "While continuing to expand its base on the traditional college campuses, SDS organizers will increase their efforts in high schools, the military, community colleges and trade schools, and especially among young workers in factories and among the unemployed." The recent rash of high school riots seems to bear witness to SDS' new directions.

#### A PREOCCUPATION WITH SWAHILI

The student leftists also have joined forces with the black militant groups on college campuses. The search for revolutionary allies explains why white leftists are supporting the campaign by black militants for separatism and even segregation. It also explains why student rebels are more eager to promote the study of Swahili and African music than the study of science or business or law or any other subjects which would give Negro students a greater stake in the American economy.

To the socialists, the primary appeal of the proposed autonomous black studies departments is that they will dwell on details of slavery and discrimination, foster a sense of estrangement from American society, and thereby make Negro students receptive to the call for revolution.

In view of the threats posed by the student rebels, businessmen, as alumni, can urge every college to deny its facilities and funds to any group which advocates force, either on or off campus. As voters, they can urge legislators to impose more careful controls on money used for state-supported colleges.

As a measure of self-defense, every college can adopt the policy promulgated by the University of Notre Dame: "Anyone or any group that substitutes force for rational persuasion" will be given 15 minutes to cease and desist. Those who refuse to comply will be suspended, and if they persist, will be expelled.

Both as taxpayers and as private donors, businessmen must concern themselves with how their money is being spent in the colleges. It is short-sighted and self-destructive for businessmen to make gifts to colleges which give sanctuary, or grant amnesty, to student terrorists. Those who value the preservation of a free society should stop subsidizing the advocates of terrorism and socialism.

#### DRAFT REFORM

**HON. JACK H. McDONALD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with each passing year the need for improving our system of military manpower procurement has become more and more urgent. I joined as a cosponsor of a resolution which endorses the President's efforts, through the Department of Defense, to begin preparation for an all-volunteer military force through administrative changes in the structure of the armed services and to place new emphasis on the attraction of greater numbers of qualified volunteers to the military. This type of military service is compatible with the basic principles of democracy and our free society. However, it must be realized that this sweeping change will take time to implement. In recognition of the critical need for draft reform the President has recommended the adoption for a lottery system based on a draft-the-youngest-men-first basis.

Its primary purposes are to provide greater equity and certainty for our young men who face the draft. These two goals are certainly commendable and should receive prompt consideration even through the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1969 does not expire until 1971.

In addition I feel it is vitally important to formulate alternative ways in which both young men and women could serve their country in some other capacity than the military. Due to the substantial opposition, especially among the young, to the Vietnam conflict and the role of the Military Establishment in our society, there has been an increased interest in providing an opportunity for nonmilitary national service. I also believe this approach deserves serious consideration.

For these reasons I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Draft Problems: A Bold Answer" which appears in the June issue of the American Bar Association Journal. Although I do not necessarily agree with all the author, William Prickett, has to say, I feel it is a thought-provoking statement on this most important problem. The text of his remarks is as follows:

#### DRAFT PROBLEMS: A BOLD ANSWER

(By William Prickett)

(NOTE.—The vagaries and inequities of the draft laws are a significant factor in the restlessness and lawlessness manifested by today's youth. Moreover, many students who lack motivation toward academic life and who consequently turn their energies elsewhere would not be present on university campuses but for the draft. Yet a lottery is not the answer, but rather a system of requirements and incentives that would bring every qualified man into the military, and at the optimum time with respect to his personal plans and the needs of the military.)

Solicitor General Erwin N. Griswold, former dean of the Harvard Law School, spoke with grim clarity in a speech before the American Law Institute in May of 1968 about the growing lawlessness that marks American society, particularly its youth. As a factor "contributing to emotion and to strong reaction", he cited our draft laws—their inequities and the real or apparent arbitrariness of administration. "To some extent," he said, "this [arbitrariness] is inherent in the system of local administration—which has a measure of merit—but in our colleges and universities, there are students who come from many different places, and the different policies of different draft boards sometimes stand out rather starkly when they are placed side by side."

A less widely recognized impact of the draft is the presence in our universities, particularly our graduate schools, of many students who, though able, are not really motivated toward intellectual life or professional training and who therefore take their energy out in other activities. Yet another effect is the increase in early marriage and parenthood, the Dean pointed out.

"Finally," he observed, "... the draft has all but made effective academic discipline impossible."

Why is this? The students who have misbehaved at Columbia, or California, or Stanford, or wherever, should be expelled, you say. Their conduct surely merits that, as far as the University is concerned. But what happens if they are expelled, or even suspended for a year? They cease to be students, they are immediately classified I-A, and are

very likely to be drafted. Perhaps that is what should be done. But it does convert the academic penalty into something potentially far more serious, and many Faculty members, who usually participate in disciplinary actions, have not been willing to take such a responsibility.

Dean Griswold thus states the problem, but does not offer any solution. Uncomfortable memories of the Dean's tax class remind me that this was often the way: The Dean would state a tax problem with clarity and force and then ask some hapless student for the answer. Boldness very occasionally served when adequate research or preparation was lacking. The following, then, is a bold answer to one part of the problem the Dean poses.

The present draft law is wrong from every point of view. The uncertainties it creates begin for young men at about the age of 16 and may continue until the age of 26. These uncertainties are created not only by international crises but by the vagaries of standards in selecting those who are required to do military service. Even worse, the present system puts a definite premium on the avoidance, if not the evasion, of military service. It makes even honorable young men magnify small or create fanciful physical disabilities in order to avoid apparently useless and possibly dangerous years with the military. It gives early marriage to a teen-age sweetheart the added allure of possibly avoiding military service. Finally, as the Dean points out, the draft induces many college students who are not properly qualified or motivated to embrace the scholarly world of graduate school in the hope of avoiding military service.

From the military point of view the draft is not satisfactory. While the need of the armed services for manpower varies from time to time, the military establishment of the United States does need a substantial number of young men each year. It needs a "mix" of privates, company-grade officers and specialists on a continuous basis in order to fill the ranks of privates, noncommissioned officers, specialists and officers. Those who serve in today's Army must be physically and mentally well qualified. It has been reported that only about half of the young men of America are in fact qualified at present. The military establishment needs a firm, fair national policy that will provide the manpower necessary for the defense commitments of the United States. The manpower policy must, however, be flexible enough to respond to the varying needs of the country, depending on the international situation at any given time.

What young men of America need is a law that combines certainty and fairness, that allows a young man to plan his education, his family and his career, allows him to fulfill honorably his legitimate obligation to his country and deals equally with all: rich, poor, ignorant, intelligent, white and black. The military services need a law that provides them with the quantity and quality of men that enable them to meet the military obligations of the country. Can the varying needs of the military establishment for adequate manpower and the legitimate desires of the youth of the United States for certainty and fairness be satisfactorily reconciled in a new law? The rest of this paper is to show it can.

The lottery system should be rejected. A lottery system honestly run might be fairer than the haphazard draft system currently in force, but it seems undesirable that the high obligation of doing military service should depend on the turn of a card or the drawing of a lot. In addition, that system would not solve the problem of the uncertainty. In fact, it might increase the uncertainty in that one's obligation to serve would not be entirely dependent on the extent that one could magnify physical de-

fects or on the vagaries of the local board, but on the whim of Lady Luck.

It should be adopted as national policy that every young man, except those in jail or mental institutions, be required at some time in his life to perform a period of federal service. (As will be explained further on, "federal service" does not necessarily mean military service.) Having established that principle, it remains to work out a system under which this service would be performed.

In order for the system to work, it should have built into it incentives, so that each individual youth would do his federal service at the optimum time, from his point of view as well as the point of view of the Armed Forces of the United States. Furthermore, since the basic objective is to fill the military manpower requirements of the Armed Forces, the period of service should be no longer than is necessary from their point of view.

The largest need of the military is for privates, apprentice seamen and basic airmen. From the point of view of the military, the optimum age for a private, airman or apprentice seaman is 18. From the point of view of most young men, it is easiest and best to do military service at 18. The majority have not married nor have they started on their trade, profession or career. Therefore, one would start with the proposition that the shortest period of military service would be for young men who enter the military service after their eighteenth birthday or graduation from high school, whichever occurs sooner. (A premium on graduation from high school might well be built into the system.) The basic period of service for those entering at 18 or after graduation from high school would have to be determined by the minimum time it would take the military to train the young men to be militarily useful or to utilize their services in time of actual crisis or warfare. Thus the basic period might have to vary from time to time.

This is all very well for the young man who is not going to college. This system would enable him to get his military service in at the optimum time for him and the military service. But what about those who are going to college? The young men that are going to college should not, under any circumstances, be excused from service. On the contrary, since the college man usually enjoys more benefits than others before going to college and is likely to enjoy more benefits from the country after college, he should be required to give something more by way of federal service. On the other hand, college students should be freely deferred on the justification that the military service needs college graduates, not as privates, but as junior officers. From the point of view, then, of the military, college men should be encouraged to enter the military service when they have completed their college education rather than before. However, in order to make it clear that deferment of federal service during a period when a man is in college is not a favor to those lucky enough to go to college, the period of service after college should be somewhat longer than the period required of those who enter military service at 18 or upon graduation from high school. For example, if it were determined that the period of service for the 18-year-olds should be eighteen months, then the period for the college graduate should be set at twenty-two or perhaps twenty-four months. Of course, if a student dropped out of college, was expelled or failed, he would be required within a reasonably short time to perform his federal service obligation. The period of obligation would be correspondingly longer because it had been deferred.

Early marriage would in no way exempt the individual from performing his national

service obligation. However, a girl might think twice about an early marriage to a youth she knows is certainly going to have to do his federal service.

All very well for the high school graduate and those going to college, but what about those who are going on to graduate school? Their situation should likewise be examined first in terms of the needs of the military establishment. The military, for example, needs doctors. Therefore, those who are going to enter the medical field should not be encouraged to do their military service as privates, nor should they be encouraged to do their military service after the completion of college. Rather, incentives should be built into the system to encourage them to do their service as doctors. Not only should they be freely deferred through college and medical school (and perhaps even internship), but the Government might well pay for their last year of medical school if necessary. However, at the end of their medical education, the young doctors would have a service obligation that would be somewhat longer than that of the 18-year-old or the college graduate. Of course, the doctor's rank and military pay would be commensurate with the training he had received and his professional status. The military would also expect that a man of his age and professional standing might be married.

As for graduate students whose specialty would have no value in the armed services, they would have already had the choice of doing the minimum service as privates when they turned 18 or doing military service for a somewhat longer period when they graduated from college. If, however, they elected to continue their education into graduate school, they would then have at the end of that period a correspondingly longer period of service to perform, either as privates or as officers if qualified. For example, if the basic period for the 18-year-old was eighteen months and for the college graduate twenty-four months, the graduate student might be required to do thirty or thirty-two months of service. Of course, the period of service required of 18-year-olds, college students and graduate students would have to be reviewed and set from time to time (i.e., every two years) in view of the current necessities of the military service and in order to readjust incentives for the young men to do their military service at the optimum time from their own point of view as well as that of the Armed Forces.

This basic plan would provide the military with the manpower it needs and would make the manpower available at a time when the individual is best suited for the tasks for which the military needs him. At the same time, it would eliminate the uncertainty that exists today and that is so unfair and disturbing to our young men. It would reverse the situation that puts a premium on the avoidance or evasion of military service and that, by encouraging deception, is thought by some to warp the moral fiber of each young generation.

However, the proposal as yet does not contain any alternative for the many young men who genuinely do not meet the high physical and mental requirements of the military service today. If those who cannot qualify physically or mentally are entirely excused from the obligation of federal service, do not the same incentives remain that currently encourage the avoidance or evasion of military service? The answer is that the inability to qualify for military service because of physical or mental defects should not be the basis for the total avoidance of federal service. Those who could not meet the high standards for military service would still have the basic obligation to perform a service to the United States. The Peace Corps, the reconstitution of the Civilian Conservation Corps and service in state and federal hospitals and mental institutions all provide

vast unfulfilled opportunities for service. However, federal service other than military service should not be an easy, short-term alternative to the rigors of military service. It should be at least as lengthy as corresponding military service and just as arduous. In the second place, nonmilitary federal service should not be the basis for the many rights and benefits that accrue to those who have served in the Armed Forces. These benefits and rights should be reserved to the young men who are able to perform military service for the country. In other words, the alternative form of service for those not physically or mentally qualified for military service should not be made attractive enough so that the physically and mentally qualified young men would prefer to do this service rather than do their military service. On the other side of the coin, it seems likely that many handicapped persons would welcome the opportunity to serve in a limited way.

The present draft applies only to young men, and my proposal speaks only of the young men of the nation. However, in these days of equality, the obligation to do federal service for the country should not be confined to the young men, but should be made to apply to the young women as well.

Of course, it is obvious that there would be heavy "costs", financial and otherwise, in carrying out these proposed reforms, and it might be that the costs are too high. However, this suggested revision of the basic federal service law would solve many of the problems which American youth is having in connection with the draft and would help stem some of the growing lawlessness.

#### CONGRESSMAN HECHLER IS "SCREAMING"

#### HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I believe that those of us in public life need to stand back once in awhile and look at ourselves as others see us. There is a great danger that men who listen to and believe public adulation will get too big for their britches, and lose perspective. It is very healthy to have an editor take the bark off an official. Too many of us are oversensitive about such criticism, or perhaps we bemoan the fact that criticism breeds cynicism.

I welcome and encourage criticism. It stimulates healthy public discussion. From the heart of the coalfields comes a good, biting piece of editorializing which appeared in the Logan News on May 30, 1969, where the able editor, Roscoe Spence, writes a column entitled "Chief Logan Speaks."

There have been many public comments and some speculation that the only reason I am undertaking the fight to protect the health and safety of coal miners is that I have ambition for some higher office. First, I would like to point out that I do not consider there is any higher office than that of a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. In fact, it is entirely probable that some Members of the U.S. Senate may be thinking of running for the "upper House"—the House of Representatives. I believe I can understand the natural inclination of any young person or a Member of the U.S. Senate wanting to become a Representa-

tive, where he can be closer to the people and play a more direct part in helping the people with the major problems of the day. Second, with respect to the speculation that my position on coal mine legislation is motivated by political considerations, I would like to point out that I have successfully incurred the ire of many coal operators, the top leadership of the United Mine Workers, the heads of a number of local unions in West Virginia, and now the Logan News has deserted me. Surely, a person interested in or having political ambitions would not deliberately stir up such formidable opposition if he had any serious thoughts of running for some other office.

In any event, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will enjoy this article:

#### CHIEF LOGAN SPEAKS

The great wealth of Logan County lies in its vast coal beds and reserves. If there be anyone anywhere who doubts this they just do not realize how hard it is to buy an acre of coal land until they have tried it.

Modern coal mining machinery is both very costly, and very sophisticated. It takes an experienced hand to operate a continuous miner, a coal cutting machine and coal loading equipment.

There is no doubt but that more dust is put into the air by this type coal production. And there is no doubt that it is increasing the amount of dust a 1969 coal miner pulls into his lungs each shift. We know there is a serious problem in this connection.

Also we know it is very easy to spend someone else's money! Those who are crying for redress and a complete, all at once approach to the problem are appealing to the most undesirable and basic emotions.

Congressman Ken Hechler is screaming like an emotionally upset man over every phase of the health and safety program which is being prepared in Congress. We simply ask: Does Hechler think this problem is something new? Does he think that suddenly the coal operators turned loose extra dust in the working places to harm the men working there? Does he think that union officials who have fought the fight for the working miners have suddenly set in motion a death trap for the men? These men have put into the welfare of the men working in the mines all they had through the years. Are they suddenly scoundrels who are filching money from the welfare fund? Does Hechler and the others think coal dust is a sudden hazard in the mines of the nation? What do they really want? In Hechler's case it is hard to tell. Sometimes we think he does not know. It matters not what position is popular at the moment—there is the spot where you find Hechler. The Statehouse Faction is reported to have considered dropping Hechler in 1966. We suggest that 1970 would be a good year to search for a new member of Congress from the Fourth West Virginia District and that a strong Republican candidate should emerge to present him with the first major opponent and the first real race.

For a great many years we have watched the events closely in the coal fields. Particularly we have watched union officials and the fights they have waged continuously for the miners. And even now as we write this a Local Union President of the UMWA came to our office and expressed great disagreement with his congressman who he says wants to be all things to all men and to walk on the water.

Also for a great many years we have done printing and advertising for the coal companies which operate in our field. They are

here to make a profit. Is there something wrong with that? They pay their bills—is this wrong? They purchase great amounts of intricate machinery which makes jobs for those who build this equipment—is this wrong? What we are saying is the fact that there are many good qualities about those who own and operate the mines of Logan County. They are trying to solve a problem which has beset both the miner and the company for which he works. We think there are more good coal operators than there are good congressmen—in this we could be wrong it is based on our personal contacts with coal people and with congressmen.

Emotional cries and emotional appeals will not cure anything wrong with the coal industry—spending someone else's money will not stop the infection of black lung. The ton of coal will only bring so much on the market. Every cost factor must come out of the price that ton of coal brings. The alternative is to remove coal from the economy and it would seem to us that Hechler is bent on doing just this. Why?

We became disillusioned with Hechler when he began a campaign which you have heard very little from since the last election. His proposal at that time was to permit transients to vote anywhere they happened to be on election day. He was part of the early human rights movement and marched with the Negro people at Selma in one of the first confrontations and then he dropped this movement when it lost its appeal to the average citizen or has he been at it without publicity. Hechler was a great champion of the Midway Airport for Southern West Virginia and campaigned in another emotionally loaded campaign for that project but evidently it became subordinated to something with more splash and emotionalism and we have heard of no follow up on it. When it starts to rain Hechler begins asking why the Bailey Dam is not being completed but when the sun shines he looks to something else. We think the man is shallow—too shallow!

#### DISSEMINATION OF OBSCENE MATERIALS

### HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 4, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we talk a great deal these days about air and water pollution and the sad state of our environment, but there is another kind of pollution about which I am concerned, along with many other Members of this body. This is the pollution of the mind—the pollution that is the result of the disturbing increase in pandering, pornographic mail. The ruthless peddlers of smut who are thoughtlessly polluting our Nation's mailboxes are a serious annoyance to people who are not interested in what they have to offer and, especially, to responsible parents who do not wish their children to be exposed to this salacious junk.

It is all well and good to talk about freedoms and liberties, but there is a place to draw the line. Mr. Speaker, the unsolicited smut going through the mails and being purveyed to youngsters clearly violates the standards of taste and decency to which I think most responsible adults subscribe. I am not one who recklessly blasts the Supreme Court for being at the root of all our troubles. But

I do feel that since the Court finds it difficult to arbitrarily define obscenity, we in the Congress ought to responsibly act to safeguard the right of citizens to be protected from unsolicited, pornographic mail.

Part of the problem has been the reluctance, in the past, of the Justice Department to work with those of us in Congress toward some acceptable legislation. Since the new administration took office, however, there has been progress. The administration's proposals for cracking down on pornographic mail are based on what can realistically be done within the bounds of the Constitution and they have pointed the way for us to move on this issue. I have now introduced a bill which is aimed at "affording to the public protection from the offensive intrusion into their homes, through the postal service, of sexually oriented mail matter." The bill covers unsolicited literature and advertising. Envelopes must bear the name and address of the sender. Those not wanting such material will be able to file their names with a local postmaster. Selling or leasing any list of those not wanting obscene mail will be a violation of the law. Postmasters will have the authority to request action by the Justice Department against any violators and courts will be able to restrain defendants from mailing activities. There is also a provision allowing the courts to direct postmasters not to accept pornographic mail. The measure I have introduced also defines quite clearly what is and what is not prohibited. The kinds of material which constitute obscene mail are defined and spelled out.

Mr. Speaker, I know from discussions with my constituents that the abuse of our mails by smut peddlers is very real and very disturbing to thoughtful, concerned Americans. I hope we will be successful in our efforts to effectively deal with this situation before it can become more serious and widespread. We are charged with the responsibility for overseeing the Post Office and assuring that it is not allowed to become the tool of selfish, unprincipled elements of our society. I do not wish to in any way shirk that responsibility.

#### BROADCAST LICENSES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the current controversy over the Federal Communications Commission's apparently hasty renewal of a broadcast license for television station WPIX in New York City raises once again the serious question of how best to serve and protect the public interest in broadcasting. A perceptive analysis of the issue by Jack Gould was published recently in the New York Times and I present it for inclusion in the RECORD so that it may have the broad readership it deserves:

**TELEVISION: CHALLENGING THOSE WHO CONTROL THE TV CHANNELS**

(By Jack Gould)

Challenges by citizens groups to renewals of licenses for long-established television stations have aroused more reaction in Washington than any other recent development in broadcasting. The controversy poses a long-range social question of substantial importance: Is TV to be a "locked-in" medium in perpetuity?

Upward of 40 bills have been introduced in the House and Senate to shield existing broadcasters from last-minute petitions to lift their franchises and award them to other groups claiming they could render a more fruitful program service. And the Federal Communications Commission, in what can only be described as unseemly haste, elected not even to study a thoughtful 350-page petition from a group of New Yorkers which sought to block renewal of The Daily News's license for WPIX on Channel 11. The WPIX renewal was rushed through the F.C.C. bureaucracy even though there was no legal barrier to the regulatory agency's power to pause and examine what the petitioners had in mind. That particular battle may be headed for the courts.

Through a proposed amendment to the Communications Act, Senator John O. Pastore, Rhode Island Democrat and Chairman of the Senate Communications subcommittee, would, for all practical purposes, wipe out the feasibility of any meaningful challenge to present occupants of television's channels. Under his suggested bill, no competing application for an existing channel could be entertained by the F.C.C. until the commission itself had first found that the present license-holder had been remiss in his responsibilities. And, if the wording of the amendment means what it appears to say, the F.C.C. would be required to rely primarily, if not wholly, on the representations of the license-holders.

It is small wonder that Broadcasting magazine, the alter ego of the lobbyists of the National Association of Broadcasters, has applauded Senator Pastore and other congressmen who have advanced similar proposals. Everyone knows that the F.C.C. has never lifted a license solely on the ground of inadequate program performance. Now, if Senator Pastore's bill clears through Congress, the preservation of the status quo will be tighter than ever.

The motivation behind the Senator's solicitude for present broadcasters is the desire to avoid interminable hearings prompted by capricious challenges which, on the surface, appear to have more nuisance value than substance. But the danger is that such a curb may also outlaw challenges having genuine merit.

When a group prepares an exhaustive petition, with extraordinarily explicit detail on how it would use a channel, the effort hardly can be considered frivolous. And that was the precise accomplishment of the New York group headed by Lawrence K. Grossman, a former vice president of the National Broadcasting Company. His associates include representatives of the Puerto Rican and Negro minorities in both the proposed management of a new station and in its financial structure. The outline of how the outlet would become involved in the community reflects a heartening awareness that broadcasting could be notably different from what it is now. There would be entertainment and commercials, but no plugs for cigarettes or anything in the nature of advertising warlike toys, and over 23 per cent of the week's scheduling would be devoted to programs outside of entertainment and sports.

With some legal uncertainty still attached to The Daily News case, the merits of the challenge can hardly be assessed precipitously. The likelihood of upsetting the WPIX renewal is perhaps not too strong, but for the

F.C.C. (save for the dissenting Commissioner Nicholas Johnson) to give the fast brushoff to such a document hardly speaks well for the agency's receptivity to new concepts.

The organized campaign to assure broadcasters indefinite immunity to challenges poses a unique problem of major social consequence. The clearcut purpose of a system of renewing licenses every three years is to keep broadcasting performance under constant review. If that is not the purpose, then a permanent franchise might as well be granted and all the costly fol-de-rol of renewal proceedings unceremoniously junked at great savings to the taxpayer.

Senator Pastore and his like-minded colleagues in the Senate and House raise the point that the huge investments of existing licensees should not be jeopardized by challenges either not seriously intended or wanting in the necessary financial resources. But this line of thinking overlooks one simple remedy: the F.C.C. could readily devise special application requirements that would quickly separate bona fide challenges from playthings intended purely as harassment. Since the burden of proof might properly be placed on the challenger, exacting documentation of the sincerity of his intentions and his ability to perform might be demanded.

But candor is also necessary when it comes to discussing an existing television station's huge stake in its occupancy of a channel. At least 90 percent of the value of the broadcasting property rests in the channel per se, and under the law that channel does not belong to the broadcaster but to the public. Banner sums of tens of millions of dollars are not paid out for studio equipment and antenna towers. What lies at the heart of the unconscionable trafficking in licenses is the desire to control a priceless facility with the knowledge that it is perennially protected.

Yesterday's generation, which was lucky enough to scoop up channels in the early days, does have a very real monopoly, a monopoly that both Congress and the F.C.C. majority go to inordinate lengths to preserve. But broadcasting is much more than a tangible item of property; it is the dominant medium for the conveyance of opinions and attitudes.

Just because a broadcaster has held a license for two decades or more does not automatically mean that he alone is best qualified to meet the needs of a continuously changing society and the rising requirements and goals of emerging groups with fresh ideas and approaches. Shutting out these eager forces from even a prayer of gaining access to the best Very High Frequency channels is bound sooner or later to bring an increasingly strong reaction. The opening of V.H.F. channels to some new blood is clearly a matter deserving of a long-range review by Congress, the F.C.C. and the White House. True diversity begins with diversity of management and it might as well be faced that this means finding room for newcomers. Shunting them off to less desirable Ultra-High frequency channels or Cable TV is electronic segregation. Since all V.H.F. channels everywhere have been spoken for, it may well be that the only socially desirable solution is to consider whether one licensee should control a channel seven days a week. Shared channels have worked in London commercial TV and, if that is the only way of increasing the number of entrepreneurs in American television, it deserves consideration. Why, for instance, should only three companies have access to national networks when there might be six dividing weekdays and weekends? Shared channels are part of the basic structure of radio: there are daytime stations and full-time stations.

Every proposed innovation inevitably raises howls of disapproval, but that is hardly the important issue in television. Unless existing broadcasters affirmatively open their doors

to those who believe the home screen can be very different and infinitely more useful than it now is, then sooner or later serious challenges to the status quo will increase. The rearguard action in Washington to thwart those ambitions is the most telling evidence of the case for change.

**FINANCING OF URBAN HOUSING**

**HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the problem of financing urban redevelopment and the construction of urban housing has long had the attention of Congress and ways and means had to be found to provide such financing at the lowest cost to the Government, and at the lowest possible interest rate to the borrower.

The recent increase in interest rates cannot help but affect the mortgage market, further reducing the available funds for housing starts. Not being an economist, I do not know when this money game will come out of the clouds.

Because of this financial crisis, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this House the proposal of Mr. Alvin E. Gershen, president of the New Jersey State Board of Professional Planners—his unique idea of financing the rebuilding of urban housing so that the average American can participate in it as a sound personal investment.

Based upon an intensive study of urban housing problems, the Gershen plan calls for a program of national urban bonds, for sale by a Federal agency, along the lines that the Treasury Department now sells savings bonds.

Under this plan, the average investor could receive a return of 7 to 9 percent a year. The high yield from the urban bonds would result from a combination of tax free income and a real estate depreciation currently enjoyed by investors under Federal tax laws.

It is hoped that such bond sales could account for hundreds of millions of dollars each year to finance nonprofit and limited-profit housing construction in urban areas.

Under the proposed program, 20 year bonds would be offered at 4½ or 5 percent, and in amounts ranging from \$500 up to keep them within reach of the small investor. Thus a family with a taxable income of \$8,500 would earn \$25 a year in tax free dividends from a \$500 bond. Added to this would be another \$11 in real estate depreciation allowances, based on the current system which permits real estate owners to write off for Federal tax purposes a portion of their property's worth each year. The combined income would amount to an annual return of 7.3 percent.

Further, Mr. Speaker, if the family's taxable income was \$16,500, the depreciation tax credit would be \$14, which, with the \$25 in dividends, would amount to 7.8 percent a year.

This program would attack the chief

problem in building urban housing—the difficulty in getting long-term financing.

Neither the Federal Government nor the large business corporations have demonstrated their ability to provide enough capital to make a significant impact on housing problems. Private enterprise cannot do it alone. Profits are not worth the investment. Government cannot do it alone, either. Local government does not have the money and the Federal Government has other priorities. We need a vehicle to bring the people, the Government, and the business sector together, and the national urban bonds programs could be that vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this approach to the ills of urban housing has much merit and I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks made by Mr. Gershen before the concurrent session of the American Management Association, Conference on Urban Affairs, which was held on May 28, 1969, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City. I also wish to include, as part of my remarks, a report outlining Mr. Gershen's proposal for financing the construction of urban housing, which he presented at the time of his speech and some informational material on his background.

This material follows:

#### A STAKE IN THE SYSTEM

(Remarks of Alvin E. Gershen, before the concurrent session of the American Management Association, Conference on Urban Affairs)

We are here today to talk about a stake in the system—what's in it for Americans to make our cities survive the 20th Century.

There isn't much point in going through the litany of problems. You know as well as I how serious they are—how close we are to total failure.

I do want to say, however, as far as housing is concerned, that we are only kidding ourselves if we think cities are going to be a fit place to work in if the people who live in them don't have decent housing.

Cities aren't brick and mortar. They are the flesh and blood of their inhabitants. A family needs pride. They need a place they want to come home to at night. As the cities decay physically, so does the quality of life of their inhabitants.

So what are we to do? For the past two decades, we have, as a nation, been merely fencing with our urban housing problems. Congress has passed a number of housing acts. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on urban renewal projects. There have been some successes. But in those 20 years has the state of American cities grown worse or better? You know the answer. That's why you are here today. We haven't done nearly enough and what we have done, we haven't done nearly fast enough.

For those who say urban renewal is necessarily a slow process, I say that deterioration and despair are fast processes—and ferociously expensive in terms of wasted opportunities, wasted money, wasted lives.

The cities are reaching the point of no return. In New York, in Newark, in Camden, owners are abandoning buildings rather than continue to pay confiscatory taxes or bring them up to housing code standards.

We have local property tax rates in some cities in New Jersey that approach 8 percent of true value a year. These are the cities with the greatest need for renewal and the least financial ability to carry it out. So we are faced not only with finding better ways of building urban housing, but faster ways. Time has nearly run out for us.

We cannot afford to wait for the end of the

war in Vietnam and pin our hopes on the diversion of billions of dollars in federal aid to the cities. That will have to happen, but we can't wait until it does.

We are confronted with a national emergency no less serious to my mind than the Great Depression of the 1930's. The outbreak of World War II.

And the Nixon Administration will have to do what the Roosevelt Administration did in those dark days—go to the people and make them believe the battle is worth fighting, that the cause is good and that we can win.

It is to this end that I suggest a program I like to call "National Urban Bonds." Under such a program a federal agency would sell investment bonds to the people in much the same way that the Treasury Department sold defense bonds in the forties; savings bonds now.

The money, I believe, would come from small, private investors—from the nation's middle-income families. It will come from what President Nixon has referred to as "the independent people's sector" of the national economy.

I believe that this kind of a program can raise hundreds of millions of dollars each year—the kind of money that must be spent if there is going to be any meaningful impact on urban housing needs.

A little earlier, I compared this program with our savings bonds. There are two significant differences. The Urban bonds would be a somewhat different kind of investment, because: one, the dividends would be tax exempt and two, the investor also would get writedowns on his federal income tax since he would, in effect, be investing in real estate, and entitled to deductions based on building depreciation allowances.

Let's see how it would work.

Let's take a family with a taxable income of \$8,500. Their \$500 National Urban Bond, bearing an interest rate of 5% and amortized over 20 years would give them a non taxable income of \$25 per year. Add to this a depreciation allowance on the face value of the bond of another \$25. The non taxable income and tax allowance would total \$50. A family with a taxable income of \$8,500 is in a 22 percent tax bracket. The annual effective tax savings therefore is \$11. This \$11 added to the income at 5% of \$25 gives a total increment of \$36. This is equivalent to an annual return of 7.3 percent.

That's not a bad investment. I think that these bonds will be attractive to the small investor. Applying the same set of conditions to a taxable income of \$16,500, the annual return would be 7.3 percent.

Now the same \$500 bond could be amortized in 10 years instead of twenty. If this were the case the annual return on 5 percent National Urban Bonds for a family with a taxable income of \$8,500 would be 8.3 percent and for a family with a taxable income of \$16,500 would be 9.3 percent. Not bad at all. This could represent a break for the nation's middle class.

I propose that bonds be sold in small denominations, so that we provide an opportunity to as many American families as possible to invest in the rebuilding of our urban areas.

In any event, each one would be dated and depreciation allowances would begin at the time of purchase. I would propose that allowances be made so that the depreciation schedule be accelerated if the holder kept the bond at least 10 years. This would be consistent with current federal income tax policy covering owners of real estate.

The millions raised under this program would be used by non-profit housing corporations. But ownership could be transferred from one non-profit corporation to another non-profit corporation or to a tenants cooperative. Transfer of ownership would not have any effect on the bond holder. All of the real estate outstanding at any one time would serve as the security against all the

outstanding debts of the national agency floating the National Urban Bonds. The credit of the federal government would not be pledged against possible defaults. I would suggest that a premium be added to the basic interest rate and applied by the issuing agency as a fund against possible defaults.

The past experience of the Federal Housing Administration shows this to be sound fiscal practice. As has been the case with F.H.A. experience, I believe the premium would produce substantial surpluses and these surpluses could be used for programs of rent supplements or interest supplements as well as for seed money loans. All this without appropriations from Congress.

It is very important that this concept be viewed as one which is independently sound—a "money maker" rather than a drain on the federal treasury. It is also important that we realize that once the fund is established, it will have its own strength and not be dependent on annual federal appropriations with the consequent possibility of cutbacks.

In the years since World War II, America has helped millions of Americans buy homes. We've done it with FHA, with the Veterans Administration, and with income tax credits. We have created tens of thousands of prosperous new suburban communities.

We have to face the fact that these new communities have contributed to the decline of the cities, drawing away from urban living some of the best of our citizenry. We have proved that the combination of government financing and individual private investment from home-buying citizens can perform housing miracles.

We can do it again in the cities. But we have to unify the nation behind the effort. Private enterprise can't do it alone. Profits aren't worth the investment. Government can't do it alone either. Local government doesn't have the money and the federal government has other priorities—priorities, as we have seen in the case of Vietnam—that are often unpredictable.

We need a vehicle to bring the people, the government and the business sector together, and I believe the National Urban Bonds program could be that vehicle.

The American citizen is, I believe, sympathetic and patriotic. He knows the problems of the cities and I believe he would like to help.

But he has his own family, his own problems, his own set of priorities.

The National Urban Bonds program would give him this chance to help and at the same time give a generous return on his investment. Properly administered and promoted, this kind of program could attract tens of thousands of investors each year.

And they would have a stake in the system—a piece of the action.

I want to point out here that while this program is designed to involve large numbers of the American middle class, it in no way precludes the participation of the wealthy or of business interests. In fact, I think the bonds will prove attractive to investors from these areas, also.

But let me discuss with you for a few minutes why I think this kind of program can work and why, perhaps, other programs have not worked. There are several basic costs in financing and operating multi-family housing units: Land, construction, real estate taxes, maintenance and operation, type of ownership. The last factor is the cost of money—the length of the mortgage, the interest rate and the amortization schedule.

All of these factors are included in the monthly rent the tenant must pay. It goes without saying that if the rents are above certain levels, the housing units will be out of the reach of the people they are designed to serve.

Now, federal urban renewal aid can offset land costs. Construction and maintenance costs are relatively fixed and relatively predictable.

Real estate taxes are not. But through a procedure of paying these taxes based on shelter rents rather than on property tax assessments, the necessary predictability can be achieved. We should deal with this problem more forthrightly.

Since the kind of housing we are considering here is non-profit or limited-profit, rentals can be reduced considerably.

In other words, there are no insurmountable problems in finding sites for housing in cities, in building the housing, in maintaining it and in keeping the real estate taxes within reason. Admittedly, each of these five factors needs additional study and solution in terms of reducing their cost values.

However, the most basic and by far the biggest problem is in finding long-term financing. The federal government so far has not made sufficient capital available. And few big corporations are willing to involve themselves as long-term financiers. Like the rest of us, most major corporations borrow money when they build. The insurance companies are exceptions but they concentrate on high-yield mortgages.

So, we ought then to turn our attention to the people—the middle-income citizen, the consumer—the bedrock of our economy—and collectively, the holder of great wealth. We may as well look at the political realities. There is a certain amount of resentment among the American middle-class—the feeling that the government is concentrating all its energies on the poor—that social programs contain nothing anymore for the middle class American and on the other that special fiscal legislation benefits only the rich.

There has been much talk lately dealing with depreciation allowances as well as tax free bonds. This talk comes from the feeling that the "rich get richer" and are given certain tax advantages which are withheld from other segments of our population.

Now, I think that from the pragmatic point of view, it is not in the cards for Congress to totally eliminate depreciation allowances from holders of real estate—notwithstanding the fact that there may be good cause to consider doing this. Similarly, I feel that tax free government bonds will not be removed from the money market place.

The concept of National Urban Bonds, therefore, tends to bridge these gaps by providing the same opportunities for depreciation allowances or tax free bonds to the great bulk of middle class Americans who before now never participated in these "savings."

We all know that the reluctance of Congress to pass any legislation aiding the cities is due in large measure to this middle-class suburban dissatisfaction. We are not going to rebuild America's slums until a large cross section of the electorate wants it done.

I believe a National Urban Bonds can dramatically help here because it is a program with something in it for the average American citizen. I believe Americans want decent cities no matter where they live and I think they will see in this kind of program a way to get what they want.

#### A NEW PROPOSAL FOR FINANCING THE CONSTRUCTION OF URBAN HOUSING

(A report by Alvin E. Gershen, presented to the American Management Association, Conference on Urban Affairs)

The purpose of this report is to describe and recommend a program to overcome the, as yet, insurmountable problem of financing construction of critically needed urban housing. The program is designed to utilize voluntary participation of a previously untapped source of investments in what would be known as "National Urban Bonds."

The source of funds would be small private and personal investments from middle income families—the "independent people's

sector"\* of the national economy—rather than the traditional commercial and governmental sources of mortgages and financing.

The effect of such investments would be to make available a resource for the hundreds of millions of dollars per year which are required to make significant progress in the redevelopment and rehabilitation of the blighted core districts of our metropolitan areas. For it is only through the expenditure of sums of this magnitude that decent and desirable dwellings can be offered to moderate income families in place of the dilapidated, deteriorating, or obsolescent and low value structures which continue to comprise a majority of the housing stock within the nation's largest cities.

It should be emphasized that these hundreds of millions of dollars represent for the most part money directed into the private construction industry, and would constitute an important stimulus of national productivity.

The particular attractiveness of National Urban Bonds as an investment opportunity to middle income families and small investors would be based upon the combined inducements of dividend payments and annual writedowns on the federal personal income tax. A rather modest outlay, for example, of \$500 could produce the tangible economic benefit of a substantially reduced tax bill.

For the first time the utilization of a tax writedown becomes available, practicable, and genuinely useful for persons and families of average or modest means.

While this proposed program, in contrast to existing programs, is designed to involve large numbers of the middle income segments of the population who, as a result, will be receiving direct benefits, this in no way precludes the participation of upper income citizens or business corporations.

It is apparent that both the public and private sectors of industry have been unable to resolve the problems of urban housing at this particular point in the nation's development. While annual home building activity has frequently set new records, the major share of this output has not occurred in the urban core areas. With the generally favorable or responsive suburban construction market, central city redevelopment—and this is generally synonymous with building new homes in central cities—has represented a far less promising return for privately invested capital.

The challenge in our urban core areas is two fold. To stop the steady deterioration of the physical plant and to make provisions for sound social, economic and physical renewal.

To attempt to rebuild the physical plant without making provisions for sound social and economic opportunities for all our people is to repeat the mistakes of the past and to fail to maximize the opportunities of the present. Conversely, to recognize the need for providing adequate social and economic opportunity and for making available new, imaginative, and bold programs to deal with America's poor while the problems of the physical environment are ignored is to fail to recognize the value of a sound housing supply.

In order to provide for meaningful long range social, education and economic programs of betterment for our poor or culturally deprived, long term, real solutions to the problems of our physical environment, including our housing stock, must be found.

In 1949 the federal government adopted a National Housing Act, which for the first

\* Phrase attributed to President Nixon in syndicated column by Don Oberdorfer appearing in *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, January 28, 1969.

time focused attention on environment as well as on housing conditions. The preface to the Act identifies a national goal of "a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family."

The matter of housing and redevelopment is most closely identified with the country's most densely populated municipalities. These include the largest municipalities as well as many smaller ones which are just as old.

Part and parcel of the need to maintain and redevelop these older communities, is to provide not only for low income families, but also for the moderate income citizen. We should point out that "moderate income" is a special term used in the housing field to refer to people who earn more than the maximum allowable for eligibility for public housing, yet are unable to afford decent housing at the prevailing rates in the private or conventional market.

Fundamentally, we are concerned with providing not only "a decent home," but "a suitable living environment" as well. Federal programs to redevelop neighborhoods and to provide for rehabilitated housing have been helpful in aiding American cities and have resulted in significant improvements throughout the country. Three things seem to be apparent: (1) we have not taken maximum advantage of available opportunities; (2) we lack general knowledge and appreciation of existing programs, and (3) this lack has prevented us from proposing new programs to fill the gaps in existing legislation, federal as well as state.

A major function of federally aided urban renewal has been to make available to private development interests vacant and reasonably sizeable parcels assembled and cleared by public means. Such land is offered at a price that would attract the private builder and far below the cost that would be entailed if all the expenses of acquiring small, intensively developed parcels and demolition were borne by the entrepreneur. Because of the high prevailing land cost per unit of area in central cities, residential reconstruction has generally taken the form of multi-storied apartment buildings.

Despite the general individual success of such projects, their number has been small in relation to the total urban situation of decay and obsolescence. Municipal obligations for land acquisition and clearance in a federally aided renewal project, representing typically about a fourth or less of the total cost, can nonetheless be very great. The debt capacity of the municipality often does not permit funding of a scale sufficient to make an impact upon the total community landscape, even with federal aid.

However, what has retarded even more the residential development of our central cities has been the difficulty (or the cost) of obtaining money to finance construction or reconstruction.

In order to approach the problem of the gap between needed housing and projected construction, we need a fundamental understanding of the financing and ownership of multi-family housing units.

Stated broadly, a multi-family housing unit is physical shelter which, as an economic entity, relates to the community on the basis of the *monthly cost of a dwelling unit*. A family looking for housing accommodations judges whether or not it can "afford the monthly rent." This monthly rent is made up of costs which can be reduced to a function of the following:

- (1) Cost of land.
- (2) Cost of construction:
  - (a) Labor;
  - (b) Materials;
  - (c) Design services.
- (3) Cost of money:
  - (a) Length of mortgage;
  - (b) Interest rate;
  - (c) Amortization schedule.

- (4) Real estate taxes.
- (5) Maintenance and operating costs.
- (6) Type of ownership.

But in actuality, it is the cost of money, more than any of the other five determinants, which accounts for the totally inadequate response to the need for urban redevelopment.

As already stated, the use of federally aided urban renewal programs can minimize the problem of land cost, transferring diversely owned, over valued and expensive land into vacant, developable parcels saleable at a determined fair market value. The two relatively "fixed" items among the six listed above are the construction cost and the overhead of maintenance and operation.

The cost of construction is composed primarily of the price of labor and materials and the fees for architectural and engineering and design services which are relatively inflexible in a given project. Maintenance and operating costs do not vary considerably between profit and non-profit housing.

Real estate taxes, on the other hand, can vary considerably according to type of ownership. Specifically, non-profit and limited dividend (or limited profit) ownership corporations, by paying taxes based on total rentals received rather than on the valuation of land and improvements (cost to replace structure and depreciation), can be afforded a necessary measure of tax predictability.

This paper essentially deals with the "Cost of Money." It is economically feasible, on the one hand, to obtain developable land in the central city through urban renewal and, on the other, to operate non-profit or low profit housing for families of moderate income and above. But the failure in urban redevelopment thus far has been in not bringing the two situations together in the volume necessary to be responsive to the moderate income housing need.

As concerns either private or public housing, or that which is held and managed by a non-profit or cooperative housing corporation, the construction itself is always privately undertaken. The real unanswered challenge in this field, on which this report now focuses, is the adequate provision of the long-range permanent financing for non-publicly owned housing.

Certain federal housing programs for bona fide non-profit or limited profit housing corporations now offer relatively low interest rates for housing developed to meet the needs of moderate income families and individuals. The Housing Act of 1965 set a maximum interest rate of 3 percent on non-profit housing or limited profit housing built under the 221(d)(3) FHA program and for non-profit housing corporations under the 202 Senior Citizens Direct Loan Program of the Housing Assistance Administration. In addition to low interest rates, these programs offer 40 and 50 year mortgages, respectively, and this combination provides a stronger basis for lower rents than could be offered in "normal" profit-motivated housing.

The difficulty in the case of the 202 Senior Citizens Housing Program, in which construction financing is obtained from federal government loans, is simply the lack of funds which have thus far been made available. The difficulty as concerns 221(d)(3) housing, where the construction is financed by banks and other private lending institutions, is the inability of potential projects to successfully compete for private capital among other investment possibilities, particularly within the tight money market of the past few years. In addition, there appears to be serious regulatory and statutory limitations in this program that inhibit its maximum utilization in core areas.

It has been suggested that big business could represent the major administrative and financial resources for this construction if a suitable investment framework were de-

signed. Yet even the nation's largest corporations generally become mortgagees rather than mortgagors when undertaking capital improvements and do not necessarily have competence in the construction field.

What is proposed here is that the middle income family, upon whose purchasing power the sustenance of the American economy primarily depends, can similarly be regarded as the basic means of support in the implementation of a gigantic master plan for urban redevelopment. Vast numbers of people whose incomes are above the poverty level will feel that "there is something in it for them."

This must be so if their interest is to be maintained in the rebuilding of America's cities, although in Congress over the past two decades, and particularly in the lower house among those representing blue and white collar classes, there has been hesitation in endorsing certain legislation addressed to the problems of central cities.

The concept of National Urban Bonds reflects first a financing mechanism for the construction of non-profit and limited profit moderate income housing, or for the rehabilitation of certain substandard rental housing owned by a non-profit or limited profit earning corporation. Coupled with this financing mechanism is a system of tax incentives that encourages individuals as well as corporations to invest for meaningful guaranteed dividends, combining tax free income and depreciation allowances.

This yield might very well be limited to a return of four or four and a half percent. However, the investor will realize a double barreled tax saving. The income from the bond similar to municipal bonds would not be taxable and there would be an amortization deduction. Therefore, the yield to the individual bond holder would actually be much higher.

The bonds would be sold initially in small denominations to make them attractive to the small non-institutional investor and provide fluidity of participation.

The feature of a tax credit would afford the bond holder the benefit of depreciation allowances. This would be similar to existing tax regulations which apply to individuals or corporations having an equity position in income property. It is proposed that National Urban Bond funds be lent at 100 percent of housing development costs primarily to non-profit or cooperative housing corporations which do not themselves utilize depreciation allowances.

Each bond would be dated and depreciation allowances would commence at the time of initial purchase. The issue would be given a life of twenty years. Preferably, the depreciation schedule could be accelerated if the holder kept the bond for a period of ten years or more. Such would be consistent with present federal income tax policy concerning owners of real property. If the bond was sold in less than ten years, there would be adjustments for normal depreciation allowances. At the end of the twenty year period of time the process would repeat itself.

What such a program might mean to typical tax paying American families in terms of specific dollar benefits is related in the accompanying tables. It will be noted that these examples refer to joint returns and to taxable rather than gross income. It is also suggested this program permit the taxpayer to take his standard deductions, in addition to the amortization deduction.

The tax rates used in the illustrations were those in effect during 1968 but do not reflect the temporary surcharge. Further, a factor for an accelerated depreciation was not included as it would tend to make the security much less attractive after the fifth year.

In Tables I and II the benefits derived from a \$500 investment in National Urban Bonds of twenty year maturity are related to annual taxable income ranging from \$3,500 to \$16,500. The data in Table I are based on

a dividend return of 4½ percent, while Table II reflects a 5 percent rate. The upper half of each table shows an amortization schedule of twenty years (at a non-accelerated rate) while the lower half indicates a ten year schedule.

For example, in the case of an \$8,500 taxable income and a twenty-year amortization at 5 percent the annual tax credit would amount to \$11.00 or \$220 over the life of the bond. The income produced at 5 percent would equal the level of the initial investment, while the total increment, \$720 would represent 145 percent of the investment, or an annual yield of 7.3 percent. For a \$16,500 income under the same conditions, the annual tax credit would be \$14.00, producing a total earned increment of \$780, a return of 156 percent on the original \$500 investment, or 7.8 percent annually.

If a twenty year bond receiving a 5 percent return were amortized on a ten year basis, then an \$8,500 income would reflect an annual tax credit of \$16.50, applicable over the first ten years. Combined with the annual earned income of \$25, or \$250 over the first ten years, the total increment would amount to \$415, or a ten year return of 83 percent on the \$500 investment. With this ten year amortization schedule the annual tax deduction for a \$16,500 income would be \$21.50 producing a total credit and dividend increment of \$465 or 93 percent of the initial investment.

As currently envisioned, the ownership of a housing project could pass at any time from a non-profit corporation to that of a tenants cooperative, or to any other non-profit corporation. This transaction would have no effect upon the individual bond purchaser, as his invested funds would have been lent by the agency responsible for selling the National Urban Bonds. All construction resulting from National Urban Bond sales would serve as security against the total outstanding debts of the lending agency and its mortgagees. It is further suggested that a premium be added to the designated interest rate and applied by the agency for administration and as a fund against possible default by a housing corporation. When not required as a reserve against defaults, such income could be utilized to accumulate management and seed money funds. Ultimately, these reserves could be applied as rent and interest supplements.

The experience of the Federal Housing Administration during the past thirty years has indicated that with a mortgage insurance premium of merely half a point, substantial surpluses are produced. Similarly, the National Urban Bond program would become, in effect, a "money maker" rather than a drain upon the Federal treasury.

In line with this point is a statement attributed in a recent Associated Press article to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, concerning the objectives of the previous administration on housing designed for particular income groups. The Secretary was quoted as saying that the number of such dwellings which has been recommended for construction was "above and beyond the resources and funding available," but that, "we can't quarrel with the goals in terms of the need".

A number of articles appearing since the new administration took office have indicated growing dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the Federal income tax structure and the discrepancy between supply and demand as pertains to adequate housing in central cities.

In the first situation inconsistencies are noted in regulations which often enable high income recipients to pay lower taxes than families and individuals in lesser brackets, owing to special exemptions and deductions not available to the latter.

On the matter of adequate central city housing, emphasis has been placed, in part, on the need to stimulate rehabilitation of

deteriorating structures, the incentive for which is often lacking owing to local property assessment procedures that automatically lead to a higher tax bill as soon as significant improvements are made.

It is felt that sales of National Urban Bonds can provide some remedies for each of these problems by making available a

new source of construction funding, providing new tax benefits to the middle income brackets, and providing funds for structural rehabilitation of certain types of substandard buildings.

Finally it might be noted that funds created through the sales of National Urban Bonds are not subject to an annual gov-

ernmental budgetary review and the resulting possibility of a cutback. While the level of new investment in these bonds may vary from year to year because of different types of economic influences, one would at the outset be led to expect a general pattern of growth, reflective of the overall expansion of the nation's economy.

TABLE I.—NATIONAL URBAN BONDS (NUB) 4½ PERCENT BOND

Taxable income (gross income less deductions and exemptions)	\$3,500	\$8,500	\$12,500	\$16,500
Tax bracket (ignoring surcharge) on a joint return (percent)	17	22	25	28
\$500 security: 20-year bond, 20-year amortization:				
4½ percent annual income, nontaxable				\$22.50
Amortization allowance of face value taken for a tax deduction				25.00
Total				47.50
Effective savings on taxes at—				
	17 percent	22 percent	25 percent	28 percent
Tax savings:				
1 year	\$8.07	\$10.45	\$11.88	\$13.30
20 years	161.50	209.00	237.50	266.00
Income at \$22.50 times 20 years	450.00	450.00	450.00	450.00
Tax savings over 20 years	161.50	209.00	237.50	266.00
Total increment	611.50	659.00	687.50	716.00
Total return over 20 years (percent)	122	132	138	143
Annual return (percent)	6.1	6.6	6.9	7.2
Note: At the end of the 20-year term the investor may have the original \$5,000 returned.				
\$500 security: 20-year bond, 10-year amortization:				
4½ percent income, nontaxable				\$22.50
Amortization				50.00
Total				72.50
Effective savings on taxes at—				
	17 percent	22 percent	25 percent	28 percent
Tax savings:				
1 year	\$12.33	\$15.95	\$18.13	\$20.30
10 years	123.25	159.50	181.25	203.60
Income at \$25.00 times 10 years	225.00	225.00	225.00	225.00
Tax savings over 10 years	123.20	159.50	181.25	203.60
Total increment	348.25	348.50	406.25	428.60
Total return over 10 years (percent)	67.7	76.9	81.3	85.7
Annual return (percent)	7.0	7.7	8.1	8.6

## BACKGROUND—ALVIN E. GERSHEN

Mr. Alvin E. Gershen is the senior member of the firm of Alvin E. Gershen Associates, Trenton, New Jersey. He is forty-two years old, married, and has six children. He has a Bachelor Degree in Civil Engineering from the City College of New York and a M.P.A. degree from the New York University Graduate School of Public Administration. He did additional graduate work in city planning at Columbia University. Mr. Gershen organized his firm eight years ago with the expressed purpose of providing total community development services. The firm specializes in planning, engineering, urban renewal, and housing. The firm has achieved particular success in creative planning and development and has been responsible for many successful planning, urban renewal and housing programs for the development of over 5,000 dwelling units of housing in New Jersey.

During the past several years, Mr. Gershen has applied his particular experience and knowledge in housing and development problems by preparing legislative programs in New Jersey and West Virginia. Foremost among these programs, were his services as a consultant to the Governor's Task Force on Housing in West Virginia and his services as Chairman of the Governor's Task Force on Housing and Urban Renewal in New Jersey. This latter work culminated in the passage of the most significant urban legislation in decades by the New Jersey Legislature. Most notable was the creation of the new Department of Community Affairs and the estab-

lishment of the State Housing Finance Agency.

Mr. Gershen was appointed in 1960 to represent the State of New Jersey on the Meadowlands Regional Development Agency. His joint publication of the paper "Develop the Meadows" was the foundation for Meadowlands activities that culminated recently in the enactment of the Meadowlands Development Commission legislature by the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Gershen was formerly associated with the New York City Planning Commission and also was Chief of Technical Operations of the New Jersey Division of State and Regional Planning. He was also active in private home building in the mid 1950s. He has been President of the New Jersey State Board of Professional Planners since its creation in 1963 and is a member of the American Institute of Planners, the American Society of Planning Officials, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, and National Society of Professional Engineers. He is assistant Director of the New Jersey Federation of Planning Officials and a licensed professional planner in New Jersey and Michigan and a licensed professional engineer in New York and New Jersey. He has lectured and taught at the Graduate School of Public Administration, New York University, College of the City of New York as well as Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. He is a consultant to the New Jersey Civil Service Commission and has been responsible for the publication of articles and periodicals

in professional journals. He recently was appointed to the New Jersey Council on the Arts. He is listed in Who's Who in the East in 1968.

## CONGRESSMAN JACOBS ASSAILS PRESIDENT NIXON ON EC-121 INCIDENT

## HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1968, when he was running, President Nixon delivered at Hillsboro, N.H., this statement:

What we can do is to not let this (seizure of Pueblo) happen again. I say that wherever we have—and we must have ships of this type gathering intelligence so that we will not have a surprise attack—let us make sure that we have in the area other ships or planes that can come to the rescue of such a ship in the event that it comes under attack.

This Administration knew that was going to happen, or at least they had reason to know it, because this ship had been harassed for weeks prior to the time that it was picked up by the North Koreans.

TABLE II.—NATIONAL URBAN BONDS (NUB) 5 PERCENT BOND

Taxable income (gross income less deductions and exemptions)	\$3,500	\$8,500	\$12,500	\$16,500
Tax bracket (ignoring surcharge) on a joint return (percent)	17	22	25	28
\$500 security: 20-year bond, 20-year amortization:				
5 percent income, nontaxable				\$25
Amortization allowance of face value taken for a tax deduction				25
Total				50
Effective savings on taxes at—				
	17 percent	22 percent	25 percent	28 percent
Tax savings:				
1 year	\$8.50	\$11	\$12.50	\$14
20 years	170.00	220	250.00	280
Income at \$25 times 20 years	500.00	500	500.00	500
Tax savings over 20 years	170.00	220	250.00	280
Total increment	670.00	720	750.00	780
Total return over 20 years (percent)	134	145	150	156
Annual return (percent)	6.7	7.3	7.5	7.8
Note: At the end of the 20-year term the investor may have the original \$5,000 returned.				
\$500 security: 20-year bond, 10-year amortization:				
5 percent income, nontaxable				\$25
Amortization allowance of face value taken as a tax deduction				50
Total				75
Effective savings on taxes at—				
	17 percent	22 percent	25 percent	28 percent
Tax savings:				
1 year	\$12.75	\$16.50	\$18.75	\$21.50
10 years	127.50	165.00	187.50	215.00
Income at \$25 times 10 years	250.00	250.00	250.00	250.00
Tax savings over 10 years	127.50	165.00	187.50	215.00
Total increment	377.50	415.00	437.50	465.00
Total return over 10 years (percent)	75.5	83.0	87.5	93.0
Annual return (percent)	7.6	8.3	8.8	9.3

Mr. Speaker, I now direct your attention to Presidential Candidate Nixon's remarks in the Detroit Free Press on September 29, 1968:

What we should have done was to bring in the power to defend that ship or get out of those waters. Let's not let that happen again, and I won't let that happen.

What happened to the *Pueblo* should and will be avoided in the future. During the weeks before the ship was seized—when North Korea was warning and threatening us—we should have either moved in with cover for the ship or we should have pulled it out of there. I would have made certain one of these two actions were taken. We did neither and the inevitable occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I now direct your attention to an article by Sarah McClendon written for the North American Newspaper Alliance within a day or two after the U.S. reconnaissance aircraft was shot down by North Korea:

A high South Korean official warned President Nixon three weeks ago that North Korea was going to shoot down two United States reconnaissance planes and capture an American spy ship. The warning, according to a reliable source who must go unnamed, was delivered to Mr. Nixon at the time of President Eisenhower's funeral by the former South Korean Ambassador to the United States, Il Kwon Chung.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, an item by Mr. Richard Homan, from the Washington Post, April 26, 1969:

The United States provided fighter plane protection for its reconnaissance flights off North Korea "for a considerable length of time after the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* last year." But this protection was discontinued before the Navy E.C.-121 was shot down by North Korea last week, General Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff disclosed yesterday.

It was ended—

He said—

because after using it for a certain period of time . . . we had no response in the way of hostile activities.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it worked so we decided it was no good.

President Kennedy said:

It is easier to make the speeches than to make the decisions.

How true.

## HOW TO RADICALIZE STUDENTS

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today's article by Mr. Tom Wicker of the New York Times as to the kind of legislation now being seriously considered in the House Education and Labor Committee is most disturbing. If it is at all accurate, then we are gravely threatened by panic.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1969]

IN THE NATION: HOW TO RADICALIZE STUDENTS

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—It may already be too late to stop the punitive, unnecessary and ill-conceived legislation against students

and universities now being seriously considered in the House of Representatives; but if anything can halt the blundering rush of vengeful politicians into Federal control of education, it may be the sensible statement issued today by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Mrs. Edith Green of Oregon apparently does not have the votes to get this legislation out of her subcommittee. So she will try to get the full Education and Labor Committee at its meeting tomorrow to take the bill away from the subcommittee; for this purpose she is believed to have a majority of nineteen—fourteen Republicans and five Democrats—of the 35 members. And if it can be pushed through the Education and Labor Committee, it will almost surely reach the House floor, where the spirit of vengeance is matched, these days, only by the mood of panic.

It is incredible, even so, that such legislation could even be contemplated; one has to go back to the South of a decade ago, when communities closed their schools to save them from integration, to find such suicidal folly. This bill would make mandatory the complete cutoff of Federal assistance of any kind to any university or college that did not set up a rigid code of conduct, including a table of penalties, for its students and faculty (as if the latter were mere employees); however viewed, that is intolerable intrusion by the Government into the control and administration of private institutions.

Since colleges themselves administer such programs as National Defense Education loans and the college work-study program, they would lose Federal funds for them. Many students who have never participated in any kind of disorder, but who either receive these funds or ought to, would thus be penalized.

### CUTTING OFF AID

The Green bill also would force colleges to cut off any form of Federal assistance to any student, faculty member, research fellow or employee who had "contributed to a substantial institution" (whatever that may mean).

This does not refer merely to student loans and grants; the bill says specifically that the assistance to be terminated also includes veterans' benefits under the G.I. Bill of Rights; payments of a surviving child's insurance benefits under Social Security; and salaries of faculty members engaged in training Peace Corps volunteers. All these, plus loans and grants, to be denied for a period of five years, and almost as an afterthought, the bill adds that if a student so penalized at one institution then transfers to another, the second has to honor the cutoff of assistance ordered by the first, no matter what the student's subsequent conduct.

### DANGERS OF MEASURE

The thought-control aspects of the bill are made even more clear by the fact any student applying for or entitled to any form of Federal payment would have to sign an affidavit that he had never "contributed to a substantial disruption"; in short, behaving as Congress commands is an absolute prerequisite for receiving even inherited Social Security benefits or combat-earned GI benefits.

Representatives Ogden Reid of New York and John Brademas of Indiana, who are leading the opposition in this repugnant measure, circulated today a number of statements by college presidents denying the need for it and pointing to its inequities and dangers.

The college heads emphasized that such punitive legislation would have as a primary effect the further embitterment and alienation of a student generation already in revolt against the standards and attitudes of its elders. That also was a main point of today's statement by the Commission on Violence.

Its chairman, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, himself a former college president, pointed out on the commission's behalf that if "aid is withdrawn from even a few students in a manner that the campus views as unjust, the result may be to radicalize a much larger number by convincing them that existing governmental institutions are as inhumane as the revolutionaries claim."

The Violence Commission, scarcely a radical body, viewed the roots of student unrest as lying "deep in the larger society" and one effective remedy, it suggested, "is to focus on the unfinished task of striving toward the goals of human life that all of us share and that young people admire and respect."

Now there would be something really useful for Congress to do. Fat chance.

## SAVING THE POTOMAC RIVER

**HON. GILBERT GUDE**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I have been especially pleased with the outcome of efforts to save the Hunting Creek area on the Potomac from the encroachment of developers. That the destruction of this marshland was averted is due largely to the commendable efforts of Congressman Reuss, chairman of the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, and of Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel. We who enjoy the natural beauty of the Potomac and who are concerned that it remain unaltered according to its established boundaries are grateful to these men for their timely and persistent efforts to protect this river.

The maintenance of river shorelines, however, is no more important than the safeguarding of the river waters. It would be incongruous from the standpoint of conservation to work for one and ignore the other. The pollution problem in the Potomac has become one of crisis proportions and notorious repute. That it should prevail in a waterway to which all Americans make patriotic claim intensifies the evil. Hence, those of us who laud the efforts of Mr. Reuss and Secretary Hickel for their achievements in Hunting Creek are hoping that continued combinations of expertise and resolve will yield some progress in eliminating the pollution of the Potomac.

With these thoughts in mind, I am entering into the Record today a copy of Secretary Hickel's letter to Secretary of the Army Resor, under whose authority the permit to fill Hunting Creek would have been issued, and a subsequent letter from Chairman Reuss to Secretary Hickel. Also, I am including a copy of the April 16, 1969, Washington Post editorial which reports the initial success of the efforts to block the Hunting Creek destruction, and finally a clipping from today's Washington Post announcing the order suspending the Hunting Creek landfill. I think this chronology of letters and reports well represents some of the most recent and best efforts aimed at protecting the Nation's rivers.

The material follows:

APRIL 3, 1969.

HON. STANLEY R. RESOR,  
Secretary of the Army,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have had an opportunity to review the facts pertinent to the issuance on May 29, 1968, of a Department of the Army permit to construct a bulkhead and to fill 9.39 acres of the Potomac River at the mouth of Hunting Creek, Virginia, by Howard P. Hoffman Associates, Inc. As you know, on April 26, 1968, former Under Secretary of the Interior Black withdrew Departmental objections to granting of the permit.

The Department now considers the proposal as a needless act of destruction of the environment of the Nation's Capital, and urges reconsideration of the permit previously issued for the proposal by the Department of the Army.

The filling and the subsequent construction of an apartment building at the confluence of Hunting Creek with Potomac River is not in keeping with the widely publicized goal of this Department to preserve and protect the values of the Potomac River. The skyline along the Potomac has been unnecessarily desecrated already. The further deterioration of "Washington's River" should be stopped and efforts renewed to improve the river and restore its former attractiveness. The Department intends to firmly contest any needless filling of the Potomac or affront to its landscape. The view of the river from our Nation's Capital parklands and the integrity of the parklands themselves must be protected and preserved.

The plan as now approved involves a much smaller area than originally considered in 1964 when the proposal to fill consisted of a wedge-shaped tract of about 36 acres jutting out into the river for some 2,000 feet. But we have no reason to believe that the original plan will not be proposed piecemeal from time to time in the future. In fact, the Hoffman proposal opens the door to future enlargements, since it will create a small bay that will be an obvious candidate for further filling. The justification would be essentially the same, that natural values have already been downgraded by existing developments. The door should not be opened further, even to such an apparently small degree. The unnecessary nibbling of areas of high public value must be stopped if we are to maintain all the qualities of our environment.

The Virginia Legislature has given its sanction to the initial proposal. Yet the State has not acted to complete this sanction by formal issuance of a patent.

In spite of many assertions made that the habitat in the Hunting Creek area has continued to be degraded, we find that since the proposal was made in 1964, the area in question has not lost any of its value. It still provides a feeding and resting ground for migratory waterfowl. It still provides a vista across the Potomac from the George Washington Parkway. It still forms a natural margin for Jones Point, a Federal property administered by the National Park Service with a major potential for addition to the developed parks of the Capital area. Serious and irrevocable changes would occur in that open water area between the fill site and Jones Point should the project go forward.

The potential of the lands along the Potomac in Federal ownership should be maintained undiminished in value for use by all the people. Any fill project at the mouth of Hunting Creek would not be in keeping with this aspiration.

The time has come for the government to take a firm stand to protect the fast vanishing natural shorelines of our nation.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. HICKEL,  
Secretary of the Interior.

APRIL 10, 1969.

HON. WALTER J. HICKEL,  
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the  
Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Every Member of this Subcommittee agrees with the position you have taken in your letter of April 3 to Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor that "the time has come for the Government to take a firm stand to protect the fast vanishing shorelines of our Nation."

We therefore congratulate you on your letter to Secretary Resor in which you urge him to reconsider permitting the bulkheading and filling of 9.39 acres of the Potomac River at the mouth of Hunting Creek, Virginia, by Howard P. Hoffman Associates, Inc.

The hearings conducted by our Subcommittee and the report issued by our Committee fully demonstrate the validity of your statement that the proposed fill would be "a needless act of destruction of the environment of the Nation's capital."

We would appreciate your keeping us advised of further developments both with respect to the Hunting Creek fill proposal and the Department's plans for preserving and protecting the potential of the Potomac River for the use of all of the people.

We are delighted that you acted so promptly on this matter.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,  
Chairman, Conservation and Natural  
Resources Subcommittee.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 16,  
1969]

#### SAVING THE POTOMAC RIVER

Lusty cheers are in order for Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel from everyone who wishes to preserve the Potomac River in its natural beauty. The Secretary has reversed his predecessor's approval of a landfill at Hunting Creek near Alexandria, to avert what he accurately describes as "a needless act of destruction of the environment of the Nation's Capital." The reversal of policy is not only of great interest to conservationists because of its importance to wild waterfowl. It is also basic to protection of the Potomac as one of the country's great rivers.

Even louder cheers are in order for the House Government Operations Subcommittee which investigated the proposed misuse of the marshland in the mouth of Hunting Creek and brought out a unanimous report opposing it. Among other disclosures, the Subcommittee pointed to a potential windfall for the developers who could acquire the submerged land at about \$1590 per acre under a 1964 Virginia law despite the fact that adjacent land recently sold for about \$144,000 per acre.

The stand now taken by Interior is the more important because it reflects a general policy. Secretary Hickel has said pointedly that "further deterioration of 'Washington's river' should be stopped and that his Department intends firmly to contest any needless filling of the Potomac or affront to its landscape." Rigid enforcement of that policy is imperative to protection of the environment of this Capital City. If private developers were permitted to encroach on the river with their landfills to support apartment projects, there would be little left of the Potomac within a few decades.

The river belongs to the public. Any encroachment on it must be regarded as an outrageous grab of public property, which becomes especially indefensible when the result would be to destroy the natural beauty and utility of the river as such. The whole community, and not just the conservationists, out to burn with indignation every time a suggestion is made to raid the river for apartment sites or any comparable development.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 10,  
1969]

#### HUNTING CREEK LANDFILL IS ORDERED SUSPENDED

(By Helen Dewar)

The Department of the Army has suspended authority for a controversial landfill and high-rise apartment project at the mouth of Hunting Creek near Alexandria.

It has ordered the Army Corps of Engineers, which has jurisdiction over all landfills on public waterways, to hold a new public hearing on the project "at the earliest possible time."

The Department's action comes in the wake of protests from conservationists and Congressmen and a dramatic about-face by the Interior Department.

At issue are 9.5 acres of marshland along the Potomac River, a last refuge for wintering water fowl in the Washington area that has become the latest battleground in conservationists' efforts to protect what is left of open lands and open vistas along the Potomac.

The Corps initially denied a permit for the landfill project to Howard P. Hoffman Associates Inc. of New York but reversed itself last year after the Interior Department withdrew its own earlier objections and approved the project.

The issue was reopened when Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel called on the Army two months ago to block the project.

Reversing the position of his predecessor, Hickel said the Potomac shoreline had been "desecrated" enough already and stated Interior's firm intention to fight the Hunting Creek project.

In a related development, a House Government Operations subcommittee under Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.) came out unanimously against the project.

The Department of the Army's suspension of the landfill authority pending a new hearing was disclosed in letters received yesterday by the subcommittee and by Sen. William B. Spong (D-Va.), who had also opposed the project.

In the letters, Robert E. Jordan III, of the Army general counsel's office, questioned the adequacy of required surveys on the impact of such projects on wildlife. He also suggested that new information was needed on "changing conditions" in the area.

Particularly, he said, the hearing should include "facts and viewpoints relative to the effect of the proposed landfill on navigation, fish and wildlife and other matters affecting the public interest."

Hunting Creek empties into the Potomac near the Woodrow Wilson Bridge and lies near the new Jones Point National Park as well as Hunting Towers, an existing Alexandria high-rise apartment development.

#### RADICALS' DEMANDS STUN AND POLARIZE WELFARE LEADERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following article from the June 1 Washington Post which emphasizes most forcefully the serious "social welfare" gap developing in America today:

#### 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 convened 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 shrilled 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 simulate a "live" confrontation. Indeed, they were going to discuss the "challenge to the professional—can you train the non-professional?"

The non-professionals 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 mail 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.

#### AGRICULTURE AMENDMENT

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of my colleagues who supported my amendment limiting farm subsidy payments to \$20,000 per producer.

I want also to assure them of my intention to continue this fight by doing all I can to see that the measure succeeds in the other body.

As evidence of my continuing concern, I include in today's RECORD a copy of my statement submitted last Friday, June 6, 1969, to the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Senate Appropriations Committee:

STATEMENT BY HON. SILVIO O. CONTE IN SUPPORT OF THE CONTE AMENDMENT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, JUNE 6, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present my views in support of the imposition of a \$20,000 limitation on aggregate payments to any producer, excluding sugar.

As you know, last week the House of Representatives again expressed its overwhelming support for my proposal. This year my amendment passed by a margin even greater than last year—by a record vote of 224 to 142.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe I need burden this Committee with an extensive explanation of the basic reason for this amendment. There can be no question that the vote in the House clearly reflected the wishes of most Americans who demand an end to the inequity of excessively large payments going to a handful of corporate farm giants. At a time when the need to combat inflation is creating strong pressure for spending limitations for rural and urban development, educational, health, housing and nutritional programs, there is no justification for continuing these excessive payments which have no place in any workable farm program.

Last week when the Agricultural Appropriations Act for 1970 was before the House, the parliamentary rules under which the House of Representatives operates did not permit me to offer more extensive legislation. While I believe my amendment by itself represents a substantial step forward, I acknowledge that certain changes which have been suggested would be appropriate at this time.

As I said during the debate on the House floor last week, I take no pride of authorship in this amendment, and I am ready to work with Secretary Hardin and members of this body on both sides of the aisle to ensure that this limitation becomes an effective part of our farm program.

I disagree most emphatically, however, with Dr. Hardin's suggestion that such changes cannot be made at this time.

I have been advised, in consultations with agricultural experts, including the distinguished former Under Secretary of Agriculture, Dr. John A. Schnitker, that a workable program of payment limitations can be achieved based on my amendment.

Dr. Hardin himself has acknowledged before this Committee that it is possible to design "a sound farm program" which would include payments limitation.

While supporting my amendment as a reasonable and appropriate method of payment limitations—limitations which are a necessary part of any sound and equitable farm program—Dr. Schnitker and others have suggested that two additional modifications would be appropriate.

These two recommended changes—repeal of the so-called "snapback provision" on cotton and a provision to permit some increased planting by those affected by the payment limitations—are, I should add, responsive to the two basic objections raised by Secretary Hardin to the Conte amendment.

Such modifications would be entirely germane to the Agricultural Appropriations Act for 1970, since they would be limited to the crop year 1970 and would restrict the expenditures of funds appropriated for 1970 in an equitable manner, providing potential government savings in excess of \$200 million. Yet these changes would not interfere with the attainment of the goals of the programs financed by these appropriations.

The first and more important additional change—recommended by virtually all those familiar with the farm program—is the repeal of the so-called "snapback provision", Section 103(d) (12) of the 1965 Act. This device was inserted into that bill because large cotton interests had foreseen the inevitable success of an amendment such as mine. We cannot permit this provision to stand. It defeats the very clear intent of the Congress.

The second recommended change is some adjustment of current acreage allotments, permitting some increased planting by those affected by the payment limitation. I am advised that this can be done without materially affecting the total amount of production.

With respect to cotton, even the analysts in the Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service have predicted that there will be no appreciable increase in total cotton production with this change. The reason for this is that, while the more competitive farmers in the Mississippi Delta and in California will increase their production, less cotton will be grown in the blackbelt of Texas and in the Southeast when my payment limitation goes into effect.

Time does not permit me now to propose the specific legislative language for these additional changes. I understand, however, that such legislation is now being drafted by interested members in this body and I would be happy to support proposals along the lines I have suggested.

In conclusion, may I repeat that such legislation can be adopted now and will clearly be germane to this payment limitation portion of the Agriculture Appropriations Act of 1970.

At a time when funds needed to tackle critical domestic ills are being cut back it makes no sense to permit farm program subsidy payments in excess of \$20,000 to some 10,000 large farmers who, by any reasonable standards, already have high incomes.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that this Committee will report my amendment, together with the additional modifications I have suggested, thereby assuring government savings in fiscal year 1970 of anywhere from \$200 to \$300 million in agricultural expenditures.

Without my amendment, some 3000 large farmers will collect \$150 million in subsidies in 1970. Five to 10 large corporations may each receive subsidies of \$1 million or more. One large corporation received over \$4 million in farm subsidies in 1967 and over \$3 million in 1968.

I submit that to continue these huge payments is indefensible at a time when government funds are urgently needed for many other worthy domestic programs.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to present my views.

#### CUMBERLAND GI IS KILLED IN WAR

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Robert H. Martin, Jr., a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 6, 1969]

#### CUMBERLAND GI IS KILLED IN WAR

Marine Pfc. Robert H. Martin, Jr., of Cumberland, who had been previously wounded in Vietnam, was killed by a landmine June 2 while on patrol in the Mekong River delta, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Private Martin, 19, had been stationed in Vietnam since February with the 5th Marine Division near Anhoa.

#### NO MENTION OF WOUNDS

Never one to worry his parents about the dangers of Vietnam life, his family learned he had previously been awarded a purple heart only when the family was informed of his death.

His mother, Mrs. Beatrice Martin, said yesterday her son always wrote cheerful letters and never mentioned being wounded.

Private Martin was born in Cumberland and spent his life in the Western Maryland community.

He enjoyed hunting and fishing in the mountains around Cumberland. "But," his mother said, "He never got a deer."

#### PARENTS, SISTER SURVIVE

A 1968 graduate of Fort Hill High School, he enlisted in the Marine Corps last July. He planned to become a conservationist.

Besides his mother, he is survived by his father, Robert H. Martin, Sr.; a sister, Mrs. Bobbie Jean Shirk, of Martinsburg, W. Va., and his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Maudie Hipsley, of Cumberland.

#### OBSCENITY IN THE MAILS

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 of this year, President Nixon submitted to the Congress certain proposals which would build upon and strengthen existing legislation to give the public recourse against those who send salacious and obscene materials through the mails.

In the last 5 years the number of complaints to the Post Office Department about the receipt of pornographic mail has almost doubled. Certainly, there has been a marked increase in complaints from my own constituents, and I must say that the complaints are thoroughly justified. Some of this material which is being directed at child and adult alike is so crude and disgusting that it makes mild by comparison the inscriptions and drawings on privy walls.

More than once a constituent has forwarded to me a sealed envelope bearing the embarrassed notation that the ladies of my office staff should not be the ones to open that particular piece of mail. Such notations have not been misplaced.

In 1967, the Congress established a procedure which has proved to be inadequate. A citizen, once he determines that mail he has received is "erotically arousing or sexually provocative," can file with his post office a judicially enforceable order prohibiting the sender of that pornography from directing any further such mail to his home. The limitations of this approach were quickly apparent.

First, the initial mailing of pornographic material takes place with impunity. Second, the procedure which the recipient of that mail is required to go through to preclude further delivery of similar material is difficult, time consuming, costly, unsure of success, and not widely known. Finally, the procedure places the burden of action upon the wrong party. Rather than the purveyor of the offensive material bearing the responsibility for his own actions, the recipient of the offensive material is forced to bear that responsibility by taking steps to prevent a recurrence of the offensive conduct.

Plainly, new legislation is called for,

and the American people will welcome the strong and forthright approach set forth in President Nixon's proposals. Fully supporting the President's statement, I am today introducing the legislation he recommends which would accomplish two objectives not adequately dealt with by existing law.

First, my proposal would prohibit anyone from using the mails to convey to those under 18 years of age matter that is harmful to minors. Harmful matter is defined to include that which is both offensive to prevailing standards in the adult community concerning what is suitable material for minors and which is also substantially without redeeming social value for minors.

Second, my proposal prohibits the use of the U.S. mails to convey to anyone matter which is designed or intended to appeal to a prurient interest in sex. This provision would prohibit the pandering of salacious material via the U.S. postal service.

There is, of course, a fine line between those things which are patently offensive and violate the right of privacy and those things which are constitutionally protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution. It must be recognized, however, that the failure of the Congress to act in this area would not mean that the line had not been drawn between pornography and literature deemed not to be offensive. Inaction would simply mean that the line had been drawn in favor of pornography and against other constitutional rights which assure to the individual his privacy. It would be far better, then, for the Congress deliberately to consider and balance these competing interests, fully cognizant of the historic principles involved. It seems clear to me that no individual should have the constitutional right to invade the very sanctity of the home and expose a child of tender years to pornographic material without providing a means by which the child can understand and evaluate that material.

While the publication of obscene material may be subject to a different and more stringent constitutional standard, the use of the U.S. mails for the distribution of that material seems to me to be quite a different matter. Although the use of the mail does not—and should not—deprive it of its first amendment protection, it does, in my opinion, necessitate the consideration of other equally important factors.

Family life is important to the structure of our society and serves a vital purpose worthy of protection by fostering the very diversity of opinions, values, and societal norms upon which a democratic republic thrives. The power of an all-pervasive national government can be utilized either to encourage that individuality and diversity or to stifle it. Too often in the past, perhaps inadvertently, that power has had a stifling effect. We in Congress must always be alert to this problem and must seek to provide the climate within which a free and diverse people may raise their families according to their own best judgment.

**BUSINESS RESPONSE THROUGH ADVERTISING TO THE ISSUES OF THE DAY**

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending the American Advertising Federation's 11th Annual Government Affairs Conference in Washington, D.C. With the recent attention focused on some segments of the advertising industry, I was pleased that this conference was an important step in promoting a meaningful dialog between industry and Government. I would like to take this opportunity to share the excellent speech of one of the participants, Norman E. Cash, president of the Television Bureau of Advertising:

**BUSINESS RESPONSE THROUGH ADVERTISING TO THE ISSUES OF THE DAY**

(Presentation prepared by Television Bureau of Advertising to be presented by Norman E. Cash, president)

Thank you for letting us be here on your agenda this morning.

Our time in history somehow associates size with importance. As this cartoon illustrates, we like to make even ourselves larger and, therefore, more important.

We do it in our advertising.

And today we find the same concern over size among some of our most serious businessmen.

So I think it speaks well for us in the advertising business that our largest advertiser is also our most important one and in so many ways illustrates the best that advertising can be. I do not refer to General Motors. Nor do I mean Procter & Gamble, proud as we are of them both.

I refer to the Advertising Council whose advertising campaigns last year received some \$352 million worth of media time and space, a figure that's some 90% of the combined expenditures of both GM and P & G.

I feel it is significant that our country's largest advertiser is the one most conspicuously dedicated to the public good.

I say "conspicuously" because I believe almost all advertising is for the public good. An ad that presents news of a faster way to communicate is a public service. An advertisement for a new car or a message for an established product . . . all these help meet a need and are public service.

And news of a public need . . . this too is public service. And this type of advertising . . . that also meets corporate business objectives . . . is what I'd like to talk with you about this morning. I speak not of charity but of business.

Two years ago, Bruce Palmer of NICB told our Board that "The first business of business is profits . . . but that profits deteriorate in a suspicious, resentful, hostile atmosphere."

The atmosphere in which we do business . . . how much it's changed since this businessman kept his rifle handy by the rear wheel of his wagon. That gun may be a symbol of business responsibility in those days.

Calvin Coolidge (in a talkative mood) said "The Business of America is Business". Coolidge was updated when Henry Luce said "The Business of Business is America".

A blue-sky slogan? I don't think so.

Take for example, the problem of unemployment and its related problem of help-wanted. Unemployment may sound like a public problem, but help wanted is a business problem and the two are being brought

together . . . for the good of both. Watch how one manufacturer uses his advertising skill to combine a social and corporate message into one commercial.

(Roll, General Electric Commercial.)

The need for better lighting to help reduce crime becomes a job with a social challenge . . . and illustrates a concern for people . . . and advertising made it happen.

At the other end of the unemployment scale . . . the hardcore unemployed. Here again business is using advertising to tell many messages in one message.

(Roll, Gulf Watts Service Station Commercial.)

A Gulf message for the ghetto . . . for its stockholders and for its customers.

Both these messages illustrated the growing involvements of business in the environmental problems of urban decay and rural blight, poverty and pollution, schools . . . crime . . . delinquency. This concentrated list is really a cover . . . of a booklet some half million copies of which were distributed after three hours of network TV sponsored by the Institute of Life Insurance.

Here is how their program was introduced.

(Roll, Institute of Life Insurance Commercial.)

The president of Xerox attacked a related problem in their six and a half hours of programming called "Of Black America" when he said, "We believe that understanding the world we live in is as much our business as the world we work in."

The growing interest in business involvement with our social problems is illustrated by TvB's invitation to address a joint meeting of two important NICB groups: Those involved with public affairs, and those responsible for company contributions. These people are close to senior management too but usually do not share your skills in the use of mass media advertising . . . advertising that we believe can help top management meet these new and broader corporate goals.

Often you have assigned your advertising agency responsibility only for marketing your product. Their skills like yours, can be put to work changing the environment within which your product is marketed . . . but only if you will show them the difference between a cost-per-thousand method of evaluating advertising and advertising media . . . and contributions-per-thousand . . . which is often more important.

How do these two measures differ? Who, for example, would sponsor a program reaching mainly the unemployed? But there is such a program . . . and public utilities and phone companies sponsor it . . . and it's called "Opportunity Line." Now covering half of America, it is a want-ad of the air . . . aimed at those who can't or don't read the help-wanted ads of their daily newspaper.

When half of such locally produced public service programming is not offered for sale, we believe it is a lost opportunity for the advertiser and the viewer.

Perhaps you saw last month's "Grocery Manufacturer" magazine's article about a local program the Heinz Company sponsors . . . called "Job Call". Here's a kinescope segment.

(Roll Heinz KDKA-TV Kinescope.)

The budget for that program is from the public relations budget of Heinz, not the regular advertising budget.

Perhaps you saw in the October 6th New York Time Magazine the story of kids and cars . . . an article that showed this poster and containing this Advertising Council ad.

The same message has become a television message.

(Roll Advertising Council Take-Your-Keys Commercial.)

The ideas of the Advertising Council can become your ideas just as Royal Globe Insurance takes this idea to be their own.

(Roll Royal Globe Insurance Take-Your-Keys Commercial.)

Crime is an obvious expense to insurance companies . . . but we pay the premiums. Speaking of crime, this little fellow cost us billions last year . . . because we paid this man to catch him. And even this private policeman is cheap when you look at the electronic equipment he used . . . equipment we paid for not to stop an enemy invasion, but as part of our private police force of 170,000 . . . which we maintain to keep employee dishonesty at the two-billion dollar level . . . because "More thieves break out than break in" . . . our own employees cost us two billion business dollars a year . . . in what they take from our business.

Crime is a business expense when pilferage equals profits . . . as it does for the A & P.

It seems the only ones to have benefited from all this are the criminals . . . and the Pinkerton and Burns stockholders.

Let me bring up one more business and social problem . . . and invite any of you to find a way to communicate it to the American people. This happy man . . . our friendly bookie . . . is our closest link to drugs in our high schools. The two dollar bet with him is his payoff to the police . . . which is his license to underwrite the whole of syndicated crime. How big is his take? Listen to an expert?

(Roll Salerno Kinescope.)

Crime is a concern of business for business reasons. It may become part of our advertising . . . like this message from the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association telling about the policeman who may never walk again thanks to his injury sustained while putting down riots on the Columbia University Campus. Or this ad from the Uniformed Firemen's Association . . . telling how hard it is to put out fires and dodge bricks and bottles at the same time.

This man is a crime fighter . . . by putting up lights on his home. A message sponsored by the Realtors' National Foundation, Inc.

An ad like this . . . with increases like these can lead to an R. H. Macy Department store ad with this gun control message . . . or a similar one from Abraham & Straus . . . and both for business reasons: If people are afraid to go out on the streets at night, why have branch stores open?

Did you see the cover story in last month's "Nation's Business"? It talked about Operation Shakedown . . . as the underworld comes into the business world . . . and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in its booklet asks . . . will your business be next?

NCCD, incidentally, offers a series of folders that we as advertisers could offer . . . as a public service to our viewers and readers, as a business service to our customers . . . as a profit move for ourselves.

Shoplifting is a crime but even good booklets like these won't impress teenagers until we find a way to let them know the booklets exist . . . perhaps through paid advertisements like this ad in a recent paper.

Your name . . . your corporate name . . . adds importance, adds belief . . . and sponsorship makes it better.

Much of the concern over crime starts with the need for more police, for better police . . . for more understanding of current police. Here are two different messages . . . that could have been your contribution.

(Roll Los Angeles Police Force Message.)

(Roll Detroit Police Force message.)

Poverty is another business concern . . . for both social and business reasons.

(Roll Urban America "Kitty" Commercial.)

If poverty could be reduced by one-third, the increase in consumer spending would be 21%.

Education is a business concern . . . at all levels of education. Here is an ad for the United Negro College Fund . . . a fund to which almost every major corporation do-

nates dollars. We would like to show you a contribution made by the Polaroid Corporation . . . a three-minute commercial run twice on network television . . . and then offered in one minute version for other advertisers. This, to us, is modern corporate advertising proving corporate concern.

(Roll Polaroid Commercial for UNCF.)

Where can you go to help? Everywhere are messages that need telling, and experts to help. The Urban Coalition knows the cities and their problems, the National Alliance of Businessmen knows unemployment, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency knows crime's costs; but they all need your advertising skills and your advertising budgets.

Why should you help? Senator Dirksen gave one reason: "Government can't do it alone." I believe your own business records will give you another reason. And so will your citizenship.

I would like to close this morning by thanking you all for one example of what we can together accomplish . . . you with your advertising skills, and we, the mass media with our audiences.

Hunger in our land of plenty is a business concern . . . a social concern. It also became a personal concern when CBS telecast its report to America.

I call your attention to the folder describing the results. At the top, it says the program "moved the nation to tears." This was the first step.

But at the bottom of the folder is the real result: it moved the people to action.

As people deeply concerned with the business of advertising, as manufacturers and media, how well we use our skills may well determine our right to advertise . . . and test our belief that the "Business of Business is America".

As individuals, as companies, you have done much to help and we in media have done much too. Together, we believe we can both do more.

Thank you.

WHEN THEY DON'T COUNT ON YOU, THEY MAY BE COUNTING YOU OUT

If you want to know what you can expect from your public, perhaps you should first know more about what your public expects from you.

Reported here is the percent and the type of people who expect and wish business, government, education, religion, unions to do more in helping solve these social problems:

[In percent]

	Government	Business	Schools	Religious	Unions
Pollution.....	89	30	3	5	5
Violence.....	85	11	20	30	10
Crime.....	90	12	7	10	7
Education.....	35	12	84	15	5
Delinquency.....	50	12	47	45	6
Poverty.....	82	30	11	25	15

Information comes from the TvB-commissioned R. H. Bruskin and Associates nationwide survey of 2,664 adults between September 2 and October 3, 1968.

TvB's Question: "In your personal opinion, which of these groups should be more involved in helping solve these social problems?"

I WISH WE WERE A NATION  
WITH PRIDE

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL  
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, our country would be a better place in which

to live if we had more young people speaking out loud and clear for what is right, more young men like Sp4c. Paul C. Mathieson.

Paul Mathieson comes from Fairview Park, Ohio, in the 23d Congressional District I represent. Only recently, at his request, I sent him an Ohio State flag in which his parents assure me he takes great pride. Specialist Mathieson has served a good share of his Army time in Vietnam. He interrupted his education to fulfill his obligation to his country, signed up for 13 months in Vietnam, and plans when he completes his service requirements to continue his education at Cleveland State College.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. C. J. Mathieson, were kind enough to share with me a recent interesting letter they received from Paul, written on a recent visit to Japan. His concluding paragraphs are particularly compelling. We often let the vocal minority drown out the Paul Mathiesons who are the hope and the future of our great Nation, and who, when the count is down, are in the vast majority of our youth.

TOKYO, JAPAN, May 11, 1969.

Hi MOM & DAD: The favorite flower of Japan is the azalea bush. They come in all colors. They have a lot of evergreens over here also.

Japan is all mountains. The size of it is equivalent to the state of Ohio.

There are 14 million people in Tokyo city at night. During the day 10 million come into the city to work. This doesn't include tourists.

They have buddha temples everywhere.

The people are very camera shy. They don't throw litter on the streets. They go out of their way to help a foreigner. They have pride. Something we Americans lack!

The boys and girls in Junior High School wear uniforms and the boys' hair is very short. They go to school 5½ days a week. Every tour we have taken so far, there have been school kids there also. They really get an education.

I really am ashamed of the way the Americans are spoiled. Everything is there and taken for granted. When I went thru Saigon, on my way to Japan, and saw the barbed wire downtown I got scared to think that this could have been Cleveland.

Something has to be done about the younger generation in the U.S.A. The riots just make them look more like spoiled brats every day. We have everything; but don't appreciate it.

If our government can't control their own people then who the devil can! They say we are the mightiest nation. I wish we were a nation with pride and not these asinine riots.

Love,

PAUL.

"ALL THESE MORNINGS"

HON. EMANUEL CELLER  
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the current books deserving consideration and a wide audience is a new and charitably brief opus by Shirley Povich, the renowned sports columnist for the Washington Post.

The book is an entertaining one, and it is entitled "All These Mornings" because, as we all know, Mr. Povich's daily

epistle in the Post is entitled "This Morning." Many years ago Mr. Povich prevailed upon a young tennis-playing clerk/typist with the Federal Government, named Bob Considine to cast his lot with the field of journalism. The subsequent Considine success has been legendary and I am pleased to insert in the RECORD Mr. Considine's foreword to Mr. Povich's new book. The foreword follows:

FOREWORD TO "ALL THESE MORNINGS"

There's been a lot of idle talk among whippersnapper sportswriters that I have a soft spot in my heart for Shirley Lewis Povich. Well, I have, and I have had since he saved me from a rapidly receding career as the State Department janitor in charge of filing top secret dispatches from our Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

Shirley led me by my nose-ring and taught me how to sit down in the press boxes of the land and, consequently, the box seats of the world. And he taught me how to report what I observed with as much dignity and decorum as I could summon. He is one of those relatively few users of the Queen's English who can write a simple declarative sentence. What a magnificent gift! Born in Maine, which speaks a tongue hardly decipherable until Edmund Muskie came along, reared in Washington, D.C., where gobbledegook was invented, Shirley has steadfastly used the 26 sharp-edged tools of the alphabet as God—who is obviously an Englishman—intended. His daily prose, as you will see as you read along, never fails to pin down a point, a thought, a sentiment, a belief. Herbert Bayard Swope called the creation of a daily journalistic endeavor "the curse of everydayness." Shirley Povich has turned that dour evaluation into "the joy of everydayness."

Fellow working stiffs marvel at his endless zest for what is happening in the ever-expanding and wonderful world of sports. They thirst for the replenishing well-springs of this jaunty observer whose home-town club has not won a pennant since 1933; whose pro football team has not done well since George Preston Marshall's fur coat turned gray.

Shirley is a special person in that having worked in one town all of his newspaper life he has never become—and, of course, never will—a home town referee. Like a Ralph McGill in Atlanta or a Galileo at the Vatican he has had his problems with the Establishments. I never saw him back up an inch.

Some day I'm going to ask him a great favor, if I find him in a pleasant mood. I'm going to ask him to let me carry his typewriter.

BOB CONSIDINE.

WATER POLLUTION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1966 the Congress promised the people of the United States that the growing crisis of water pollution would be attacked by the Federal Government through financial support of the efforts of communities to control their own pollution. Along with many other promises to meet our civilian needs, this promise too has been broken.

We have the chance during this Con-

gress to keep our past promises and to start work on the Herculean task of cleaning up our Nation's waterways. For these reasons I am joining those who advocate the appropriation of the full \$1 billion authorized for community sewage plants during the coming fiscal year.

At present the administration is requesting but \$214 million, an inadequate figure, which would bring current sewage treatment programs to a near halt. I understand other inadequate programs are under consideration by the administration, programs which would cost the local community far more than the present grant programs.

The \$1 billion funding would result in at least twice that amount of new construction as Federal water pollution programs are on a matching basis with local communities.

I would repeat the urgings of Maryland's able Governor, Marvin Mandel:

Our people are fed up with billion-dollar talk and million-dollar action.

Let me cite my own area, San Francisco Bay, as an example of the magnitude of the water pollution problem.

The taxpayers of the bay area have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on water pollution facilities, but recent studies show that expenditures of up to \$2 billion are needed to meet the problem.

At the same time the bay is facing a relatively new threat—the threat of red tides which discolor its water and spread odors across its surface.

These tides are apparently the result of the addition of nutrients to bay waters, a new factor in problems of the bay.

We must either meet and overcome these problems of our waterways, or abandon them for all times as open sewers, a place of contamination.

This Congress must act to meet this and other pressing needs of our Nation.

#### WE WERE VERY TOGETHER

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Fred M. Hechinger, education editor of the New York Times, in a column that appeared on June 2, has described with incisive perception a factor that goes to the root of student unrest.

Rather than attempting to paraphrase Mr. Hechinger's excellent and well-expressed thoughts, I include his column in the RECORD so that our colleagues might have the benefit of his important thoughts:

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1969]

WE WERE VERY TOGETHER

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

After the student occupation of Harvard's University Hall, an undergraduate reporter wrote in The Harvard Crimson: "What was most euphoric, however, was us and what we were to each other. For those few hours we were brothers and sisters. . . . You had to realize, whatever your politics and whatever your tactics, that we were very beautiful in

University Hall, we were very human, and we were very together."

This theme has run through all student uprisings, and it is being overlooked at the risk of missing what may be the most significant—though irrational and entirely non-political—ingredient of the student rebellion: a search for an emotional, communal escape from reality.

"Emotions are our guts; without them we are but thinking machines, and the destruction of which such machines (Bundy, Kissinger) are capable has left its scars on all of us," wrote Nicholas Gagarin, the Crimson commentator.

Through most of the campus unrest runs a theme of intoxication with rebellion-forged bonds among a passionate new community—a heady replacement for the lonely life of reason, especially when that life is too often debased by pedantry. This theme was hailed by the chroniclers of the communes briefly established in last year's occupied buildings at Columbia. It reflected the mood of the 9,000 gathered all night in Cornell's Barton Hall.

There is nothing new in the emotional search for a camaraderie of danger. It is deeply felt by veterans of virtually every war, and the warmth of shared experience becomes mystically glorified as the terror that once accompanied it fades from memory. That was why Londoners after World War II readily agreed with Churchill that the days of the Blitz were indeed their "finest hour."

#### CAMARADERIE OF DANGER

The stark fact, however, is that the camaraderie of danger or fear does not lend itself to institutionalization. It continues in Israel's frontier settlements, but only as long as the external threat persists. In ordinary life, it occasionally envelopes groups of people, like a flash flood, when a mining town is hit by disaster below or when a child is trapped in a well. During the city's school shutdown last year, the embattled bonds of resistance created a campfire unity among the black and white teaching staff in Intermediate School 271 in Ocean Hill-Brownsville, but the harmony has long since evaporated. It went with the police barricades.

Through the ages, men—and particularly rulers—have made efforts to bottle the essence of togetherness and let out a whiff of it whenever the masses seemed to get restless and bored. The Romans called it "bread and circuses," which (depending on one's station in the economy) could mean either affluence or welfare along with the artificially created excitement of the arena.

In this century, the state-run business of communal excitement was developed to extreme efficiency and fever pitch by the Nazis' Nuremberg Party Congress—gigantic tribal hate-ins which Hitler's oratory pointed against imaginary enemies outside the magic circle.

The colleges themselves are no newcomers to the art of creating shared-danger togetherness. Hazing, after all, was a clumsy and often violent effort at mass-produced cohesion among freshmen by exposing them to legalized persecution. It went out of style only after it had become clear that violence, especially when officially condoned, soon gets out of hand.

#### SUBSTITUTE FOR BOREDOM

The synthetic rah-rah spirit of the gridiron, occasionally reinforced by panty raids and food riots, fits the pattern. It is a tribute to the greater academic and social consciousness of today's youth that it has created the teach-in as a form of togetherness protest. But the teach-in became institutionally condoned so quickly that only the boredom remained. Talk marathons, once legalized, were thus replaced by building occupations.

Those who doubt that boredom, and the human search for the excitement of shared

risks are ingredients of the present student unrest, should consider that Sweden has had its share of youth rebellion and even violence. Sweden is, after all, the country where social justice has been nationalized and slums do not exist.

The pursuit of communal excitement, especially among the young, is perfectly natural. The trouble starts when its emphasis on emotion and sentimentality, instead of being an occasional escape, becomes dominant and a full-time occupation. It is then that empathy and prejudices quickly become scrambled, and the anger of the commune, in its world-saving zeal, ceases to focus on aid to the oppressed and looks for scapegoats.

The world of scholarship puts a premium on the lone, personal effort, and therefore is exposed to loneliness. In an era of television, political consensus, commercially propagated togetherness and social directors even for children's parties, loneliness is likely to pose a threat to many youths who should have been, but in fact were not, prepared for it by parents, teachers and society.

#### EDITOR'S LETTER TO TODAY'S GRADUATES

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, Maury Vincent, the well-known editor of the Macomb Daily of Mount Clemens, Mich., has written an "open letter" to today's high school graduates, a letter which I encourage everyone to read.

Mr. Vincent's letter contains a thoughtful message to these graduates:

Set your sights on a high goal and make every effort to achieve that goal.

So tuck your dreams and your hopes under your arm—

Writes Mr. Vincent—

And make it straight for the future.

Mr. Vincent's letter follows:

GRADUATES: YOURS IS THE GIFT OF THE FUTURE

Dear high school graduates of 1969:

Very soon now, you will reach a milestone in your life . . . graduation from high school. That diploma you'll be receiving is the transfer document which takes you from relative serenity of sheltered waters to the turbulent sea of the mainstream of society with all of its challenges. As you approach this important moment in your lives, I'd like to discuss a few people with you—people like Socrates, Marcus Aurelius, President John F. Kennedy and Galloping Joe—plus some ideas—philosophy if you will—as well as the enigma of the student of today and tomorrow.

But wait a minute. Galloping Joe? You ask. Who is he and how did he get into such distinguished company? Well, Galloping Joe—like Reggie Trombley or Joe DeLamelleure—was a hardrunning football back for a high school on Detroit's East Side when I was a senior at St. Ambrose High School. You know St. Ambrose today as a football powerhouse. Back in my day we were the league's doormats. We lost the opening game of the 1939 season by the score of 69-0.

Galloping Joe knew but one way to play football. Once the ball was snapped, he tucked it under his arm and barreled straight ahead. No fancy running for him. And on this afternoon, after Joe has run over me the third straight time and is helping me to my feet after scoring, I say to him: "Joe

how come you don't engage in some fancy broken-field, swivel-hipped, side-stepping running instead of running over me like a Sherman tank?

As he walked away, Galloping Joe said: "Man, the quickest way to that goal line is straight ahead."

We'll get back to that later.

I can't help but feel that life is a relay race run by succeeding generations. Some of us lead, some trail behind and some drop out, but the majority of us plod along, enjoying a bit of the scenery along the way and perhaps suffering a pang or two but accomplishing most of those things expected of human beings. The important factor to realize here is that we have a goal . . . a finish line for which we strive and expend every effort at our command, transcending the confusion and chaos of a world gone mad.

This world has been confused before. It has been chaotic before. And, certainly, it has been mad before. Your parents and I are familiar with the pattern. We grew up in the depression and in our late teens or early twenties we fought that second big war to end all wars. Yet, there followed Korea and now there is Vietnam. The world and times do change, have changed and are constantly changing.

Language, for instance, has undergone great changes. Webster's third international dictionary, published in 1963, had to add 100,000 words to the list first published in 1934. Your parents, as I do, recall that in our high school days we didn't have, and therefore had no words like, astronaut, atom bomb, antibiotics, contact lens, black power, white backlash, sit in, love in, hippie, yippee, up tight and way out.

So the quest for knowledge and identity goes on in an ever-changing world. Socrates was asked by the young men at his feet—the intellectuals of their time—what is the earth made of? How did it come to be? What are human beings here for? How can we be happy?

And Socrates said to them: "Do not bother your heads overmuch with problems regarding creation or the substance of things. Here you are, a man, living for a while in a world with other men. What you must do is to think how you can live and help others to live, most nobly and wisely."

Think how you can live and help others to live most nobly and wisely.

Certainly, a great part of that thinking process is education and college is a major portion of that education. But today's student—along with his university—is often an enigma to those who live in the broader spectrum of society. Long hair, beards, social protests, sit-ins, the use of drugs—all these are manifestations of a situation which students can hardly explain to themselves, much less to outsiders or elders.

"Why," a businessman or laborer or housewife often ask, "are today's kids the way they are? We weren't like that."

In answering that question, Professor Donald Brown of the University of Michigan, states that student discontent is not new. Trends born of a mass world culture accounts for its prominence today. Today's rapid social, cultural and technological changes have largely done away with the Hollywood rah-rah of the campuses. The modern student has less fun (and feels guilty about having fun), says Prof. Brown. He works harder and relates his intellectual life more closely with his social life than did the student of the past. The more sophisticated modern student also becomes more concerned over issues of individual rights within the university and in society.

This is normal, Prof. Brown explains, since greater sophistication generally leads to a concern over man's relation to his society and his political order.

The contradictions of society—affluence

and freedom existing alongside poverty and enslavement of ignorance, discrimination and hopelessness—become clearly visible to these young adults. An awareness of these contradictions constitutes a growing up, a "loss of innocence" which is intensified by rapid mass communications that expose hypocrisy in a seeming authoritative fashion.

Along with this trend toward loss of innocence, says Prof. Brown, has come a search for a new socio-political stance. Old notions like patriotism no longer stir a person as they once did. The new mass ethic of the younger intelligentsia stresses an existential view of self-determination, responsibility, meaningful and personal communication and the essence of one's self-identity. Fraternities and sororities go begging for members. The days of the raccoon coats and gold-fish swallowing are passe.

Students today not only want to know who they are and what they are but where they're going as well. Can any of we parents honestly say that at the age of the youngsters in our midst now we were aware of the world around us as they are?

Alright, you ask Prof. Brown, as how does a university or college prevent student stress and alienation? By meeting students' needs for widespread, meaningful intellectual and social interaction, says Brown, adding: "Given the inherent shyness of young people, and yet their great need to communicate with one another, a university atmosphere which throws them together but provides little mutual intellectual experience will quite naturally lead them to seek ways to interact that do not always reflect the purposes of the university."

A sit-in is born.

In his meditations, the philosopher Marcus Aurelius wrote: "If you work at that which is before you, following right reason seriously, vigorously, calmly, without allowing anything else to distract you . . . if you hold to this, expecting nothing, but satisfied to live now according to nature, speaking heroic truth in every word you utter, you will live happy. And there is no man able to prevent this."

How perfectly does it describe our young people of today. They seek, and achieve, a truth which has eluded many parents. That truth is their relationship to one another and the world in which they live. It is an attribute that too many of we parents do not possess . . . and in spite of this our children, most of them, are surviving and will grow to become the stalwart parents and leaders of tomorrow.

You young people reading this are a part of that future.

In his inaugural speech, President John F. Kennedy said: "The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all form of human poverty and all forms of human life. . . . And yet, the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe . . . the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God. . . . Let the word go forth from this time and place to friend and foe alike that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans . . . born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a cold and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage . . . and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed and to which we are committed today."

Although President Kennedy meant these words for all Americans, I am certain he was thinking primarily of you young people . . . the citizens, the parents, the leaders of tomorrow . . . the heirs of this battered old globe which grows heavier on our shoulders every day as we grow older and feel the burden of its weight.

We are getting tired and it's about time

for others to step out into this relay race of life.

So tuck your dreams and your hopes under your arm and make straight for the future . . . remembering the words of that gridiron philosopher, Galloping Joe, who said: "Man, the only way to that goal line is straight ahead."

I wish you well.

## THE THIEU GOVERNMENT AND THE U.S. COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the following lead editorial from today's New York Times:

### MIDWAY TOWARD PEACE?

The size of the first 25,000-man American troop reduction in Vietnam is less important than the policy direction it indicates. The Vietnamese are as familiar as Americans with the old Chinese saying: "A journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step."

The Nixon-Thieu announcement at Midway is a step toward American disengagement from Vietnam. Before disengagement is completed, a negotiated settlement will have to intervene that assures North Vietnam's withdrawal and an agreed shape for South Vietnam's political future. But nothing is more likely to advance those goals at this time than progressive de-Americanization of the war.

Two other decisions taken at Midway may prove ultimately to be of importance. But not enough is known about them yet for a judgment to be made. President Thieu spoke of a new land reform program which President Nixon has agreed to help finance. If, as rumored, it involves immediate cancellation of all land rents and transfer of the land to tenants tilling it—without delay for clearance of land titles and compensation to landlords, which could come later—peasant support for Saigon and Vietcong interest in negotiation could both be stimulated.

The third decision at Midway, which could prove the most important of all, evidently concerns a new proposal for South Vietnamese elections that doubtless will be advanced in Paris in the coming weeks. The precise nature of the proposal has not been disclosed, nor is it clear whether detailed agreement was reached. But it is not likely that the Paris negotiations can be moved very far off dead center until there is a negotiable reply to the Vietcong proposal for an interim coalition government to conduct new elections in South Vietnam. A proposal for a mixed electoral commission, including Vietcong representatives, could bring the two sides within negotiating range.

The political future of South Vietnam is what the war is all about. Mutual withdrawal of external forces—which could be brought about tacitly by American troop cuts—can begin but it cannot be completed until an agreement is negotiated on the future government of South Vietnam.

The ten points advanced by the National Liberation Front and Mr. Nixon's eight points coincide to a considerable degree, as both sides have acknowledged. But it is unlikely that Hanoi and the N.L.F. can be enticed into serious private talks until the central point of disagreement—an interim coalition—is opened for negotiations as well.

Some of the newsmen have reported from Saigon and Midway that the Nixon-

Thieu conference results have caused great concern in South Vietnam about the firmness of the U.S. commitment.

If that is so—and I hope it is—President Nixon is to be commended. For it is high time that the Government of South Vietnam should begin to realize that it will not continue to enjoy U.S. support no matter how it behaves.

In the light of this, it is gravely disturbing that, since returning from Midway, President Thieu has stated that Vietnamese who advocate a coalition government will be punished. Surely, if this attitude continues and is implemented, the prospects for a political settlement of the war will be dim indeed. The United States ought to make clear that its support will be withdrawn if the Thieu Government insists on blocking the possibility of an agreement with Hanoi and the NLF in this fashion.

As the Times editorial suggests, no agreement on elections will be possible unless both sides are reasonably satisfied that the elections can be carried out under free and fair conditions. This means not only supervisory arrangements for the elections themselves but governmental arrangements in all parts of the country that will minimize improper pressures on the electorate.

#### BLACK STUDIES WITH A RED HEAD

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the manipulation by the intellectual elite never ceases to amaze.

The exclusive Bryn Mawr College for women, pressured into accepting a black studies program, has tentatively appointed the Communist Party's national committeeman, Dr. Herbert Aptheker, to its faculty.

I include in the RECORD a June 8 report from the New Hampshire Sunday News:

[From the New Hampshire Sunday News, June 8, 1969]

BRYN MAWR PICKS TOP U.S. RED, DR. AP-  
THEKER TO DIRECT "BLACK STUDIES PRO-  
GRAM"

(By Victor Lasky)

NEW YORK, June 7.—Would you believe that a leading Communist has been appointed by Bryn Mawr College—yes, Bryn Mawr College—as director of its Black Studies Program (BSP)?

Well, you'd better believe it. It's true.

Dr. Herbert Aptheker, a member of the Communist Party's National Committee and its leading "expert" on the "Negro Question," has been named to direct "Black Studies" at the exclusive college for women beginning next September.

That is, of course, if the appointment is not withdrawn. Already considerable opposition to Dr. Aptheker is building, particularly among horrified alumni. Even some faculty members have voiced misgivings, not so much because Dr. Aptheker is a devoted Communist but because his own writings persistently revealed him to be a slavish follower of the "Party Line."

Dr. Aptheker, however, is well aware of the significance of his appointment to the

cause of communism. He is quoted in the "Daily World"—the successor paper of the "Daily Worker"—as saying:

"It is thrilling, with wide national significance for the Communist Party. It also reflects something of what this student movement is all about, which many people have failed to understand."

The "Daily World" contended that Dr. Aptheker was appointed "after black students demanded a Black Studies Program with him as its head."

The idea of "black studies," in itself, is controversial.

Legitimate fears have been expressed that such programs will not encourage scholarship as much as revolutionary activism not only on the campuses but in black communities across the nation.

Now, the appointment of Dr. Aptheker, who is white, to head the Black Studies Program at one of the nation's more elegant institutions will only tend to confirm the widespread fears.

Another aspect of "Black Studies" that has caused concern has been the tendency of such programs—as at Antioch College—to lead to the separation of black and white students. This tendency has been excoriated by such leading negro spokesmen as Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the renowned psychologists, Dr. Kenneth Clark.

The record clearly demonstrates that Dr. Aptheker is far from an objective scholar. His writings are completely attuned to the shifts and turns of the Communist Party "line."

He is a leading Communist historian. And, as Dr. Wilson Record wrote in his monumental book, "The Negro and the Communist Party":

"The Communists wrote American history, and especially negro American history, with a purpose. The Party, like its mother organization in the USSR, demanded that the past explain and justify the present, and that it point to the future—a future in which great things were seen for the party.

"If the role of great negro figures was distorted, if small men were clothed in the garments of the mighty, if undifferentiated protest was imbued with heavy ideological overtones, if the accomplishments of moderate leaders were reduced to insignificance, if facts and scholarship suffered in the process, this could not evoke major concern.

"The Party historian was a Party man first and a historian second."

In a footnote, Dr. Record added:

"Aptheker is currently a good case in point."

#### TRIBUTE TO LENA WASHINGTON

### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 23 in Los Angeles, a large contingent of leaders of my political party met at the Biltmore Hotel to honor one of our most popular and most effective members.

Lena Washington has now served the Republican State central committee for more than 20 years.

Since 1948 she has held virtually every position and has been entrusted with virtually every important responsibility that can be given to a key executive staff member.

She was my indispensable aide when I

was chairman of the Republican State and county central committees in California.

She served such other former party chairmen as Secretary Robert Finch, Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Assemblyman George Milias, former Assemblyman Laughlin Waters, and a host of others with equal distinction.

In recognition of her service to her party Lena Washington was selected to serve as honorary secretary of the Republican National Convention of 1952 and as a presidential elector for the State of California in 1968.

More impressive than all the honors that have come her way, however, is the galaxy of Republican friends and admirers she collected over the last 20 years.

Not the least of these is the President of the United States who was a Los Angeles Congressman when Lena first began her service with our party in California.

Lena Washington has been a good friend and a tireless supporter of many of the most distinguished men in public life who have carried the Republican banner.

It is fitting that this good friend be given evidence of the high regard, admiration, and respect that all of us feel for her.

#### REMEMBER ME

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, recently an excellent newspaper in my congressional district, the Oyster Bay Guardian, printed a poem written by an American soldier on duty in Vietnam. This poem poignantly describes the terrible conditions to which our boys in Vietnam are subjected.

The author of the poem, Sp4c. Donald P. Fleury, asks something very simple but something very important of those of us back home. He asks in a sincere plea "Remember Me."

I would hope that we would never forget for a moment that hundreds of thousands of our brave young men are fighting a war 10,000 miles from home. To remind the people of the United States and to give appropriate recognition to Specialist Fleury's just request, I wish to include his poem in the RECORD at this point:

#### REMEMBER ME

(By Donald P. Fleury)

(NOTE.—Sp4c. Donald P. Fleury is with the First Engineering Battalion of the First Infantry Division of the U.S. Army, stationed at Lai Khe, VietNam. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. E. C. Fleury, of 78 Hawthorne Road, East Norwich.)

You know last night while standing guard,  
I thought I'd write a poem,

And tell it like it really is to all you people  
back home.

You folks read all the papers and watch the  
TV shows,

But even with all of that, not one really  
knows.

You hear the good side of all our battles,  
the enemies we kill,  
But you've never seen your buddy fall, while  
charging up a hill.  
At home you walk down crowded sidewalks,  
or in a crowded mall,  
But here, the brush or jungle trail is thick,  
and you have to crawl.  
Back in the world, you have bridges built,  
to go across a river,  
But here in Nam we walk right in, and when  
it's cold we shiver.  
You've got air conditioners there, to cool  
your shop or den,  
But over here it's so damn hot, we think  
it's hell we're in.  
At home you take your wife or girl, go out  
and dance all night,  
But here we stand guard, sometimes stiff  
with fright.  
Have you ever looked around at all the  
things you've got?  
Or stopped to think of the many things we've  
not?  
You have cold beer, fresh water, and hot  
meals to eat,  
Any one of those to us would really be a  
treat.  
And every day you take a walk down life's  
easy path,  
But I'll bet you never had to go a month  
without a bath!  
To you a bath is water, hot enough to make  
it steam.  
To us it's nothing more than a leech-in-  
fested stream.  
You have no doubt been scared enough to  
think the end was near,  
But I'll bet you never had to live a year  
in total fear.  
You folks have got it easy, compared to us  
across the sea,  
But all any soldier asks is, "Please remember  
me!"

#### EULOGY FOR TRUMAN WARD

#### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of Capitol Hill's best loved institutions has passed away. I learned with great sorrow of the loss of Truman Ward, majority clerk of the House of Representatives, and my friend for more than 10 years.

In all that will be said in remembrance of this exceptional man, I would like to say a word or two about his fondness for the freshmen of this House. His office was a sanctuary for newcomers to Capitol Hill for more than 48 years.

Looking back to the time of my own first days in Washington in 1959, I remember that Truman was one of the first and friendliest people to welcome me to this labyrinth we call Capitol Hill. It seemed to me, as it must to most freshman Congressmen, still a little ill at ease in these historic surroundings, that he knew everyone and that there was nothing he could not find a way to do.

He was extraordinarily generous with his time and the services of his office. That office, piled to the ceiling with paper samples, with noisy and impressively ink-stained machines, with catalogs and boxes and printed matter of every description—that office was home ground to many Members.

Truman was the original Mr. Unflap-

pable. Somehow all his promised deadlines were met, despite the countless dilemmas of last-minute changes in copy. More often than not, his suggestions about the text or tone of a newsletter salvaged an ordinary report and made an eloquent and effective one.

In half a century of serving the Congress, he knew and was a friend to thousands of men and women who came to Washington during the five decades that established this Capital City as capital of the world. Truman Ward was part of that history.

He was a link with the excitement and diversity of our past. What makes him unforgettable is that he was younger in spirit than any of us.

We have lost a living journal of Washington's history, but the stamp of Truman Ward's friendship, humility, generosity, and humor is enshrined forever in the permanent memory of his friends.

Mrs. Pucinski joins me in extending deepest condolences to Mrs. Ward and her family.

#### GRADUATION NOW SOUNDING AT GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

#### HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today, when countless graduation ceremonies are taking place in every town across this vast Nation, I feel that the following article from the Bulloch Herald and Times of Statesboro, Ga., deserves my colleagues' attention. I believe that Ric Mandes has said things about graduation which most of us often have difficulty in putting into actual words and I am sure his comments will ring a nostalgic cord in everyone's heart:

[From the Statesboro (Ga.) Bulloch Herald and Times, June 5, 1969]

#### GRADUATION NOW SOUNDING AT GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

(By Ric Mandes)

STATESBORO.—This is the time of graduation on college and high school campuses throughout the nation. It is the time of the long good-bye to the people, places, and things this young set has come to know so well during the past twelve or sixteen years.

No longer will the bell's ring to interrupt their lives every fifty minutes; no longer will the din of the dining hall smack their ears; no longer will the thrill of victory or the ache of defeat found in a cold winter's football night invade their weekends.

The library stacks, the bluebooks, the syntax of grammar, the thrust of Shakespeare are now over, temporarily for the high school crew, permanently for the college set, except for those whose horizons date graduate school.

Generally speaking though, it is a time of special exodus for millions of students. Friends touch with a final closeness as they stand in lines of march ready to move toward the stage; a thousand miles of footsteps that have crossed the twelve or sixteen years are caught up in silent, simple posture as the last walk is made.

Some graduation exercises are held in stadiums in a bright sun that somehow reflects the still, almost fresh, tracks of that

special halfback's run across the turf. Some are scheduled at night in auditoriums. To stand in the nocturnal scene of so many memories, seeing the ease of the night soften sets of hard brick steps, the bare dirt spots of the campus, the stone benches, even the old buildings. This is something.

It is graduation time. . . . when the special halfback, the sights, and the sounds move into the form of tall hooded ones, bearers of future title, tactics, and tones.

Graduation is now, And for just a few more minutes it is loose and free . . . as tomorrow begins its final and definite approach.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

#### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues are aware, I have been extremely concerned about the widespread violations of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in Department of Agriculture programs. On May 19, as chairman of the Democratic Study Group Task Force on Civil Rights and Minority Affairs, I wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin and asked what steps he was taking to implement recommendations of Attorney Mitchell which are directed to establishing procedures to end the flagrant violations of Federal law at USDA.

On May 20, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 13170-13176, a copy of the Attorney General's letter to Secretary Hardin, additional documentation from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights as to widespread discrimination in USDA programs, and my letter to the Secretary. On May 22, my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) included additional documentation with his remarks which appear in the RECORD at pages 13456-13465.

On May 20, I received a response from Secretary Hardin. While the Secretary's letter expressed his personal dedication to the elimination of discriminatory practices wherever they may exist in the Department of Agriculture, his letter did not address itself to the specific steps he intends to take to end the present violations of Federal law.

I have therefore written another letter to Secretary Hardin asking that he keep me informed of the administrative changes which are to be taken to bring USDA programs into compliance with title VI. I await his response with great interest.

For the information of my colleagues who are also appalled by the current situation at the Department of Agriculture with respect to title VI compliance, I insert at this point in the RECORD Secretary Hardin's response to my first letter and a copy of my second letter to the Secretary:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, May 21, 1969.

HON. DON EDWARDS,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDWARDS: I have your May 19 letter relative to the reports of the

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights regarding the program of this Department.

You have asked that I advise you of the steps being taken or being planned to implement the suggestions of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the Attorney General relative to civil rights enforcement in this Department.

The 1968 report of the Civil Rights Commission is a part of the material you include in the Congressional Record for May 20, 1969. In connection with that report, I am sure that you will be interested in Secretary Freeman's January 17, 1969 response to it.

You will note from that response that Secretary Freeman took exception to parts of the report. However, he pointed out that he had requested additional funds in the 1970 budget for civil rights work in this Department.

Those funds—\$250,000, originally included in the Johnson budget for 1970—were retained in the revised budget President Nixon sent to Congress on April 15. We already have \$320,000 for equal opportunity and civil rights enforcement within my office for fiscal year 1969. If the additional \$250,000 is approved by the Congress, we will then have a total of \$570,000 for civil rights enforcement in my immediate office.

This, however, does not give the complete picture. An additional 11 people are detailed for contract compliance work. These people are paid by their employing agencies. Additionally, the Office of the Inspector General conducts investigations and special audits in the civil rights area at a cost that will approximate \$350,000 in 1970. Thus, there will be more than \$1 million available at the Department level in 1970 assuming the Congress appropriates the additional \$250,000 requested.

In addition, the operating agencies are active in implementing and enforcing civil rights laws and orders. While no specific amounts are separately identified for this work, at least \$2.5 million to \$3 million will be used by our agencies in fiscal year 1970 for civil rights activities. This makes a total of \$3.5 million to \$4.0 million in the Department of Agriculture in 1970, principally for enforcement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

I assure you of my dedication to the elimination of discriminatory practices wherever they may exist within this Department. I think that our budget demonstrates the serious concern of this Department in the civil rights area. It is my intention that we live up to the intent of the law.

Money alone, however, does not assure an effective civil rights program. Consequently, I have emphasized the importance of an effective civil rights enforcement program to the line officials of this Department because in the final analysis the job will be done or not done at the operational level by the program administrators.

At the moment, I am developing our organization and program for civil rights enforcement. This work is going forward without delay. For instance, I have scheduled a conference for May 22 with Father Hesburgh, Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission; William H. Brown, Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; and a representative of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, to review our programs, policies, and organization in this important area.

There are some vacant positions in this area at the moment, but I assure you that as soon as the organizational pattern and fund situation is clarified we will build a staff to do an effective job of civil rights enforcement in USDA.

In a very short time this Department will be in a position to carry out a more effective program to fulfill the intent of the law and to meet the standards of adequacy as

determined by the Civil Rights Commission, the Attorney General, and other bodies charged with responsibility in this area.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. HARDIN.

JUNE 3, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your prompt response to my letter of May 19, which raised specific questions with respect to the steps your Department is taking to implement the recommendations of the Attorney General and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights relative to ending discrimination in USDA programs.

I particularly appreciate your personal assurances of dedication to the elimination of discriminatory practices wherever they may exist in the Department of Agriculture. I note with great interest that you anticipate that your Department will have \$3.5 to \$4.0 million in 1970, principally for enforcement of Title VI, and I was pleased that the House provided the \$250,000 in additional funds requested by the Department for civil rights enforcement. I hope that these funds will be directed toward ending the present violations of law which have been documented by Attorney General Mitchell and the Civil Rights Commission.

I had hoped that your letter would state precisely the steps you are taking to make the administrative changes recommended. However, I recognize that you may not have had sufficient time to make a full and adequate response. I therefore ask that you keep me informed as to the administrative changes which are to be undertaken to bring the programs of your Department into compliance with the law.

Again, my thanks for your prompt reply to my letter.

Sincerely,

DON EDWARDS,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN GENE SNYDER SUPPORTS VIETNAM DISENGAGEMENT AND THE SAFEGUARD ABM

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

MR. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, GENE SNYDER, spoke last Saturday to the State convention of the Kentucky Motor Transportation Association at Louisville. His speech in support of President Nixon's disengagement of our troops in Vietnam and in support of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system is worthy of consideration by the Members of this body and I include it in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN GENE SNYDER SUPPORTS VIETNAM DISENGAGEMENT AND THE SAFEGUARD ABM

When Paul Young asked if I would come speak to you today several months ago, I readily accepted. I thought it would be a real opportunity for me to come and express my appreciation publicly for the help that you folks—and Paul in particular—have been to me in my efforts to put together certain facts and information in regard to the trucking industry and its impact on roads, and its impact upon the economy of the nation and the economy of Kentucky.

He has always been most helpful and I want to let you, the members of this association, know of the diligent efforts that your staff makes in attempting to work with the Kentucky Congressional delegation.

I must confess, however, that I had great reservations when, a few weeks ago, we had lunch together and in the course of conversation, I said that I suspected it would be about time for me to put together some very pertinent facts in regard to the trucking industry and prospective trucking legislation so that I might talk here today about those things which concern your industry—and Paul said: "Look, these folks talk the trucking industry all the time, and they will be talking it in their work sessions. It would be much more appreciated if you would speak about other matters than our industry." He said it would be more of a diversion at this lunch hour. Upon pursuing that point just a little, it was with a certain amount of fear and trepidation that I agreed to be here today when Paul said he thought it would be good if I would discuss Vietnam and the controversial ABM.

These are deep and complex matters. They are matters that are of concern to every American—but I suppose more particularly to Members of the Congress for several reasons. Certainly in regard to the ABM, we must reach conclusions that will permit us to cast a vote for the best of our country—cast a vote in accordance with what we believe will be for the best for the preservation of our country and the preservation of peace in the world. In regard to Vietnam, while we in the Congress do not have the final say-so as to the conduct of the war, whether it will proceed or whether it won't, we know that we must weigh very carefully what we say because as the news media carries our words over the air and into the press, the future of the solution to that conflict can be impaired as well as enhanced by what we have to say.

It has been well over a year now since I have spoken publicly to the issue of Vietnam. It is with a great amount of reservation and hesitation that I do so today. My position has consistently been that this is a bad war. I have consistently questioned our involvement in it to the extent that we are involved.

I remember well President Johnson telling a few of us at the White House of General Eisenhower's comment to President Kennedy when he turned over the reins of government to him. President Johnson indicated that General Eisenhower said he realized the problems that were existent in Southeast Asia where he himself had committed some six or seven hundred advisor—that while he did not desire to avoid making firm decisions—that he was glad that his successor, and not he, would have to make the decision as to what our future role would be in South Vietnam.

What I have to say here today is not intended to be an indictment of any past or the present administration—and what I have to say I have tried to weigh carefully so as not to endanger peace in any way by joining with those who would compromise our position to the point that we cannot have a respectable peace. I would not want to contribute to anything that would put this government in a more difficult position than it is as it negotiates for peace. Certainly, I, as one individual, would not be in a position to do that. I know that. But weighed with all of the other comments that have been made by Members of the Congress, a trend establishes itself and one which can be either helpful or hurtful to the negotiators in Paris—or wherever they may be meeting that we don't know about.

It consistently has been my position that a military conflict is what exists in Vietnam—and that a military conflict is a war, whether declared or not, whether justified or not—and that we should conduct ourselves on the battlefield as is customary in time of war;

that we should be committed to win and should not commit American boys to any cause with any other goal in mind. I have not changed my position.

I said through two campaigns, when asked about the issue, I felt we should win or get out. For two years, during the 90th Congress, I labored under the previous administration with the awesome responsibility of answering the inquiries of my constituents and—yes—sending out those letters of sympathy and condolence, knowing full well that that Administration was not committed to the course that I thought best—win or get out.

It was with all of the vigor at my command that I supported to the fullest extent the nomination and election of Richard Nixon to the Presidency of the United States. I did this for many reasons—both domestically and within the purview of foreign policy—I believed he was the man best equipped to solve many of our problems. But I believe the most overwhelming, most compelling reason that I supported Richard Nixon with the vigor that I did, and even to the exclusion of some at the convention—at least one—whose political philosophy I perhaps favored was because I felt that he was the man in this country, the one man best equipped to lead us in these troubled times; to lead us particularly in the area of foreign affairs, and to lead us where he was committed to lead us—where he had committed himself so fully and that was out of the war in Vietnam. And I am standing here today with confidence that Mr. Nixon was committed to that course in that campaign.

And I stand here today fully convinced that he is committed to that course today. We are moving toward a disengagement of the conflict in Vietnam.

This I believe.

I believe it not solely out of hope, but based upon the facts as we see them developing. If you eliminate the possibility of winning the war—which I do not agree with, but which I accept as being a fact under a previous administration and now under this administration—

Then I think you must likewise confess that it is a practical impossibility to simply abandon ship—honorably.

We have a war that has lasted for five years—since the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. To get out of that war—honorably—yet without winning—takes time.

The President's statement to the nation on May 14 said, and I quote: "We have ruled out attempting to impose a purely military solution on the battlefield.

"We have also ruled out either a one-sided withdrawal from Vietnam, or the acceptance in Paris of terms that would amount to a disguised defeat."

Let me, too, call your attention to the statement of Secretary Laird at his meeting with the press at the Airlie House in Warrenton, Virginia, on May 3, 1969. Asked by the press to comment upon the statement of the Senior Senator of the Republican Party, Senator Aiken, and the Senate Whip, Senator Scott, both of whom had demanded that the troops be withdrawn immediately from Vietnam—Secretary Laird said that there were three conditions, all of which, or any one of which, should be met before our troops could be withdrawn from Vietnam. These conditions were, first, that we must have an agreement on mutual withdrawal in Paris as far as the peace talks are concerned; or secondly, that there must be a sufficient upgrading and modernization of the South Vietnamese forces so that they can, in fact, take over the responsibilities, or at least more of the responsibilities of the war in Southeast Asia; or thirdly, that the level of activity on the part of the Viet Cong or the North Vietnamese substantially reduces in the area of South Vietnam.

He made it clear that all of these, or any one of these conditions would permit us to begin the withdrawal of troops.

Tomorrow the President meets on Midway Island. He will discuss with South Vietnam's President this war—and I am fully convinced of the seriousness with which Mr. Nixon goes to that meeting.

I have sat across the table, and we have looked face to face—and when asked how things were going in Kentucky—in a nutshell, my response was: "you are doing pretty well, but the sands of time will soon run out on Vietnam, Mr. President."

I witnessed the seriousness of his look. I saw the impressive attitude that he had as we discussed the future of that conflict. I say to you here today that having ruled out the possibility of a military victory, that I firmly believe this administration will move to disengage American military troops from the conflict in South Vietnam as fast as they can within the confines of the safety of our troops there.

There are those who say "Well, we ought to pack up and come home," and that is the position that I have taken—if we are not going to win, I think so too.

But there is a practical aspect of doing that that makes it impossible. Aside from the political implications, which I do not think are worth the lives of the American boys that have been sacrificed there—the practical problem is the sacrifice of that last group of Americans as you attempt to board them on ship or plane to bring them out. Assuming that you can remove yourself into enclaves, the truth of the matter is the last groups—probably 20 percent of our forces—would probably be annihilated.

This could not be tolerated, and would not be tolerated either by the administration or the American people.

But I think as we look toward the three points that Secretary Laird made, we recognize that the idea of the Vietnamese forces taking over the responsibility of defending their country should not be, must not be, and cannot be the long, drawn-out process that we have been told it must be.

I remember six months ago the talk of four or five years to upgrade the Vietnamese and train them for the defense of their own country. Stop and think a minute in retrospect—can we accept this as being a true fact? My idea is—we cannot.

In this country, we train American boys for five or six months to defend the homeland of another—and I say that it is not asking too much of those whose homeland American boys are defending to say to them that there is no legitimate reason why it should take you any longer to train your soldiers to defend our country than it takes Americans to learn to defend your country.

Yes, I think that, being committed as we are, we would have an obligation to continue technical advice and support by way of arms and munitions to a freedom-loving people . . . if that is in fact what we determine they are. But I think it is immoral—not the war immoral as the leftists would say—but immoral for patriotic Americans to be asked to fight a tour of duty in any country, but not to win the war . . . only to fight until they complete their tour of duty or lose their life or limb.

So it is today that I say to you—first, I am not in agreement with what is known as a limited war. If we are to be committed to a conflict, we should be committed to use all of the resources at our command to win and save American lives that are there committed. But I face the grave reality that the leadership of our country under administrations of different political faiths have elected that that not be the course.

I, therefore, find myself committed, consistent with the stand that I have taken heretofore, to say that if that not be our course, then we should move as expeditiously as possible to disengage from the conflict the American troops. And I say to you with confidence, the confidence that I have not had

in any administration's actions in many a year . . . that I believe this administration is moving in that direction. I ask you and the people of my Congressional District and my home state to watch carefully the actions of this administration for the next few weeks, and I will be watching too.

I believe the events of the next few weeks, after that meeting tomorrow at Midway, will bear out the confidence that I express here today in the President.

I believe the events of the next few weeks will bear out the confidence of the electorate in Kentucky last November in this administration. I do not want to mislead you in any way. I am not suggesting that within the next few weeks we will be out of Vietnam, but I think you will see the evidence of the ultimatums—if that be the proper word—the evidence of the *understanding*—that's a better word—of the various meetings that have been taking place, including that one tomorrow which will lead to the disengagement of our troops from Vietnam.

Now, let me talk for a few minutes about the Safeguard ABM system. I would like to outline the chronology of the development of the system . . . provide a brief description of its components and their capabilities.

The Army has been working on ballistic missiles for many years . . . and in 1956 began work on the Nike-Zeus system. In 1962 the Nike-Zeus successfully demonstrated its ability to intercept an offensive intercontinental missile warhead. However, the technology of the time would permit the Nike-Zeus to handle only a few incoming missiles, thereby rendering it ineffective as a valid defense. New developments in both radar and warhead technology made possible the interception of large numbers of incoming missiles at great altitudes, outside the earth's atmosphere. Even with this increased capability, it was and is still impossible to provide a complete defense of the whole United States against large numbers of missiles. By 1966, the Russians appeared to be building many more offensive missiles than were required for their defense. They commenced installation of a defense of their own. In 1967, a new threat to our security appeared with the Chinese development of thermonuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles. Our technology offered the possibility of a complete defense against a limited threat such as that posed by Communist China. This threat was apparently the basis for the decision to employ the Sentinel system around selected cities to provide full defense against the Chinese and to offer the option of protecting Minute-man bases from the threat of Russian attack.

In 1969, this year, several courses of action were considered in reviewing the employment of an ABM system. These were: to do nothing; to continue the Sentinel program; or to establish a purely defensive ABM system which would contain no offensive implication.

The third choice was elected and the decision was made to employ the Safeguard system with an initial deployment of two sites. This choice provides the United States with a great flexibility. It can, if necessary, provide substantial protection of our strategic offensive force against an increased Russian threat—to preserve our deterrent without adding new offensive missiles. It will provide protection against the Chinese threat without the necessity of aiming new offensive missiles at China.

I would like to go through the basic components of the system, their characteristics and progress in their development and test. The components are: the PARS, Perimeter Acquisition Radar—the MSR, Missile Site Radar—the Spartan missile, the Sprite missile, and the Data Processing Subsystem.

The first is Perimeter Acquisition Radar, the PAR. It has a very large radar face to provide the long-range capability and ac-

curacy to provide the information for the system. It is housed in a building that is some 2000 feet square and 130 feet high. It has an antenna diameter of over 100 feet. The PAR has a detection range of over 1000 miles against the expected ICBM. In order to provide the capability for this system, it must not only detect the enemy warhead out quite some distance, it has to detect a number of them, if necessary, since we have to be prepared for a number of missiles coming in simultaneously.

The PAR uses an electronically steered beam so that this beam can be scanned across the sky very rapidly, acquiring a great deal of information in a very short time. The normal radar you are familiar with uses a big dish that is moved around mechanically and would not be suitable at all for this sort of system. The principles, functions, power level and frequency of the PAR are similar to the existing space and air defense radar in operation today. It has been decided that the first PAR will be assembled at an operational site. The technology involved in the PAR is so well known and sufficiently reliable that this proposed procedure is entirely satisfactory.

The Missile Site Radar is designed on the same general technical principle, and has to do very much the same kind of job that PAR does but a more complex one. The MSR has a shorter range within which to pick up the track of the incoming missile in flight. However, the MSR with its data processor must ready interceptors for launch, launch them, and guide them to intercept.

The Spartan missile is the long-range missile used in the area defense. The Spartan is a scaled up version of the Nike-Zeus, which was fired many tens of times. And in its system test phase made several successful interceptions of ICBMs fired from the West Coast in 1962 and 1963. But the first Spartan was not fired until the 30th of March 1968. It has had several firings to date.

The Sprint is a very fast missile. It has to get off the ground and get up and intercept the incoming warhead when it is within the atmosphere. This is really a very impressive development. The area defense concept is provided by the Perimeter Acquisition Radar to intercept the warhead a long way out, the Missile Site Radar to acquire it when it is within range and to guide the Spartan and/or Sprint to the intercept point. There is one other component that is very important in the system and that is the Data Processing Subsystem. There are large capacity data processing elements in each PAR and each MSR. The computer capability is extensive and is one of the things that provides a very impressive capability for the entire system.

This basically is the chronology of the development and a statement of the components involved in Safeguard.

The current debate on the Safeguard system has taken a curious turn down a dark, and I think illogical road. Suddenly it is wrong in the eyes of some of its critics to plan to defend the United States of America. Weapons of any kind are wrong they reason, even if they are purely defensive in nature. For an encore, the same folks, might well reason that the presence of the policeman on the beat provokes robbery and criminal excesses and should therefore be removed to promote domestic stability.

There are some ABM defenses that unfortunately are ineffective and wasteful and, therefore, should not be attempted. For example, we do not have the scientific wherewithal to protect our population centers effectively against a massive Soviet attack. No such theoretical defense could guarantee stopping 100% of all incoming Soviet ICBMs. Therefore, it is absolutely senseless to waste our national largess by pouring it into a bottomless pit.

However, we do have the capability to protect our population centers against a small unsophisticated Chinese Communist attack of the scale and type they might be capable of launching during the next 10 years or so. And I take violent issue with any of the opponents who take the dangerously naive position that we need not and should not do so.

And I say—why shouldn't we? What assurances do we have that the Red Chinese will spare our cities during a moment of frantic confrontation? They don't have a very good track record to date. Just read their endless barrage of threats—all of this noise without a nuclear ICBM capability at the present time. How loud will those threats and harangues become when they soon have a nuclear ICBM capability? What if they decided to strike at our major industrial and population centers? If successful, our sustained warmaking capability would be severely blunted. The United States would have been reduced to relative impotence. We must maintain our retaliatory threat to prevent such a possibility. That's what Safeguard is all about.

It is imperative that we protect ourselves when we can from an irresponsible attack from Asia. By the same token, let us protect ourselves from other fanatic countries that may acquire nuclear weapons in the future.

Then, too, what assurances do we have that through error or failure in another country's fail-safe procedures that a nuclear tipped ICBM may not be accidentally launched at a pretargeted destination in the United States? It could very well happen.

Safeguard as presently envisioned will provide protection against fanatical unsophisticated attack or accidental launch. We can't afford not to have this protection. I see no virtue in nakedness.

We do have the technological capability to protect the necessary minimum of our deterrent force against anything that even the Soviets might throw at us. This is Safeguard's primary mission, protecting a sufficient amount of our defensive, second-strike deterrent force—thereby making any Soviet first-strike attempt utterly foolhardy in view of the guaranteed destruction that our remaining protected retaliatory forces could unleash upon them. This deterrent, second-strike capability is essential in discouraging Soviet surprise attack, thereby safeguarding our national viability and preserving any meaningful world peace. We must provide that Safeguard protection.

We must endorse the President's Safeguard program.

It calls only for a start—only for protection at two Minutemen sites in Montana and North Dakota. It is a modest, phased, reasoned step which will only grow larger if our highest-level intelligence evaluation discloses an increase in enemy first-strike capability. If we don't take this minimal step, we will be unable to meet the developing threat from Red China or from some other country. We will be unable to protect our country and our resources from an accidental nuclear attack . . . and we will be unable to keep pace with the currently reported Soviet erosion of our deterrent force, if the Soviets continue to install great numbers of offensive SS-9 ICBMs.

Safeguard, I say, is a small premium to pay for all of that insurance—and insurance is what we are talking about.

In capsule, let me say this about Safeguard: if the proponents, and I am one of them, are successful in the contest and are wrong, we will have wasted some money. That's bad—but it is the worse that can happen from an error in favor of Safeguard. On the other hand, if the opponents are successful and are wrong, then we have wasted a country.

Thank you.

## ODOMETER TAMPERING OUTLAWED

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation dealing with still another facet of consumer protection. I note with regret the continuing need for such legislation and express the hope that Congress shall continue to see and to respond to its responsibilities in this oft neglected field.

This bill prohibits "tampering" with speedometers and odometers and conditions the sale of any vehicle so altered, providing also for punishment of any individual found guilty of violating its provisions. It is hoped that this effort will serve as a deterrent of such activities until such time as the automotive industry may adopt a sealed or "non-pickable" odometer, should the report I have requested in this bill of the Secretary of Transportation find such a device feasible.

At this point, for further explication of the need and aims of this bill, I offer the following excerpts from a Consumers Union press release of April 24, 1969, for insertion into the RECORD:

MILEAGE TAMPERING MAY COST CONSUMERS  
\$1 BILLION ANNUALLY

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.—"If it is important to protect the consumer from the butcher who cheats a few cents on the hamburger, it's at least as important to protect him from the odometer 'artist' who chisels a few hundred dollars on a used car."

So says Consumers Union, the nonprofit testing and advisory organization, after conducting a study of mileage tampering, a practice that is not even illegal in most states.

The total cost to consumers may be \$1 billion a year, CU says in the May issue of its magazine, *Consumer Reports*.

"But the cost must be assessed in terms of safety as well," it notes.

Even with the best of care, a car with 75,000 miles on the odometer is not the car it was at 25,000 miles. The prudent owner knows this and is less likely to take his steering or wheel bearings or exhaust system for granted. But the owner of a low-mileage used car may be lulled by the odometer. Until the critical moment, he may have been completely unaware that his car was dangerously in need of repairs—a menace to himself and others.

### THE ODOMETER RAID

Some indication of the scope of mileage tampering was disclosed as a result of an "odometer raid" staged last summer by the Massachusetts Attorney General's Division of Consumer Protection.

Working in pairs, state investigators selected 24 new-car showrooms at random, entered and announced they were conducting a "routine check" of cars on display in the dealers' used-car lots.

Mainly on the basis of educated guesswork—comparing the odometer readings with the appearance of the cars—the investigators listed about 250 vehicles open to suspicion of odometer tampering.

Locating the former owners wasn't easy—about 70 per cent of them could not be traced and some would not cooperate. Of those who were found, 20 owners said the reading on their odometers when they

traded in their cars was much higher than the readings found by inspectors.

#### MILEAGE CUT IN HALF

On average, between 20,000 and 30,000 miles had been subtracted. One man said his odometer reading had been pared from 90,000 to 45,000 miles.

Massachusetts' Assistant Attorney General Robert L. Meade decided he had strong cases against six of the biggest new-car dealerships in his state. Massachusetts is one of four states with "little FTC laws" patterned on the anti-deceptive practices provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (the others are Washington, Vermont, and Hawaii). Acting under his state's laws, the official succeeded, after months of polite arm-twisting, in convincing three of the dealers to sign an assurance of discontinuance.

That meant, simply, that they filed an agreement in court saying they would not offer "for sale any vehicle upon which the odometer has been adjusted in any manner . . . so that it does not disclose . . . the true mileage . . ." As in consent orders filed with the FTC, assurances of discontinuance in Massachusetts are carefully worded so that the signer does not admit to having used certain specific deceptive sales practices in the past, but, nevertheless, agrees not to use the same deceptive practices in the future.

The assistant attorney general is still negotiating with two of the other dealers. He took sterner action against the sixth on the list. Saying it had flatly refused to cooperate, he filed suit for permanent injunction.

#### SUGAR-COATED WITH SECRECY

"All things considered," the *Consumer Reports* article says, "the Great Odometer Raid might have been a very bitter pill, indeed, for any auto dealer to swallow had it not been for a high level decision to sugar-coat the pill with secrecy."

"The Attorney General's office could have given the names of the dealers to newspapers, but it decided not to—this time. The only excuse offered by a state official was that it would have been 'unfair to ruin these guys when everyone else is doing it too.'

"But by not alerting the press," the article adds, "the state deprived itself and the public of a most effective enforcement tool in consumer protection cases—the glare of publicity."

#### COSTS TO CONSUMER

According to one report, Americans bought nearly 20 million used cars in 1967 and paid an estimated \$20 billion for them. *Automotive News*, the trade journal, says that prices start falling off sharply after a car has traveled 30,000 miles. Beyond that distance, a two-year-old car loses about \$10 of value for every 1000 miles.

"Assuming that only half the used cars sold in 1967 were two years old or older, and that only half of them had 20,000 miles 'picked' or 'spun' off their odometers," *Consumer Reports* says, "it doesn't seem unreasonable to estimate that consumers are being misled on used-car lots to the tune of \$1 billion a year."

#### HOW TAMPERING IS DONE

Technically speaking, odometer tampering is all too easy to do.

The favorite technique in the trade is called "picking" because most operators use a homemade assortment of specially shaped ice picks. The procedure of turning back the odometer only takes a few minutes (and usually involves only the digit for tens of thousands of miles). If the picker is skilled, his handiwork is rarely detectable by a used-car shopper.

With less skill but much more patience, an odometer tamperer can spin the speedometer

cable with a high-speed electric motor to the desired low reading. But since it can take hours to spin off just a few thousand miles, spinning is most commonly used by the amateur.

The simplest way to falsify an odometer is by disconnecting the speedometer cable. Dealers will sometimes do that on a new car to be used as a demonstrator or to be driven cross-country to the point of sale.

Is a tamperproof odometer possible?

The answer is a qualified yes, according to Consumers Union's automotive engineers.

#### YANKEE KNOW-HOW

"While anything Yankee know-how can put together," the article says, "Yankee know-how can probably take apart."

General Motors' 1969 models have odometers that cannot be spun backward. But there is no way for the used-car buyer to detect whether the mileage reading has been spun forward beyond 99,999.9 to zero and then some youthfully low second-time-around setting.

In GM cars made after January 1, the odometer will exhibit a telltale color separation between the numbers if it has been picked. But, a GM spokesman admits, the buyer would have to be "a knowledgeable individual" to recognize the evidence.

Consumers Union engineers say one way of cutting down on tampering would be to make the odometer unit much less accessible, and possibly sealed in plastic. To be completely tamperproof, the speedometer cable would have to be sealed in two places—where it connects with the speedometer head and at either the transmission or the front wheel connection, depending on the car.

#### SOME PROBLEMS

This type of sealing might present some problems. To fix a broken odometer of this type, or to install a new one, would probably be impossible without breaking the seal.

"But," the article adds, "mechanics could be required to reseal the unit and verify the original mileage."

It concedes that enforcement might be difficult, yet "no more impossible than any other weights and measures regulation."

In the absence of tamperproof odometers and effective anti-tampering legislation, *Consumer Reports* says there may be limited protection for consumers in title registration laws:

"A used-car buyer in one of 41 states that require car titles to be registered—much as home titles are—might be able to certify the odometer reading with the car's former owner. But the process takes time and patience.

"For example, in Connecticut, a title-law state, any person may send any automobile's vehicle identification number (it's the same as the serial number) and \$1 to the Motor Vehicle Division, and computers there will perform a title search. With that information in hand, the prospective buyer can request verification from the last previous owner.

"The system isn't foolproof, certainly. The former owner is under no legal obligation to cooperate, and the dealer probably won't hold a car for you if a hotter prospect comes along."

There is no assurance either that other title-law states will make the same information available to the consumer.

#### ROAD TO RUIN

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, A. Q. Mowbray has written what I believe to

be one of the most important books this year, "Road to Ruin." Published by J. B. Lippincott, this well-researched, well-written work exposes the depredations of the 20th-century highwaymen that are pushing our runaway roadbuilding program.

The excellent review by Mary Perot Nichols, which appeared in the book review section of the Sunday Washington Post explains the importance of Mr. Mowbray's book and why it should be read by everyone concerned with preserving a livable environment. I am inserting a copy for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 1969]

#### FEEDING THE MANY-LANED MONSTER

("Road to Ruin." By A. Q. Mowbray. Lippincott. 240 pp. \$5.95.)

(By Mary Perot Nichols)

From sea to shining sea, America is being uglified by the most massive public works effort in the history of the world—the \$60-billion interstate highway program. *Road to Ruin* is a testament of what man hath wrought with this cataclysmic amount of money.

The Highway Trust Fund was set up by legislation in 1956. It is a perpetually filling pitcher of money which is derived from a one-cent tax on every gallon of gas sold and taxes on various other auto products. The more gas is sold, the more roads are built; the more roads there are, the more gas is sold, and around and around we go until we arrive at where are now—3,600,000 square miles of land surface with 3,600,000 miles of roads and streets; that is, one mile of street for every square mile of land. And that's not counting land for parking lots. As Mowbray points out, Los Angeles, with the most advanced case of asphaltitis in the country, "devotes an estimated two-thirds of its downtown land to the storage or movement of automobiles—about one-third for parking lots and garages and the rest for roads and freeways."

If there was to be a limit to this orgy of road-building, such as the proposed end of the Highway Trust Fund in 1972, it would not be so alarming. But, as Mowbray shows, the highway lobbyists and their political friends are promising bigger and better highway programs for the future. *Road to Ruin* is a good piece of propaganda for the cause of a balanced transportation system. But for those who have followed various community uprisings against highways in the press, there is little that is new. For the uninitiated, this compendium of highway horrors in Nashville, Cleveland, Chicago, Washington and other cities is useful and instructive.

Indeed, Mowbray's story of Governor Nelson Rockefeller's pet road, the Hudson River Expressway, is worth the \$5.95 price of admission. He also quotes the mayor of Tarrytown, New York, where the Rockefeller's have their fabulous Pocantico Hills estate. Said the mayor, the Expressway is a "crass abuse of gubernatorial power by Mr. Rockefeller, whose own lands stand to increase in value by millions of dollars while Hudson River communities are cut to pieces, while taxable properties are wiped out and all life irreparably disrupted."

Not only does this Expressway destroy the natural beauty of the Hudson shore (so much for Rockefeller's conservation image!), but it literally wipes out about 1,000 Negro homes in Ossining. Since there is no low-cost housing program in the area, the highway produces, in effect, Negro removal. (So much for the governor's civil rights image!) Even former Interior Secretary Stewart Udall comes off badly in the book because he caved in on the Hudson River Expressway—one of his last acts in office.

But when outrage is piled on outrage, it's a bit numbing. One feels helpless. The book could have offered more practical proposals on what to do about all this. A landmark court decision which awarded damages to a citizen who had his privacy and view ruined by a six-lane freeway gets short shrift from Mowbray. There have been other cases in the field that could have been touched upon. There have also been some famous victories against the highwaymen that should have been analyzed.

Inexplicably, or perhaps just as a mordant witticism, Mowbray mentions a bug that has been eating up highways in Australia. Is he recommending importing such a bug to American soil or just being funny?

He proposes amending the Highway Trust Fund so that some of the boodle can be used for mass transit. But this gambit has been tried and overwhelmingly defeated for the past three or four years. Too late for Mowbray's book, but offering a slight glimmer of hope is the proposal, embraced by Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe, to create a Mass Transit Trust Fund. Already, a bill introduced by Congressman Edward I. Koch of New York has attracted seventy co-sponsors. If passed, it wouldn't stop the automobile in its tracks, but it would initiate a countervailing power to the highway lobby. Once the billions start to pour forth from Washington, the Mass Transit Trust Fund will attract a cluster of businesses dependent upon it and congressmen willing to protect and increase it.

Mowbray's book is a good text on what is happening in this country because of our crazy, short-sighted devotion to a single mode of transport. An index would have been helpful, but that's a small quibble. With propaganda tools like this, the climate of opinion may begin to change. Who knows? Some day in the not too distant future, riding a train may be *avant-garde*.

The Hudson River Expressway, to which Miss Nichols devotes so much attention in her review, represents an incredible abuse of governmental power. The book describes extent to which New York's Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller has gone to advance this highway project, despite a clear conflict of interest in that it enhances his family's personal holdings at the expense of the broader public interest. This situation would be scarcely believable if the record were not so clear.

Since Mr. Mowbray finished his book there have been a number of even more amazing revelations regarding actions by the Governor, by the Hudson River Valley Commission, by former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, and by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In subsequent records, I will discuss these in greater detail. At this time, however, I would like to enter the section of Mr. Mowbray's book that exposes the expressway and its friends:

[From 'Road to Ruin' by A. Q. Mowbray]

#### CHAPTER 10—A ROAD FOR ROCKY

The battle over the Hudson River Expressway includes just about all the elements of similar battles across the nation, plus a few that are unique. The proposed route along the east bank of the Hudson River is being pushed vigorously by a Republican state administration; it is violently opposed by nearly all the affected communities; and it is viewed with unconcealed distaste by the federal authorities in Washington. It promises to enhance or to despoil an area of great natural beauty, depending upon whose testimony is being heard. The threat of wholesale displacement of people, mostly Negro, in one

community gives substance to charges of white racism. A proposed interchange threatens to destroy what is left of the once quiet charm of a riverside suburban village.

A citizens' group organized to fight the expressway is made up of predominantly upper-middle-class Republicans, the party that traditionally opposes centralized authority in Washington. Yet this group of Republicans found itself turning to a Democratic Administration in Washington for help in fighting the Republicans in the State House. Finally, there are the ugly charges that a patrician governor is twisting arms to build this expressway because it promises to increase the value of the lands in his private estate adjoining the proposed route.

In May, 1965, a bill was introduced in the Rules Committee of the New York State Senate and State Assembly providing for construction of a highway. "Beginning at a point on interstate route 503 in the vicinity of Beacon or in the vicinity of Wiccopee, to be determined by the superintendent of public works, thence in a generally southerly direction to the vicinity of Ossining and then continuing southerly, west of U.S. route nine, along or near the Hudson river to the north city line of New York, thence generally southerly and easterly to a connection with interstate route connection 512 in the city of New York, to be determined by the superintendent of public works."

In the controversy that developed over this proposed highway, its opponents charged that this bill was unique in several respects. First, its title was vague and nondescriptive, stating merely that this was a bill "to amend the highway law, in relation to state expressways on the state highway system," without stating the location of the proposed highway. Second, no sponsor for the bill appeared on the document; usually the New York State Department of Public Works is identified as the sponsor. Third, in violation of customary practice, no preliminary plan was announced and no public hearings held before the legislation was introduced. Fourth, the route numbers used in the description of the highway are the route numbers used by the Department of Public Works on its own internal maps; they are not the numbers found on any public maps, and therefore they are not likely to be meaningful to the casual observer. Fifth, a bill such as this is customarily accompanied by a supporting memorandum explaining the need for the legislation. No such memorandum was sent to the legislature until after the bill had passed.

Finally, the bill shot through the legislative mills with record-breaking speed. It emerged from the Rules Committee of the Senate and was passed on May 24. On the following day it reached the floor of the Assembly. Despite its vague title, Assemblyman Lawrence A. Cabot noted that the expressway would run through his district. He left the floor of the Assembly and called the district office of the Department of Public Works in Poughkeepsie, but was told the department knew nothing about the expressway or the legislation. He then called the department headquarters in Albany and was told that the bill had been "requested" by the localities along its route. Knowing that this was untrue, he hurried back to the floor in time to vote against the measure, but in vain.

Sensing a "railroad," Cabot asked Speaker Anthony Travia to recall the bill, but Travia said that a special courier was rushing it to Governor Rockefeller for his signature. The governor signed the bill on May 28, the same day that the supporting memorandum from the Department of Public Works reached the legislature. The memorandum was dated May 14.

So poorly identified was the bill that at least two state senators later admitted they voted for it in error, believing it was just a

routine highway study bill. Said one of them, "I have been deluded. I am ashamed."

A companion bill that received the same priority treatment provided for a 3.5-mile east-west spur expressway to connect the Hudson River Expressway with Route 9A about three miles to the east. This spur would run roughly along the northern edge of the Rockefeller family estate, and its ostensible purpose would be to remove traffic from Route 117, a winding, two-lane country road which cuts through the heart of the estate where the Rockefeller mansions are located. The spur has thus become known as the "relocated route 117."

Only two assemblymen voted against the highway legislation: Mr. Cabot, a Democrat, and Richard A. Cerosky, a Republican. The proposed Hudson River Expressway would run through their districts. After passage of the bill, Mr. Cabot had several private conferences with Governor Rockefeller, asking him to support repeal of the legislation or to modify the proposed route. The governor refused. Mr. Cabot also asked the governor for factual evidence supporting the need for the expressway, but Rockefeller replied that no traffic studies had been made.

The mayors of the towns strung along the east bank of the Hudson River in the path of the expressway unanimously condemned it. Shortly after the passage of the legislation, the mayors of Ossining, Briarcliff, Irvington, Tarrytown, Dobbs Ferry, North Tarrytown, and Hastings sent telegrams to their state legislators asking them to repeal the expressway act and chastising those who had voted for it: "Your vote in favor of this bill without consulting local communities and without considering possible effects of the route chosen is frightening."

The failure to consult with those affected was deeply resented. Said Assemblyman Cabot, "What irks me most is that the Department of Public Works introduced legislation affecting particular areas without any prior knowledge on the part of the legislators who are to vote on it." U.S. Representative Richard L. Ottinger, the young freshman congressman who gave strong leadership to the expressway opponents, complained, "No hearings of any kind were held. No notice was given to the public. The mayors of the villages to be affected were ignored in spite of promises by the governor that they would be consulted." Ossining Mayor Richard E. Purdue accused Governor Rockefeller of "bad faith, bad judgment, and bad public policy" in pursuing his "juggernaut tactics."

The citizens of the affected towns were equally outraged. Assemblyman Cabot reported that he and his fellow legislators received more mail on this issue than the combined mail on the sales tax, capital punishment, and birth control.

Rockefeller's state officials stood foursquare behind his decision. Westchester County Planning Commissioner S. J. Schulman declared that the expressway "will result in cleaning up the shoreline of the Hudson, and it ties in with the new federal highway program for beautiful highways and the state plan to clean up the waterways." Charles E. Pound, commissioner of parks, recreation, and conservation for Westchester County, also saw the expressway as an opportunity to "clean up the riverfront and provide a magnificent scenic drive." The opposition charged that Schulman and Pound were confusing beautiful highways with highways through beautiful areas, and that there were more effective ways to "clean up" a waterfront than to build expressways along it.

Schulman and Pound, however, were joined by all the state, county, and local politicians who owed their jobs to Rockefeller patronage or who simply were awed by the Rockefeller name. Strong support also came from the Westchester County Association, representing some 550 business organizations.

The newspaper nearest the center of the

storm, *The Tarrytown Daily News*, enthusiastically supported the expressway from the outset, pointing out that it could "add millions to area wealth." With its eye firmly on commercial gain, the newspaper urged its readers to "face up to facts. The expressway will be built. . . . Let's forget politics. Let's thank the governor for inking legislation that gives the project daylight. . . . Let's concentrate on building the project along the shoreline of the Hudson where it belongs."

During the gubernatorial campaign that fall, pressure on the governor reached such a pitch that he finally agreed to repeal the part of the highway act providing for the route south of Tarrytown. That part, he said, could be added later. True to his word, he did push the repeal, and it passed the following spring. The governor thereupon was accused by the communities north of Tarrytown of using divide-and-conquer tactics, since the opposition of the relieved towns south of Tarrytown would now be difficult to maintain at fever pitch. The only remaining bone of contention was the 10-mile portion of the Hudson Expressway between Tarrytown and Ossining, plus the relocated Route 117 spur along the Rockefeller estate.

Tarrytown, population about 12,000, and North Tarrytown, population about 9,000, lie along the eastern shoreline of the Hudson roughly 20 miles north of Manhattan's Central Park. The two towns, and their bedroom suburbs of Phillipse Manor and Sleep Hollow Manor, house a number of upper-middle-class citizens who commute to the city on the Hudson branch of the Penn Central railroad, whose tracks run right along the river's edge. The 3-mile-long Tappan Zee bridge brings the six-lane New York State Thruway across the Hudson just at the southern edge of Tarrytown, from which point it swings southward toward the city of New York.

Ossining, about 10 miles north of Tarrytown, has a lower percentage of affluent commuters; therefore a higher percentage of its population of 22,000 depends for its livelihood on local industry. Roughly 12 per cent of the population of Ossining is Negro. Dominating the town at its southern edge is the great, gray rock of Sing Sing Prison.

Just north and east of the Tarrytowns, at the heart of Washington Irving's beautiful and historic Sleepy Hollow country, is the 3,500-acre Rockefeller estate, which centers on the Pocantico Hills and stretches from the Saw Mill River Parkway all the way to the Hudson River in a narrow corridor north of Tarrytown. The mansions on the estate include homes for John, David, Laurance, and Nelson Rockefeller.

At one time, no doubt, Tarrytown was a lovely, quiet village nestled along the banks of the Hudson, with a splendid view of the majestic river rolling along at its feet. But the sleepy-village atmosphere was dispelled when the town permitted construction of a giant \$100-million General Motors assembly plant on the banks of the river. Assembled Chevrolets pour out of this plant in an unceasing stream, some on the tracks of the Penn Central, which run right through the plant, and others on truck vans, which thunder along U.S. 9 through the center of Tarrytown. A clog of traffic chokes the streets of Tarrytown during shift change at the plant; but the pounding of the heavy automobile vans through the streets is incessant.

From the opposite shore, the banks of the Hudson at this point and north toward Ossining invite the eye. The wooded land rises rather steeply from the water's edge, and the roofs of the villages interrupt the foliage in a pleasing pattern. A closer inspection, however, reveals no evidence that the river affords pleasure to the community. Its waters are heavily polluted, and the railroad tracks along its edge isolate it from the villagers. Its cluttered shoreline portrays the blight of neglect and careless waste disposal typical of so many American riverbanks.

At Tarrytown itself, the enormous gray complex of the General Motors plant completely destroys any scenic value that this section of the shoreline might once have had. Thus Tarrytown finds itself of two minds with regard to the proposed Hudson River Expressway. On the one hand, a planned interchange ramp going right down into the parking lot of the General Motors plant should siphon off plant traffic that now clogs the village streets. On the other hand, if the expressway is built, the town will all but disappear in the snarl of interchange ramps connecting the Hudson River expressway with the eastern terminus of the Tappan Zee bridge and the New York State Thruway. What is left of the town, once nestled securely in the scenic bosom of the Hudson, will be caught in the tentacles of two superhighways, with approach lanes and ramps running freely through its vitals.

A few weeks after the legislation for the Hudson River Expressway and the Route 117 relocation passed, a group of aroused residents formed a Citizens' Committee for the Hudson Valley and proclaimed that they were "unequivocally" opposed to the routes and prepared "to fight these proposed highways and any other future scarifying encroachments of the Hudson's remaining natural beauty, by publicity, by organization of community protests, and, where feasible, by legal action." The committee added that "urban sprawl, expressways, industrial ugliness are not needed in the Hudson Valley. This legislation is an act of madness. Our government has become the foe instead of the friend of the people." The first chairman of the committee, William Rodgers, declared that the proposed expressway would engulf a beautiful and priceless heritage in "automobile fumes, commercial ugliness, and technological progress."

Opposition to the expressway grew. In June, angry officials of the towns and villages along the route charged that the expressway would destroy the "quiet charm" of their communities, "slash real estate values, wipe out years of town planning, and burden their downtown areas with the roar and stench of heavy truck traffic." A representative of the town of Mount Pleasant said his first choice for the route would be "a half mile off shore and ten feet under water."

Support came from Washington. Interior Secretary Udall stated that such an expressway would seriously impair the highly scenic and historic values in the corridor. The Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation urged that the expressway be killed. "The construction of such a highway," it said, "serving commercial and industrial traffic as well as private automobile traffic, would seriously impair and destroy prime recreation values. It would destroy public access routes to the river necessary to scenic and recreation enjoyment."

On the contrary, said *The Tarrytown Daily News*: "We, too, believe in scenic conservation, but we also hold that . . . there should be roads—such as the expressway—that make it possible for the masses to enjoy this scenery."

The Hudson River Valley Commission, a regional planning group headed by Laurance Rockefeller, reported that the expressway would be an excellent means of providing much better "visual access" to the river for motorists. The Citizens' Committee thereupon asked angrily what kind of visual access it would be "when you are thundering along at 60 miles per hour between two high speed trucks?"

In reply to an anxious inquiry from Senator Jacob Javits, Governor Rockefeller counterattacked. Charges that the expressway would impair the beauty of the valley, he said, were "most idiotic" and most "viciously false." The governor promised that the highway builders would work closely with the Hudson River Valley Commission, "recently created on my recommendation,"

to "enhance" and "restore" the scenic beauty of the Hudson. "Some uninformed or deliberately misleading critics have characterized the proposed road as a 'truck expressway' and have conjured up the specter of a noxious, noisy 'gasoline alley' along the riverfront," Rockefeller fumed. "According to the studies of the Department of Public Works, the traffic on the proposed road would consist of more than 95 per cent passenger cars and less than 5 per cent trucks."

Editorial writers for *The Tarrytown Daily News* unswervingly touted the governor's expressway. One editorial warned: "Hysteria blocks progress and the rights of the majority. Its to be regretted that minorities nurse imaginary wounds. . . . We think thanks should be showered on the governor for planning now and not waiting until the area is more choked with traffic." Another said that "interference" from Washington would be overcome. "This is a sovereign state, and it is its right to build the expressway the way it will benefit all. If Washington will not contribute towards it, the state will finance the job itself."

As spokesman for the "hysterical minorities," William Rodgers condemned the newspaper for supporting a highway that would destroy community and esthetic values along the eastern shore of the Hudson. "We shall fight you," he wrote the editor, with sweeping Churchillian defiance, "in the legislature, over the telephone, in small meetings, in the streets, and along the beaches of the polluted Hudson until the end—or until there is no fight left in us."

Destruction of scenic values along the Hudson was only one of many arguments leveled at the expressway. But specific complaints about dislocation of people and businesses could not be formulated until the state released information about the exact route. So far, only the corridor had been defined in general terms. Not until June, 1967, more than two years after passage of the legislation, did the state publicly reveal detailed plans for the expressway. The Citizens' Committee later charged that the behavior of state officials during those years—statements issued and later denied, maps released and later disavowed—was purposefully designed to confuse and confound the opposition.

Many nasty accusations flew about during the long fight over the expressway, and the ugliest of all was the charge that Governor Rockefeller's desire to move in the bulldozers was born of a wish to increase the value of the land in his Pocantico Hills estate. The proposed relocation of Route 117 (also called the Pocantico Expressway) would run along the northern edge of the estate, through relatively inaccessible land. Over the years, the Rockefellers had obtained zoning changes in the northern parts of the estate, with the apparent intention of developing it with apartments, shopping centers, and office buildings. A relocated Route 117 would not only divert traffic from the areas near the family mansions, but it would send traffic into the areas marked for development. Some estimated that construction of the Pocantico Expressway would quadruple the value of the 3,000 acres in the northern part of the Rockefeller estate, which is some distance from the barbed-wire-enclosed family enclave in the south.

In addition to this, the intersection of the Hudson River and Pocantico expressways along the shore of the river would create a region of incalculable commercial value. The land to the north of this intersection belongs to the Rockefeller family.

Tarrytown Mayor Anthony Veteran has called the expressway plan a "crass abuse of gubernatorial power by Mr. Rockefeller, whose own lands stand to increase in value by millions of dollars while Hudson River communities are cut to pieces, while taxable properties are wiped out and all life irreparably disrupted. . . . This expressway is for the benefit only of the Rockefellers paid for

by public expense. It's a fraud from start to finish." William Rodgers, the first chairman of the Citizens' Committee, states bluntly that "the story behind this scandal is a singular demonstration of the avarice of the very rich."

The governor has repeatedly denied that his interest in the expressways is in any way connected with personal financial gain. He has denied, in fact, that the relocation of Route 117 would improve his family's property. And in a cynical attempt to avoid responsibility for a proposal that he all too obviously initiated, the governor told the press that he had "no choice" but to support the recommendation of the State Department of Public Works. As Mr. Rodgers notes, the mind boggles at the picture of the billionaire governor of the Empire State knuckling under to a decision by his own highway department affecting the welfare of his own baronial estate.

Although the rest of the Rockefeller family has not commented publicly, there are reports that other members of the family are opposed to the Route 117 relocation. According to one member of the Citizens' Committee, the governor has said ruefully, "My brother John isn't even speaking to me" on the question.

State employees are unanimously loyal to the governor, as one might expect. In a press interview in January, 1966, Joseph P. Ronsan, administrative deputy in the Department of Public Works, admitted that there were "political" overtones in the whole subject. "They all think Rockefeller is pushing this 117 thing for personal reasons, but it just isn't so. There has been no pressure from the governor on this matter. None."

The innuendos continue, however. Ossining's Mayor Purdie stated baldly: "The proposed road is more than just another state highway. It is an outright investment in the North Tarrytown property of Governor Rockefeller." *The New York Times* noted that "the old two-lane road winds close to the homes of three of the Rockefeller brothers—the governor and Laurance and David Rockefeller—and a replacement for it has been sought by some members of the family since 1932." An irate member of the Tarrytown Board stated publicly that the benefits that would accrue to the property owner at the junction of the two proposed expressways would "make Senator Dodd look like a kid stealing green apples."

Representative Ottinger wonders why the "unnecessary and extravagantly wasteful expressway has been pressed with such unseemly haste and cloaked in such strange secrecy?" "What is it for?" he asked in a public meeting. "Whose interests will it serve?" He promised that, before any construction could proceed, federally sponsored hearings would have to be held. Then, he went on, "the question of who benefits from this road—and how—will be fully and publicly explored."

The Taxpayers Association of the Town of Mount Pleasant, in which the bulk of the Rockefeller estate is located, is also highly critical of the governor's part in the Route 117 relocation fight: "It is well known to many persons in Mount Pleasant that the Rockefellers have been trying since 1932 to have Route 117 relocated. They want truck and automobile traffic through residential park and the hamlet of Pocantico Hills, which they own, reduced as much as possible."

"One look at a map of the proposed relocation indicates it has been designed to cross the estate where it will do the least amount of damage and will be far removed from all Rockefeller homes. . . . When the Governor commented that the revised alignment of the road would result in less cutting-up of properties, he was entirely right. It would—his family's. He failed to mention that the hiking and equestrian trails he said would

be protected are wholly within the Rockefeller preserve.

"Also omitted from the Governor's remarks was reference to the commercial zoning the Rockefeller sought and obtained now in the vicinity of the new expressway. . . . This zoning was revoked by the Mount Pleasant Town Board last January as being inconsistent with the semi-rural atmosphere of adjoining areas. At the hearings, a spokesman for the Governor's family said the Rockefeller did not object to the rezoning, but 'they do think, however, that rezoning should be deferred until the route of the spur [Route 117] is determined.' Does this signify the disinterest or displeasure the Governor would like the public to believe his family has in the 117 relocation?"

"The Mount Pleasant Taxpayers Association objects to the Governor's repeated assertions that opposition to the relocation is politically motivated. Mount Pleasant citizens of all political persuasions, like the preponderance of citizens everywhere, aware of the facts, are shocked by the ruthless manner in which the 117 relocation and Hudson River Expressway were rammed through the Legislature . . . and are aghast at the questionable way in which these roads are being given top construction priority."

At the public hearings on the Hudson River Expressway held in February, 1968, an opponent of the highway stood up in the rear of the packed Ossining High School auditorium, and, with the aid of a bullhorn, shouted to District Engineer M. Nicholas Sinacori, who was presiding, that, in view of the fact that Mr. Sinacori worked for Mr. Rockefeller, whose private real estate interests were involved in the decision, Mr. Sinacori should disqualify himself to chair the hearing. An aide to Mr. Sinacori left the stage, walked up the aisle, and gently quieted the obstreperous citizen.

In the spring of 1966, a carrot was added to the stick behind the Hudson River Expressway. The state announced plans to build a 4-mile-long riverfront park between the expressway and the river, complete with sand beaches, marinas, bicycle and hiking paths, fishing piers, and plenty of parking space for automobiles. The opponents of the expressway were inclined to agree with *The New York Times* editorial stating that this plan sounded like "elaborate window dressing" designed to make the expressway more palatable to the residents. Of course, the park was a fine idea, and would be a big step forward in the badly needed rehabilitation of the banks of the Hudson, said the editorial. But this should be done without building an expressway; the two were entirely separate questions.

At the February, 1968, hearings in Ossining, detailed plans for the park development were unveiled. Artists' breathtaking renderings showed vast green areas containing badminton and tennis courts, swimming pools, fishing piers, a marina for 400 boats, picnicking areas, a restaurant, a golf course, hiking trails, and, of course, parking space for 2,000 automobiles. When the full sweep of the scene was uncovered for the thousand residents jamming the school auditorium, many of them laughed cynically. "It's great," shouted one, "but where are all the ferris wheels?" Another citizen asked, "Why can't waterfront parks be built along the Hudson without an expressway?" The school building rang with applause.

In his testimony at the Ossining hearings, John G. Mitchell, chairman of the Staten Island Greenbelt Natural Areas League, questioned the "sincerity of the state in its proposal to combine this truck route with a waterfront park—built, incidentally, on fill into the river in total disregard of the river's delicate ecology. The paradox of picnic tables and passing trucks is all too familiar to us. The state recreation planners also envisioned such incompatible uses for the

Staten Island greenbelt—a hiking trail, if you will, 70 feet from a 55-mile-per-hour parkway!"

Another speaker suggested that the riverfront park could easily be built without the highway. He turned to District Engineer Sinacori during the hearing and told him that, as a gesture of good faith, the state of New York should publicly declare its intention to build the park, even though the expressway should be defeated. The state, he argued, should not hold out the park "as some kind of lure, or prize." The boisterous applause drowned any reply that the engineer may have wished to offer.

In the late summer of 1966, the Citizens' Committee uncovered a report by the State Department of Public Works issued four years earlier over the signatures of Superintendent J. Burch McMorrin and District Engineer M. Nicholas Sinacori, in which the Hudson River route for an expressway was rejected as unsound. The report argued that the river route "would confine costly facilities to a narrow corridor without provision for the greatest traffic needs of the region."

If the expressway was such a bad idea in 1962, the committee asked, why was it suddenly the solution to the region's traffic problems in 1966? The committee implied that the Department of Public Works, against its better judgment, was knuckling under to pressure from the governor. During the remaining years of the controversy, the committee returned again and again to this question, but heard no satisfactory answer.

In June, 1967, more than two years after passage of the enabling legislation, state officials sponsored the first public "information meeting" on the expressway. According to one witness, the meeting was "jammed to the rafters with more than a thousand people." The opening presentation by highway officials was interrupted with "some applause, jeering, yelling and laughter." The hero of the hour was Representative Ottinger, whose long, impassioned condemnation of the proposed highway route was greeted with enthusiastic applause at every other sentence and a standing ovation at the end.

The legislation for this highway, said Ottinger, had been rushed through the legislature in an "extremely unusual—not to say irregular fashion." Since that time, plans for the highway had been "shrouded in mystery." Ottinger had repeatedly asked the governor and his representatives to explain the need for the expressway. The answers, he said, ranged from the "unresponsive to the ridiculous."

Ottinger heaped derision on the argument that the highway would benefit the region by making available filled land in the river for recreation purposes. This justification, he said, was spurious, ridiculous, and self-contradictory. Can't they think of cheaper and more effective ways to provide parks and recreation lands, he asked, than to build a six-lane commercial expressway? The claim that the expressway would enhance the scenic resources of the river valley, he said, was a "desperate and dishonest effort to justify the project after the fact."

The congressman noted that the state was just then in the process of going to the voters for approval of a \$2½ billion bond issue for transportation, most of it to be spent on highways. This money, he said, could be used by the state to build highways without recourse to federal aid and thus without the need to comply with federal requirements. If the state was planning to use that means of ramming through the Hudson River Expressway, said Ottinger, it would fail, because the approval of two federal agencies would still be required. The expressway was to be built for about half its length on fill in the river, and the law clearly stated that this required approval of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Also, a bill sponsored by

Ottinger and passed by the Congress the previous fall required that any decision by any federal agency (the U.S. Army included) affecting the Hudson River Valley had to be reviewed by the Secretary of the Interior, who was already on record in opposition to the Hudson River Expressway.

Ottinger called for curbs on the unlimited state powers of eminent domain. "The state," he said, "cannot be permitted to just crash around the countryside, dividing villages, destroying homes, wiping out whole sections of towns, desecrating natural resources, without any effective check."

At the June meeting, James C. Harding, commissioner of public works for Westchester County, presented forecasts of traffic demands to justify the need for the Hudson River Expressway. He also defended the "cloak of secrecy" in which the state and county agencies had wrapped their plans for the highway. It was a very difficult thing, he said, for engineers to take the public into their confidence during preliminary design stages. The minute anything is announced, the engineers are "deluged with requests for information as to just where it is going to be located. This, they, of course, do not know, until preliminary investigations, designs, etc., been completed." It is impossible to present a highway project to the public without drawing criticism from "some group or other."

As for Secretary Udall's statement that the Hudson River Expressway would impair the natural beauty of the valley and destroy public access routes to the river necessary to scenic and recreation enjoyment, Mr. Harding replied that "this is ridiculous. Where is there any adequate public access to the river now between Ossining and North Tarrytown? Where are there any recreation areas? How can any public access or recreation areas be provided except by means of a road similar to that proposed?"

Community leaders in Ossining and Tarrytowns had been arguing for years that the traffic problems existed in the towns, not along the entire 10-mile route between the towns. They had long ago prepared an alternate plan which included construction of bypass routes around the towns, connected by an inland route using an abandoned roadbed of the New York Central, bordering the eastern edge of the Rockefeller estate. This plan, the mayors claimed, would be far less disruptive of existing property and would cost less than half the estimated \$115 million for the expressway. State officials unswervingly treated this proposal with disdain.

Eight months after the June meeting, the state held the first official public hearings to unveil detailed plans for the Hudson River Expressway. During the twelve hours of hearings, which heard testimony from some seventy persons, only three spoke in favor of the proposed highway. These February hearings clearly delineated the destructive route of the bulldozer. Of the 9,000 residents of North Tarrytown, 853 would lose their homes—nearly 10 per cent of the population. Also in the path of the highway were thirteen businesses and a 2½-acre park including a children's playground. The tax-assessment value of the property scheduled for demolition exceeded half a million dollars.

Altogether, it looked as if Tarrytown would lose \$2 million in assessed valuation, including public and private waterfront property, an insurance company, many homes, a firehouse, a recreation facility, the state police barracks, parts of two schools, Washington Irving and Tarrytown Board Clubs, the village's Losee Park, a commuter parking area, and several additional business sites. This was an impressive list for a village having a population of only about 12,000 persons.

A clergyman testified that most of the displaced persons in the Tarrytowns were low-income families. Those who owned their homes lacked the means to buy new ones. Many, however, were tenants who would be

forced to find new homes to rent. These did not exist. After four years of operation, a full-time urban renewal director with a staff in North Tarrytown had been able to place five or six families. "How are they going to find places for 900 people," the clergyman asked, "when a full-time urban renewal director has been able to find only five or six?"

The expressway threatened to plow through the Negro section of Ossining, displacing a quarter to a third of the entire Negro population of the town. Of the thousand or so persons threatened with displacement, about 90 percent were Negro. The ugly accusation was that Ossining Mayor John Donzella looked with favor on the expressway for this very reason—that it would wipe out a large section of the Negro community. "Wipe out" would be accurate, since Ossining, with a population of some 22,000, has no low-cost housing program. As one witness said, "The consequences of these displacements can not be other than a forced departure from the village of Ossining."

The first night of the hearings, the Ossining NAACP distributed handbills designed to look like circus posters. In big, black Barnum-and-Bailey type, they shouted: "Welcome to Rocky's Magic Road Show Featuring The Hon. J. Donzella. Guaranteed to be the Greatest Sleight of Hand Show on Earth. See Gov. Rockefeller & Mayor Donzella Make 1,000 Black People Disappear. See Gov. Rockefeller's Concern for Ossining's Black Residents Evaporate Into Thin Air! See Ossining Mayor John Donzella's Relocation Housing Program Vanish Before Your Very Eyes!!!"

William B. Rascoe, president of the Ossining NAACP, charged that the officials of the village had repeatedly refused to entertain any proposals for relocation housing. The expressway, he said, would "slash into the very heart of the community, destroying the homes of hundreds of Negro families. To all intents and purposes, these are plans for Negro removal." The village government, said Rascoe, sees the expressway as "an opportunity to get rid of hundreds of its Negro residents."

One Negro resident deplored the "total disregard for human lives that has been displayed by the governor, the State Department of Transportation, and, last but certainly not least, the village government of Ossining." At the conclusion of his testimony, he read a statement prepared by his wife:

"The outlook of over 200 families in the village of Ossining is one of bleak despair, a despair compounded with frustration at the injustice this road would bring to most of those families, who are Negroes. The history of the Negro people in the United States has been one of bitter rejection, of a continuing struggle up the economic and social ladder of this land to achieve some degree of self-respect and sense of accomplishment. Some have succeeded in overcoming the barriers thrown up in their paths, and through almost superhuman effort have managed to take a place in the mainstream of American life.

"This is what many of the 200 families have done. Homes obtained after many years of privation and self-denial are being threatened by this proposed highway. According to this plan, the road would cut through the area where the majority of the Negroes in this village have purchased homes. These are families who have achieved stability through prudent use of their meager resources—families who wanted to assume full citizenship, its rights and responsibilities. A number of the people threatened are elderly, retired people, who cannot hope to purchase again to replace those homes acquired while actively employed.

"These people lend dignity and worth to any community, and if they are forced to leave their homes, Ossining will be poorer spiritually and morally for their departure.

The proposed highway would wipe out much of the stable Negro community while retaining blighted slum areas. Such action would only add discontent and anger among those residents who could lose what incentive they have for forging ahead.

"It is not our desire to stand in the way of 'progress,' but is progress to be measured only by the number of motor vehicles that thunder along a six-lane highway at 60 miles per hour? We love the Hudson and are moved by its grandeur and beauty. What mechanized juggernaut roaring along its banks can appreciate the river? Is not the human element worthy of consideration? Cannot New York State truly be the Empire State and concern itself with social justice as well as super-highways? This great state must surely put man before motor."

It may be more than just coincidence that, during the tumultuous days following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., racial tensions reached near the explosion point in Ossining. Students left their classes in the high school and ran through the corridors. Several hundred of them massed in Main Street, blocking traffic for three hours. But property damage was held to several broken windows, and there were just a few injuries to Negro youths. Only quick action by a Negro neighborhood youth corps director and officials of the Ossining Interfaith Council for Action and the Afro-American Teens took the steam out of the impending disaster.

Negroes weren't the only minority group threatened by the expressway. The lines drawn by the highway engineers passed right through Sing Sing Prison. One citizen commented wryly: "Now that I see that the expressway is going to pass through Sing Sing Prison, I hereby resolve to make an extra effort never to be found guilty of a felony in New York State, and I hope that the State Department of Transportation will show the same resolve."

As the second night of the hearings came to a close well after midnight in the Sleepy Hollow High School in North Tarrytown, and the echoes of the jeers and hisses died, all possible debate and dialogue seemed exhausted. But the big questions still remained. Would the state of New York use part of its \$2.5-billion transportation bond issue to build this expressway wholly with state funds and thus avoid a possible federal veto? Would the Hudson River Valley Commission, the regional planning group created by the governor (and now headed by Alexander Aldrich, the governor's cousin) approve the plan for the expressway? Would Interior Secretary Stewart Udall weaken in his opposition to the expressway, as Representative Ottinger had warned? Would the nearly unanimous hostility displayed at the public hearings persuade the governor to change his plans for the expressway?

Several months later, in July, 1968, one of these questions was answered, and a hint was dropped about another. The Hudson River Valley Commission unanimously approved the plan for the expressway, a decision that was a surprise to no one. Also predictable was the reaction of Representative Ottinger, who protested that the decision made a "complete sham" of the Commission's assignment "to encourage the preservation, enhancement, and development of the scenic, historic, recreational and natural resources" of the valley. The Commission, he said, had "allied itself with the violators of the river."

The hint was dropped by a New York state official who declared that the expressway would be financed from state funds.

By the end of the year, yet another question was answered: Stewart Udall's opposition collapsed. Further studies by his Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, he said, had concluded that the Hudson River Expressway would not "unfavorably affect the scenic, historic, or recreational values" of the Hudson

Valley. In a letter to the Corps of Engineers, Udall wrote that the Department of the Interior would not stand in the way of the necessary dredging and filling along the river's edge. He did ask, however, that the work be done carefully to prevent "undue siltation and turbidity in the Hudson River."

Udall's about-face, one of his last official acts as Secretary of the Interior, comprised what *The New York Times* called a "victory for Governor Rockefeller but a defeat for the public." Representative Ottinger was incensed. "I just don't believe that any self-respecting Secretary of the Interior could impartially conclude that a six-lane highway is an advantageous use of the resources of the Hudson River," he fumed. Udall, he went on, must have "succumbed to pressure growing out of his long-time close relationship with the Rockefeller family."

The Citizen's Committee for the Hudson Valley, which had worked for so many years to thwart the governor, joined forces with the Sierra Club and the NAACP to decide whether a court action offered any hope as a last-ditch measure. At the time of this writing, that decision had not been made.

#### THE FORGOTTEN MINORITY

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, NBC News in Chicago recently televised a program that clearly illuminated the plight of children in our school system who cannot speak English.

In particular, this timely program called attention to the severely inhibiting forces that blunt the intellectual development of Spanish-speaking children in the United States. In our city of Chicago, 400,000 Spanish-speaking Americans live and work. Their children attend Chicago public schools and more than 50 percent of those children drop out of school because the language barrier eventually becomes insurmountable.

Without question, the most urgent problem which faces the Nation today is the breakdown in communication between the many different minority groups, age groups, and interest groups, which together comprise the very fabric of our society.

Competent bilingual teachers who do not speak English as their native language can help to build the bridges which are needed between school and community, just as bilingual education itself can help to restore the linguistically disadvantaged American to his rightful place in our society.

While the 91st Congress intends to improve access to effective programs of bilingual education, educators can be instrumental in creating a climate of opinion in States and local communities which actively support our attempts in Congress to insure that no man is excluded from an excellent education because of his cultural heritage.

Diversity has traditionally been one of our Nation's great strengths. The interplay of cultures has provided a constant source of those new ideas which are necessary for continuing progress and the renewal of our national energies.

Bilingual education is an affirmation of the value of this heritage from the past; it is also a promise to the future—a future in which all Americans may share in the development of a society in which diversity is cherished as a national asset.

Harry Mantel, of NBC News in Chicago, produced and wrote this brilliant documentary concerning the enormous conflicts confronting Latin American children in our schools. In spotlighting the need for effective bilingual education in Chicago's schools, the program invites similar inquiries into other American school systems. The problem is not isolated to Chicago alone.

Chicago's NBC affiliate, radio station WMAQ, and Mr. Mantel have performed a notable public service in producing this important documentary. This is radio at its very best. I am pleased to announce that WMAQ has agreed to make this tape available to any radio station that wishes to focus similar attention in this very important problem of the "Forgotten Minority."

Mr. Speaker, the full text of "Forgotten Minority," telecast in Chicago on May 25, follows:

#### FORGOTTEN MINORITY

##### ACT 1

Producer-writer: Harry Mantel.  
Director: Robert Sprentall.  
Technical supervisors: Harry Dinaso, John Hoffman.

Narrator: Bill Lindsay.  
(Open cold.)

LINDSAY. Good evening. This is Bill Lindsay. There is a tragedy in the education process in Chicago . . . a crisis that concerns an estimated one out of every ten Chicagoans directly. Unlike the Blacks, the Latin Americans have not protested violently against the machine-like process of gearing them to failure in Chicago's high schools. By age 16, unable to cope with the English language . . . the majority of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban and South American children will legally drop out of school at the rate of six out of every ten. This is the hopelessness facing Roberto Contreras and thousands of other Latin American school children each year in Chicago. They have not been taught English . . . They are the silent minority—the Forgotten Minority.

(Theme in and under.)

ANNOUNCER. Forgotten Minority—A Special Report!

(Theme up and under.)

FACTORY WORKER. 16 (almost unintelligible.)

JUANA CERDA. Most of the students go gambling in the rooms or in Morris Hall and in the Lawrence Room they are always gambling. They lose their money. They don't buy their lunch. They rather spend their money gambling.

MARY BUCH. The teachers do not communicate with the students . . . and I guess in a way they're afraid or maybe they just don't care. Like for instance in the auditorium of the school you see students drunk either by liquor or by pot.

JOHN MENDEZ: They keep on kicking me out for hardly any reasons. Then I don't get no grades on my report card. They said they can't give me none. I had hardly gone to school and I had hardly gone—and they keep kicking me out. When I first went to school they didn't give me no books . . . and they said they don't have no more books—and I can't study . . . or nothing.

(Music.)

LINDSAY. There is a sense of futility that hangs over the Latin Americans who live in

this city . . . their population is estimated as high as 400 thousand. Chicago once meant for them hope and a means of finding a better life. A better job and education for their children—a better life than they lived in Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, South America, or Texas. There was belief when they migrated to this city the language barrier would be overcome. But belief too often has become despair. Before Bruno Escamilla quit Harrison High school he admits he was a trouble maker; he had no communication with his teachers; the English language was a frustration. Now at age 22, married, unskilled, he is determined to return to school, but not in Chicago.

ESCAMILLA. I'm going back to Texas and I'm going to school over there because here is like a rat race you know. You get home and before you know it, it's time to get up and go to work again.

REPORTER. What do you think you can accomplish in Texas that you can't accomplish here?

ESCAMILLA. Well, there's a lot of chances over there. They've got a lot of schools. They got a lot of trades that offer to you to go back . . . and educate myself again. Over here I don't even know where to go. I don't even know where to go and ask for some information for courses that are valuable to me.

LINDSAY. It is painfully difficult for a Spanish speaking student to answer for the English speaking teacher whom he fails to understand. The teacher does try perhaps the best he or she could under the circumstances. But the language gap is still there, and there is little effort by the board of education to provide bi-lingual teachers in the high schools.

MAGDALENA GARCIA: The board of education knows definitely, dead definitely that we need bi-lingual teachers. We need bi-lingual counselors. Our teachers . . . now in the United States . . . shameful . . . and disgracefully they get a degree only to open a door to a job and be behind a desk but not to work within the school classes and the children as children. As far as I'm concerned if we want a better America we have to wake up and accept human beings as human beings and accept them with the two languages and try to understand them. We cannot understand human beings until we start to level with them and accept them before we can really work with them. If they can't communicate with the students, they can't communicate with the parents, they can't communicate with anybody for that matter without the Spanish speaking language, and yet they try. The only thing they're doing is humiliating them so that they can push them out of school.

LINDSAY. The charge that Latin American children are being pushed out of high schools was made by Miss Magdalena Garcia, a hospital technician, who fortunately was able to overcome the language barrier. Now she fights for those who fail.

(Music in and under.)

LINDSAY. One of the Latin Americans in Chicago, Roberto Contreras, aged 15, refuses to flunk out or drop out of Harrison High School. He is determined to remain in school regardless of his failing grades because he believes he can succeed if only he can lick the language barrier. Roberto discusses his plight with NBC Reporter Frank Rios:

RIOS. (Speaks Spanish).

ROBERTO. The problems is that the teacher not speak two languages . . . English, Spanish . . . but my problem is my counselor . . . He don't know how to speak Spanish. But I don't know how to speak English good. I understand a little, but no more . . . and you know other . . . friends . . . he told me the school is not good. I don't know why. The school is beautiful . . . but the teacher he no . . . (breaks into Spanish).

RIOS. You came from Mexico to this coun-

try and you were anxious to study because you knew science technology was more advanced.

STUDENT. (Answers in Spanish).

RIOS. You believe now . . . what is the most difficult problem that you find in this country.

ROBERTO. (Answers in Spanish).

RIOS. The language barrier and the teachers.

(Music in and under.)

LINDSAY. Roberto Contreras and the thousands of other Latin American children despair over the language barrier, finally raising their voices in anguish. Hoping for help whether it comes or not. But no longer are their community leaders silent . . . Vociferously they demand an answer to this dilemma . . . Forgotten Minority . . . A Tragedy In the Education Process—continues after this message:

(End act one.)

Music in and under.

LINDSAY. A major focal point for Latin Americans in Chicago is the Emmanuel Presbyterian Church at 1850 South Racine Avenue on Chicago's West side.

(Music: Seque to church choir, then choir under.)

LINDSAY. Here in the Pilsen neighborhood, in the shadows of old Chicago, the community today is mainly Mexican. The Emmanuel Church encourages the Mexican residents to do much for themselves in learning English and running their own community organizations. Their church choir sings in both Spanish and English, any attempt to drop their heritage is frowned upon.

(Choir: Up and seque into adults learning English, then bring adults under.)

(Voices: "Where are you from . . . I'm from Mexico . . . etc.")

LINDSAY. In the evening class underway now, one sees only adult Mexicans and the Anglo lady teacher. The absence of their children is apparent.

(Voices: Seque into "Hi Joe, how are you, Hi Joe, how are you. I got a new job yesterday. Fine, thanks, etc." Establish then under.)

LINDSAY. The city of Chicago has taught English to foreign speaking people for more than 50 years in evening schools. The classes can be conducted in the city's churches as well as in public school buildings. However, there is a school board requirement that each member of the class must be at least 16 years old, which only by coincidence is also the state's legal dropout age.

(Voices: Up and seque into adults learning Spanish . . . then under.)

LINDSAY. Long time Chicagoans living in Pilsen area know their neighborhood has changed and that this change likely will continue. Rather than fight it, they've joined it. We hear their class learning Spanish from the wife of one of the two ministers. Right now they're conjugating Spanish verbs.

(Voices: Up and under . . . then out.)

LINDSAY. Perhaps as many as 400 thousand, or more, Latin Americans live throughout the city of Chicago. Although estimates of their numbers do vary, there is one statistic that remains fixed in the minds of their community leaders. The dropout rate for their youngsters in Chicago's schools is about the same as New York's Puerto Ricans. About Sixty Percent. Six out of Ten. Perhaps shackled the rest of their lives by the language barrier and ignorance. Their parents and leaders are terribly concerned. But not all of these are Latin Americans. The Reverend Henry Murray is one of the Emmanuel church's two ministers. He's an Anglo. He sees another reason for the dropout.

MURRAY. There are two types of dropouts in one sense. One type is the youngster who comes from Mexico or Texas speaking little or no English and for whom the school is a hostile environment that is not able to communicate with him at all because of com-

plete lack of bi-lingual staff people and particularly Latin American staff people who are sympathetic to his cultural adjustment problems. The other type of youngster is the youngster who has a good facility in English, but because of the lack of sympathy of the school system . . . because of what really in a sense is a kind of racism in relation to the Latin American, ends up being pressured and harassed and eventually forced out of school.

(Music: Establish and under.)

LINDSAY. What can be called the quest for equality underlies a growing barrage of complaints from the Latin American communities. They detest the melting pot ideology. It frustrates their individuality. One of the Pilsen residents is Jose Castillo, father of five, a machinist, born and raised in the United States:

CASTILLO. It seems like the teachers have a very great lack of interest in the Latin American students. I know for a fact that years back the Latin Americans were mixed with other nationalities such as the Italians or the Irish or the Polish or what have you . . . and they were all accepted as individuals by themselves but when a great number of them together . . . they seem that the people feel not a great desire to be with them. They don't give them an opportunity to do what they want to do. They want the people to get out of school totally unprepared to go work on the docks, to work on the railroads, to work driving a truck. They don't have any opportunity at all.

(Music: Up and under.)

LINDSAY. Mrs. Grace Gonzalez is a Chicago public school teacher. She believes that a monolingual and monocultural society are absolutely wrong. She speaks for thousands who want Latin Americans teaching their children in Chicago. Mrs. Gonzalez contends that the school board is dragging its heels.

Mrs. GONZALEZ. They keep telling us that there aren't any teachers who are qualified. Well, if they would just look around, look in their files they would find that there are people of our nationality that can go in there and be counselors and be teachers and have a feeling toward these children that apparently up to now they haven't had as is evidenced by the dropouts that we have in our community.

(Music: Up and under.)

LINDSAY. Chicago's failure to provide bilingual, bicultural teachers and educational administrators to serve its Latin Americans has drawn the anger of Mrs. Mary Gonzales, mother of two.

Mrs. MARY GONZALES. Many people have the thinking that a Mexican is lazy first of all, that he's asleep, that he's under his big sombrero taking a siesta in the afternoon and is not concerned with what is going around, what is happening around him. Well, the only thing I would like to say at this point is we're not asleep, we're waking up. We're going to move, and the school, the board of education is either going to have to wake up and realize that we are here and admit that we are here and accept the fact that we are here and work with us . . . or we're going to work against them until we get what we need in our schools.

(Music: Up and under—take out at will.)

LINDSAY. Mrs. Josephine Mendez, mother of seven, worries about her 15 year old son, John, failing in school. She claims the teachers don't care about the kids . . . she says the kids roam the streets not wanting to go to school . . . and get suspended for as much as 30 days.

Mrs. MENDEZ. I think they should let us know in time when a child is absent or cutting classes they should let us know the same day. They have our phone number in the office. They should let us know right away, not a month later, when it's too late . . . then when we do take them back, they've been cutting for a whole month, you know.

We don't want them here, we don't want to bother with them.

(Music out.)

LINDSAY. About one third of Harrison High school's three thousand students are Latin Americans, most of them of Mexican origin. The school is only one of about nine high schools in Chicago where Latin Americans are concentrated. But the problems of one are reported to be similar to the problems of the others. A leading community voice in the Harrison school area is the Reverend Jose Burgos, co-pastor of the Emmanuel Presbyterian Church. The Reverend Burgos says he has lost his patience with the school board for its failure to provide bilingual teachers and for the deepening frustration of parents in the school offices, where only English is spoken. He does not want to see the Latin American culture abandoned in his community.

BURGOS. We would like very much to have PTA's run in Spanish with some leader of the community to chair the PTA and be open to the whole community to voice all their problems and their concerns. We would like courses in Latin American history there. We feel that identity is one of the greatest problems that our people need. We need people that can have some self respect. We need people that can be identified with their own background and to be proud of it.

(Music: In and under.)

BURGOS. The Latin Americans are in the same cage that the Afro-Americans are. I think that the problems of the Latin American are worse than the problems of the black. And I say this because we are not the second class citizens we are the third class citizens. And I say this because the blacks, Afro-American people, now have a greater representation on the board of education. They have greater representation at City Hall. They have greater representation in places of responsibility . . . while the Latin Americans are at the bottom of the scale in this kind of representation. Our voice has not been heard. That's why they call us the silent minority.

(Music: Up and under.)

LINDSAY. Chicago's Latin Americans are gradually taking the posture of the city's Afro-Americans in their determination to achieve equality. One school official dissecting the crisis of the Latin American dropouts in Chicago frankly stated: "We have been seriously derelict at the high school level . . . This was just never discovered." Forgotten Minority—A Tragedy in the Education Process—continues after this message:

(End Act Two.)

LINDSAY. The language barrier at Harrison High and the critical dropout rate are thorny problems for the district school superintendent, Al Cheatham. Since taking his post one year ago, he has received a steady stream of complaints about the lack of bilingual education and the futility of the job future facing Latin American students. He sadly admits that the problem has recently fallen into focus.

CHEATHAM. It is obvious how difficult a task it is for our youngsters to try to manage the matter of learning English as well as to understand their course content. To this and we have moved to ask our superiors to immediately begin planning with the committee for the institution of a program designed to provide the educational skills necessary for our students who are Spanish speaking. By that I mean we want a full scale bilingual educational program designed for our high schools.

LINDSAY. It appears that Al Cheatham, too, may join the ranks of those frustrated. Chicago does teach English as a second language to Latin American school children, but only in the elementary school. Edwin Cudecki (Kuh-deck-ee) heads the TESL (tess-uhl) program and also directs the division of

foreign languages. He says there is some tutoring for some Spanish speaking students at several Chicago high schools, but there is no bilingual program throughout the system because of a lack of money. Cudecki says the school board does not have enough funds; and the money available from the federal government through Title Seven of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act falls far short of what Chicago has requested.

CUDECKI. We submitted a preliminary proposal in December of 1968 for approximately a million and something dollars which would have included bilingual centers in the elementary school as well as at the high school level and some of the high schools singled out were Harrison High School, Tuley High School and Wells High School to give a greater service than what we're able to do now. This preliminary proposal was cut down to \$79,000 which means we can establish two bilingual centers and at the bilingual conference, sponsored by the U.S. office of education in Washington, D.C. among the guidelines is one that suggests that the bilingual centers begin at the elementary school level to insure the success of the program. And with the limited amount of funding available, we preferred trying to make this program a success because we have to convince many people, many administrators, many lay people in fact of the need for such a program.

LINDSAY. There is a great deal of continuing criticism leveled at the school administration for failing to budget a bilingual program to the high schools . . . for those falling bewildered children who soon will join the unskilled labor force. One critic is Chicago Congressman Roman Pucinski, chairman of the house sub-committee on general education and co-author of the bilingual education act.

PUCINSKI. My fear is that the Board of Education has a false sense of priorities and I'm not willing to accept their excuses, their alibis. I think the time is long past due and they ought to recognize that there are certain serious trouble spots in our educational system. And the Latin American community is one of them. These young people do have a very high intellectual capacity. They're not illiterate . . . and it would be a great mistake to write these young Latin Americans off as being incapable of absorbing the learning process. They are fully capable. Their only problem is that they do not understand English . . . and it would seem to me that if private language schools can teach you how to speak Spanish in a matter of 30 or 40 or 50 days under a high concentrated course, it would seem to me that the board of education would adopt the same policy in reverse and put in these high density, high pressure English language courses in high schools where you have your high concentration of Latin American youngsters. To me, this is dereliction at the highest level and I am perfectly unwilling to accept the alibis and excuses. The educators are going to have to learn that they can't write off every single problem we have with the alibi that there's no money available. There is money available. There's got to be more prudent use of the money that we have available.

LINDSAY. The charge that there is ignorance of the Latin American school problem at high level of the administration was perhaps borne out when a top official was asked for a reply to the community's complaint. The person he suggested to answer the charge turned out to be one of the persons who was doing the complaining. Miss Dolores Guerrero is one of the six Spanish resource teachers now working with thousands of Latin Americans in Chicago's high schools. Their task is not so much to teach them English, a logistical impossibility, but to try to get them through high school and onto a trade school or college. Miss Guerrero has knocked on many official doors in her frus-

trated efforts to develop a logical program of language training in the high schools, where the language crisis exists more so than in the elementary schools where there is a TESL program.

GUERRERO. The problem is not the academic achievement. The problem is the language—only the language—because some of these kids that come from Mexico, from Puerto Rico . . . are already in that level. They don't have to come to the United States to learn how to add and subtract . . . they know this already. What they need is the communication of the regular classroom, following directions, getting into a more advanced material. But if they don't have the basic need of communication, how can they further any education if they don't know the language. It's like anyone going to China and being on a high school level and not being able to continue his education because he doesn't know Chinese.

Rios. How can they surmount this language barrier?

GUERRERO. If programs with intensive English classes were given this will solve the problem, and they probably would have to go as basic, as audio-lingual, first listening, comprehension, then reading and writing. But, if they are exposed to reading and writing without having the basics of comprehending and speaking how can anything be accomplished.

(Music: In and under.)

LINDSAY. A leading authority on the learning process says "When we talk about a dummy . . . we're saying that a person can't do something that we expect him to do . . . so we all may be dummies on a football field . . . or in a course in nuclear physics . . . our expectations for a child are such that we normally label practically 50 percent of the children who come into the schools as dummies . . . because we're expecting them all to do what the average child can do." By that definition, the youngster we heard earlier, Roberto Contreras, who is failing his courses at Harrison High, could be considered a dummy . . . if he has to respond to problems in an environment where only English is spoken. Roberto says he was a good student in Mexico, before he came to Chicago. He took a job in the city to help support himself and went to school expecting that he would be able to learn from his teachers. But he quickly learned one thing . . . that he spoke only Spanish and not English while his teacher spoke only English and not Spanish. Under these conditions it is rather difficult to learn American history, geography, science, mathematics and English rhetoric. Roberto discusses his problem in the best English he knows with a community leader, Juan Morales:

MORALES. How do you feel about the system? Do you think that we have to have somebody who will be able to communicate with you?

ROBERTO. Well, I no got it . . . (talks in Spanish).

MORALES. You have nobody to communicate with you . . . are you planning to leave the school? (translation in Spanish).

ROBERTO. No . . . well, he's told me he's got many children. My friend, she told me . . . I don't come to school, but I don't speak English. See my problem. The answer to my problem . . . are on the class me talk to the other teacher in English. You told me be quiet you don't speak English. You know I don't understand much in English.

MORALES. What grade are you in?

ROBERTO. In second grade.

MORALES. In second year.

ROBERTO. Well, I would say . . .

MORALES. Robert, where do you come from?

ROBERTO. Monterey, Mexico.

MORALES. Were you grades good in Mexico?

ROBERTO. Is good in Mexico . . . and here they are on the . . . not good . . . but I don't speak English and any teacher who

told me I don't speak English . . . you got an F . . . well Okay . . . but my teacher in English now told me in Spanish . . . you got an F . . . you got an F . . . well okay.

MUSIC: IN AND UNDER

LINDSAY. Roberto Contreras wants to become an engineer. He'll be lucky to finish a Chicago high school. NBC News wondered about his real ability and aptitude, but those tests used by the school board are given only in English. We, therefore, had Roberto and 11 other Latin American children, most of them potential dropouts, tested in Spanish . . . to see what their learning abilities really are in their native tongue. Forgotten Minority—a Tragedy in the Education Process—continues after this message.

(End Act 3.)

(Music: In and under, out at will.)

LINDSAY. Any parent whose child was considered a dummy might naturally be concerned about the child's undiscovered abilities and potentials. Educators agree much of the learning potential remains below the surface of fulfillment, like the bulk of the iceberg that lies below the surface of the water. The problem of communicating to masses of minority children is not unique to only Roberto and other Latin Americans in Chicago . . . a similar problem exists for the city's Indian children, the migrated Southern Whites, the Blacks, Why the communication gets bogged down by dialects and concepts. In the case of the Latin American, NBC News with the cooperation of Science Research Associates, had Roberto and 11 other children from Harrison High school, many of them potential dropouts, tested in both Spanish and English. Although the results were predictable, the documentation was believed to be necessary.

The one group of 11 children were a cross section of Latin Americans in various grades of the school. All were having trouble with their courses and it was doubtful that the seniors in the group could qualify for college even if they wanted to. The battery of tests given by S.R.A. indicated that if Spanish were spoken the group had the ability of making at least average grades through high school. Average grades . . . as compared to the poor or failing grades they are getting. Two highly qualified consultants from Science Research Associates analyzed for NBC News the capabilities of Roberto. First, Dr. C. G. Gray:

GRAY. Roberto is an interesting case. He's one of millions that we see as we travel around the United States. Roberto is the case of a boy that comes from a home where they speak Spanish and Roberto is very fluent in Spanish . . . He has very little English. He is attempting to function in a school situation where English is the dominant language . . . so that Roberto is functioning as far as school goes as a retarded child would function. Whereas, Roberto is actually a very capable person. So we tested Roberto in Spanish with directions and all that he understands . . . and his test scores indicate that he's probably in the top quarter of the population as far as ability goes. Yet when we test him in English, Roberto will fall in the bottom quarter or next to the bottom quarter . . . and as far as working in a school situation where everything is done in English, Roberto will continue to function in the bottom quarter level, which probably means he'll fall most of his work in English. . . . Whereas if he were . . . if he knew English and could work in English on the same level in which he could work in Spanish he could be functioning as an above average student . . . probably as an honor student.

LINDSAY. The solution to the problem suggested by Dr. Gray is already an accomplished fact in Miami, Florida in the Dade county school system, which has received special funds appropriated by Congress to educate the Cuban refugee children there.

However, other areas of the country where Latin Americans have concentrated . . . New York City . . . Chicago . . . Southwest Texas . . . Philadelphia . . . for example . . . are not as fortunate as Dade county and they must rely entirely on funds from local taxes, state aid or stringently measured help from Washington . . . under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Earlier we heard that Chicago's request for more than one million dollars under this act was slashed to 79 thousand dollars. The money for Roberto and the others may not be there at this time, but nevertheless what should be done to save these children? Dr. Gray answers:

GRAY. The same thing that should be done for Roberto that's done for any student who has this problem . . . and there's millions of them . . . that have this problem. Before you can learn anything in any kind of situation you have to start at the point where the child is and take him from that point. All right, Roberto is expected to function in English so that the first thing that we can do for Roberto, if we're going to continue his school instruction in English . . . the first thing we can do is teach him English. Then when he is understanding English, then he can learn . . . in English . . . and with any student, regardless of what the language problem is, you first have to overcome this before you can teach him what you're trying to teach him. Now if you want to teach him in Spanish . . . then his learning problem is removed. With a child as capable as Roberto is, my guess is that probably six months of concentrated effort in learning English would have him functioning at a very capable level in English.

LINDSAY. Dr. Thomas Edwards, Dr. Gray's associate, has worked for many years on the problems of culturally disadvantaged people, traveling and meeting teachers throughout the United States, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. He was "trying," as he says, "to pinpoint very specifically the nature of the problem." As he puts it, "there is not only linguistic isolation but also a cultural isolation . . . isolation from the mainstream culture . . ."

EDWARDS. We have deluded ourselves into assuming that we have a melting pot culture but we don't. There's an awful lot of emotional stuff that a youngster has deposited in his early childhood experiences and if we tell a Puerto Rican youngster knock off the Spanish you're in America, just turn your back on that—and also on all the other aspects of his indigenous culture you're forcing him really to go through a traumatic experience of self hatred, self rejection, rejection of his parents, his peers, and this whole warm security blanket culture that has spawned him. My feeling then is that it's highly possible and very desirable for these youngsters to become cultural straddlers so that they can operate with equal ease and efficiency in their own indigenous culture as well as in the mainstream culture of the United States. And, ultimately become citizens of the world—so that they become tricultural if you will.

(Music: Bridge.)

LINDSAY. A British sociologist and social educator, Richard Hauser, says, "the solution is to avoid allowing the young people to be failures, trained in a failure atmosphere, in a failure school and in a failure area." Five years ago, Hauser says a government study group declared that half the children in Britain are failures because the educational system is not reaching them. Is the educational system of Chicago reaching its children? Dr. Thomas Edwards, a Negro, says he was convinced through high school that he was a dummy. He said his achievement expectancy level was so low that he was sure he was a dummy. He said he only snapped out of this sense of failure after his teacher said something positive and sincere to him that led to his motivation to write, and he says he hasn't stopped writing since.

EDWARDS. We can make a mistake if we focus our attention too exclusively on the language problem and not consider how the youngster feels about himself as a member of a minority group . . . and a Black kid . . . as a youngster from Spanish speaking background or whatever . . . kind of cultural isolate he is . . . and he's likely to have a very depressed level of aspiration. He might say who am I . . . I'm nobody . . . I'm neither fish nor fowl . . . I'm not Anglo . . . I'm not Spanish . . . I'm nothing and this can be very, very damaging how the youngster feels about himself. He won't aspire because he's not convinced that he can achieve. His achievement expectancy level is very low. I doubt that this chap Roberto realizes that he has a learning potential . . . If we don't look at the totality of the psychological development of this youngster in terms of his attitude toward himself and society we're going to have all this wasted manpower . . . brilliant people . . . who are doing nothing. In a society as great as ours I think our undergirding philosophy is that everybody should enjoy self fulfillment . . . and they're not happy people who feel like social rejects.

(Music: Up and under.)

LINDSAY. The conclusion of Forgotten Minority—A Tragedy in the Education Process—after this message.

(End Act 4.)

(Music up and under.)

LINDSAY. Less than a year ago Chicago's schools were decentralized into three major areas each with its own director of human relations. On the North Side's Area C, Juan Cruz is a specialist in the problems of Latin Americans who attend six high schools. Here, like Harrison on the West Side, the dropout problem is just about as serious. Cruz says there are about 100 Latin American organizations in the city of Chicago, each trying to help the Latin American children get through school. But he points out that most of these groups work independently with very little political power to speak of and they have no alderman in the city council. From his own sources, Cruz believes there may be more than 400 thousand Latin Americans living in Chicago, although the city's own estimate is in the neighborhood of only 150 thousand. The next census should reveal the correct number. Cruz says that the Mexican and Puerto Rican leadership are trying to merge to form a united group, and they are trying to get the other Latin Americans to join them. The purpose obviously is to achieve political power and to bring an end to their educational tragedy and numerous other minority problems. Cruz also attacks the melting pot myth:

Cruz. We are facing the cultural assimilation of the students where our youngsters have learned to behave in certain ways. They have acquired attitudes that are peculiar to the Latin American society and then when they come into the schools where the teacher has middle class values, the Anglo Saxon type of attitudes, then we are asking our youngsters to divorce themselves completely from this Latin American culture. It is detrimental to their learning and to the personality. Right now our Puerto Rican and Mexican youngsters are looking to find who they are. They're asking who am I. I'm neither Latin American. I'm neither Anglo Saxon—Therefore, I'm not an American.

(Music up and under.)

LINDSAY. I am not an American, I am not an American. How many young Latins; how many young blacks; how many young whites, feel such alienation for our society? School officials say the answer to the problem is money. They warn that almost 8 thousand Chicago teachers may be fired this year unless the schools get more money. But is it enough of an excuse for failing to solve . . . or at least attack problems . . . simply by saying " . . . we need more money". Some suggestions have been made in this program: A crash program to make Latin American children proficient in English so they may

learn other subjects in that language . . . Teachers proficient in two languages, knowledgeable in two cultures, able to reach youngsters trying to adjust to a different society. Chicago's great universities might provide part of the answer . . . special programs, or volunteers. The Latin Community might provide volunteers as it wishes to do and as it's done in the Miami schools. Even the state's teaching requirements might be amended for this crisis. It would seem that almost any effort is better than no effort at all. This city . . . this country . . . beset by so many other difficult problems cannot afford to lose so many potentially productive citizens simply because they do not know English . . . to lose six of every ten youngsters growing up in the Forgotten Minority.

(Music: Up and under—Student saying cannot speak English, I don't understand English etc.)

ANNOUNCER. This has been a special report, "Forgotten Minority, a Tragedy in the Education process." Reporter, Bill Lindsay. Field Reporters, Harry Mantel and Frank Rios. Technical Supervisors, Harry Dinaso and John Hoffman. Director, Bob Sprentell. Producer-Writer, Harry Mantell.

(Music: Up to fill.)

#### THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CRIME

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most critical problems facing America today is our staggering crime rate. I have received numerous letters from deeply concerned constituents regarding the imperative importance of action to halt the upward crime spiral on all levels, from the purse snatcher to the Mafia extortionist, and am most pleased that the new administration has decided to give this matter prompt and detailed attention. The following article by my distinguished colleague from Virginia, Hon. RICHARD H. POFF, briefly summarizes the major thrust of the administration's new programs and I include this statement in the RECORD:

#### THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CRIME

President Nixon's message on Organized Crime is the first preplanned, coordinated, systematically-organized attack the nation has attempted on the problem. It is bold, imaginative, innovative, and yet realistic and altogether responsible. It recognizes that the jurisdiction and responsibility are shared jointly by the Federal, state and local governments and it does not attempt to blink away the unblinkable fact that more citizen safety is going to cost the citizens more money. The expenditure increase of FY 1970 is the only increase made in any agency of the government by the new Nixon budget.

I am particularly pleased that the President has endorsed new witness immunity legislation. We now have more than 50 such statutes on the federal law books. For a variety of reasons, these 50 are now practically useless. The National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws has recommended a universal witness immunity law applying not only to courts and grand juries but to Congress and executive agencies of the government. It will employ a new concept. More importantly, it will facilitate a new function. It will greatly enhance the information and evidence-gathering capacity of the federal law enforcement establishment.

I am also pleased that the President sup-

ports the policy announced earlier by the Attorney General. The Achilles heel of the organized crime apparatus is its vast treasure houses of property and money. Those treasure houses were filled by income acquired illegally and surreptitiously in violation of both federal and state laws. Needless to say it is money which has not been declared for federal tax purposes. Moreover, it is the money from these storehouses that has been used by organized crime to invade the world of legitimate business enterprise.

The President and the Attorney General intend to target upon these treasure houses, using wherever possible the antitrust laws of the techniques illustrated by the antitrust laws.

Initially, the principal thrust will be against the largest single source of income, namely that derived from illegal gambling. The Wagering Tax amendment bills introduced by Senator Roman Hruska and I can be helpful in this effort. Our bills are designed to fill, so far as it is legislatively possible to do so, the void in law enforcement left by decisions in the Marchetti and Grosso cases. Beyond this, the Attorney General shortly will submit a draft of a new statute bottomed upon the interstate commerce clause, which makes professional gambling in areas where it is unlawful under state laws a Federal crime as well. The definition is so structured as to focus federal concern principally upon the gambling mechanisms of syndicated crime rather than upon the conduct of individuals. The new statute will recognize the problem of official corruption in connection with gambling. The simple fact of the matter is it is difficult for illegal gambling apparatus to grow big enough to operate profitably without the active cooperation of law enforcement officials in key places.

I was impressed that the President understands the organized crime problem enough to refrain from pledging that his organized crime program will eliminate organized crime. Those knowledgeable in the area agree that no single law and no package of laws is likely ever to be wholly successful. This is because the dimensions and complexities of the problem are in many respects beyond the capacity of any government, but a government so powerful as to be unacceptable to America.

#### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY MUDDLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, we hear many internationalists praising international finance—always apologizing as to why it must work or how it should work. Seldom do we hear scholars on finance who dare suggest the true answer to the problem—the return to a gold standard.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD Dr. Harry Schultz' paper "The International Monetary Muddle" from the June 14 Human Events:

#### THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY MUDDLE (By Harry Schultz)

The world has been preoccupied with international monetary problems for several years. Crisis follows crisis and each one threatens to be the complete collapse that only pessimists are meant to forecast.

The scene is chaotic, with endless national and international actions being taken, each one making the man in the street more con-

fused. Governments emit nonsensical blurbs to minimize the appearance of bedlam and to cover their own footmarks. The press faithfully reproduce government views, seldom questioning their logic, and ignoring like the plague any thinking from the right wing.

Britons and Americans alike have been brainwashed over a period of years to believe that they (the private citizens) are the cause of the problems . . . that their idleness reduces exports, their greed increases imports and their shortsightedness results in low savings, high consumption and highly speculative investments.

Individual actions are blamed for balance-of-payments crises which reduce confidence and provide a playground for the supposed big bad wolf, the speculator who rocks the boat by selling weak currencies and buying strong ones. Incidentally, anyone who invests in anything is now categorized as a speculator rather than an investor.

Our politicians would have us believe that the solution lies in making speculation ineffective. If we produce an international currency we can demonetize gold (which we are assured is worthless anyway). So what are they waiting for? Fortunately there are a few apostles of logical thinking left in the world and they are digging their toes in at the Alice-in-Wonderland attitude taken by most world monetary authorities who even seem unable to agree on what they want, let alone on how to achieve it.

Any hope of a future situation of genuine stability lies with those individuals who believe that a satisfactory and permanent monetary system could exist if based on sound principles. It is quite untrue that no such permanency can be achieved simply because no previous system has lasted forever. If you build a house on sand it falls, but if you build one on rock it lasts, if not forever, at least for several hundred years, and most of us would opt for that sort of a system.

Before we can build our proverbial house we must understand what is sand and why, and what is rock and why. Clearly most of our present leaders are unaware that there is a difference between the two.

#### THE SCENE AT THE MOMENT

The international monetary system is the means by which transactions across national boundaries are financed. The balance of payments of any country is the external accounts of that country, and it records all money leaving the country to pay for goods and services purchased abroad as well as all money coming into the country to pay for goods and services purchased by foreigners.

A German buying goods in England cannot pay the English manufacturer in marks, as these would be useless in England. What the German must do is change his marks for pounds and pay his debt in pounds sterling.

Each and every such trade requires a monetary exchange transaction to finance it and this requires that there is a rate at which all currencies can exchange. Under the gold exchange system (under which we live) these rates are fixed versus each other and versus gold, and it requires that individual nations have stocks of internationally acceptable payments media: i.e., gold or convertible currencies, if they wish to trade freely. If they do not have such stocks, then their trade may be limited to direct exchanges of goods, which are unwieldy and limit trading potential.

Some may ask: but why the need for trade? The answer is that without international exchange our living standards would be greatly reduced. This seems to be one point agreed on by all economists. Trade enables specialization and a far higher level of production from the available resources in the world. It also works for a leveling of living standards throughout the world. If

you limit trade, the discrepancy between developed and underdeveloped, between rich and poor must widen.

Countries add to their reserves when they export goods and services and reduce them when they import. Reserves can be held in any currencies, but since the last war the dollar and pound sterling have been the principal currencies used for this purpose.

The pound has been used mostly by those countries which are in the sterling area, many of which made big loans to the United Kingdom during the war and which now look upon these debts of the U.K.'s as their reserves. Other countries have relied on the dollar, immediately after World War II seemed to have achieved an unassailable position. Gold is also used as a reserve asset, although some countries have relied on it more than others.

Since the Bretton Woods Conference of 1944, which laid the foundations of the present system, the U.S. dollar has had its price fixed vis a vis gold while other currencies are usually quoted in terms of the dollar and so, indirectly, are related to gold and each other.

The various exchange rates cannot move more than 1 per cent away from parity (their fixed price) in either direction, because when they do, the government in question is required to move in and buy its own currency if the price is falling or sell it if the price is rising. Unless the country has the stocks of gold and convertible currencies just mentioned, it obviously could not maintain the value of its currency in this way.

The price of gold, the dollar and other currencies has been held steady by the U.S., which has guaranteed to buy and sell gold at \$35 an ounce. This was intended to give absolute stability to the whole system.

Since Bretton Woods aimed to give stability why, one might ask, has it failed to do so? The visible signs of the recurrent crises are that the reserves of some countries are running out or seem liable to run out. These countries have and do continually (or on balance) spend more abroad than foreigners have spent with them. Deficits in the balance of payments have been financed by the countries in question paying out of their reserves until they have reached the point where they could no longer do this.

When this point comes into view, all and sundry can see that the value of the currency may be changed and anyone who holds that currency will worry about the loss in purchasing power he may suffer if the currency is devalued.

No one wants to see his capital drastically reduced overnight, and under IMF regulations any readjustment must take place either overnight or over a weekend. A country cannot (say the rules) continually make small changes in the value of its money, but may occasionally make a fairly major readjustment when all other measures to stop the outflow of reserves have failed.

We have had this very situation in the U.S. and U.K. After the war the U.S. had what seemed to be unlimited reserves and a huge trading surplus. But now she faces a payments deficit . . . and when government-subsidized trade is deducted, an increasing deficit at that.

For example, Common Market steel exports to the U.S.A. increased by 38 per cent in the last half of 1967 and voluntary quotas are now being discussed with major steel exporters to the states in an effort to aid U.S. domestic production and sales.

Although the U.S. claims to be the top-ranking nation in the individual gold-holding-nations cup, this position is largely a government confidence trick. Her true total gold holdings probably do not now exceed \$5.8 billion (after gold claims and gold loans are deducted), or only enough to cover less than one-third of her direct overseas dollar claims, and less than one-sixth of indirect dollar claims.

The U.S. has been forced over the years to stop first her own citizens from trading in gold (at any price) and now she has had to *virtually* give up the fixed gold price of \$35 per ounce.

Since *admitting* to this would have been tantamount to a dollar devaluation, a two-tier system was set up by which the official rate is still \$35 and the major central banks agreed to deal at this rate. The U.S. will only supply gold to these banks at the fixed rate, or at least that is how it goes in theory. But analyst J. F. Smith's description is more accurate of the system as it is *in fact* practiced: "Instead of calling this a devaluation, it is called a two-tier system on the pretense that the official book figure of \$35 is still a price even though (virtually) *no gold is sold to anyone at that rate.*"

All other gold is called non-monetary gold and can be bought and sold (by the citizens of those countries which permit it) at the free market price. In fact, this too is a farce. The U.S. having previously (and strenuously) persuaded other countries to hold dollars rather than trade them in for gold, now not only manages to pressure central bankers not to ask for gold at the official price, but also tries to get as much gold (other people's) sold on the free market as possible so as to hold that price *down*.

A case in point here is the U.S. refusal to buy (or let IMF buy) South African gold at \$35 an ounce in the hope that this will force it onto the free market. They seem to have had some limited success here.

The U.K. has the same sort of problems. It has those huge debts abroad which originated during the war and have been added to ever since, by borrowing abroad (so as to be able to support the parity of the pound sterling at home). Her reserves are pitifully small and could not *begin* to pay off all her overseas debts. So a run on the pound, for any reason, tends to rock the international boat.

Many countries have staked their savings on the system set up at Bretton Woods and have felt they must be very tolerant of the U.K.'s economic problems. These allies have endlessly lent money (or refrained from withdrawing their reserves) in the hope that Great Britain would put her house in order and that the crumbling fabric of the international monetary system would survive.

Not least of these loans was the infamous Basel Agreement of 1968 (if it can be called an agreement, for no one will say definitely if anything *was* agreed) by which huge sums were ostensibly put at Britain's request. They were in practice a loan to pay off other loans at best and at worst they were nothing but a public relations smokescreen. The confidence that this bought was fleeting and it only took another month of bad trade figures to bring back the gold gloom (and a lower pound price).

We have finally reached the point where people are beginning to realize that loans only worsen a bad situation and put off the reckoning for a few more weeks. The U.K. and the U.S. are virtually bankrupt and this despite the 1967 devaluation which was supposed to set the pound back on its feet.

Those countries which hold a large part of their reserves in pounds and dollars are realizing that their hard-earned savings will soon be reduced again unless a solution is found and so they frantically meet time and again to discuss the situation, but with no visible success as yet.

Each time there is failure to find a permanent solution, another loan or gimmick has to be found to support the parities of key currencies, and each one gives yet another gasping space to be followed by yet another crisis. Every loan is a burden placed upon the back of the people and the U.K. would appear to have achieved a position now from which it is almost impossible for her to extricate herself. Her debts are so large that it will take a surplus of 40 mil-

lion pounds (\$96 million) every month for 3.3 years to get rid of them and Wilson's government has just had to admit that the payments deficit for 1968 was in excess of 500 million pounds.

Many burdens are imposed on the country in a misguided effort to cure the payments deficit and as a manifestation of good intent to impress past, present and possible future creditors. The additional controls and burdens that the British people have accepted during the last four years are astounding. Exchange controls have been put on all external movements of money; prices and wages have been frozen or tightly subject to government regulation, and all the time taxes are going up, and money is becoming more expensive to borrow.

Selective Employment Tax (that most unwarranted and unpopular of all British taxes) was inflicted in an effort to encourage exports and discourage home consumption—but it has simply raised costs and administrative expenses. Tax surcharges and purchase taxes leap like March hares (only more regularly), and all in the name of reducing the deficit, yet the deficit spirals relentlessly upward in defiance of all actions and controls.

It is surprising that most people have not yet paused to wonder whether we might be walking in the wrong direction, whether we are perhaps mistaking sand for rock. When you are looking for an address and cannot find the way, you ask somebody; but after asking the way 10 times and never finding the information to be correct, you begin to question the understanding of the informants.

When are the people of the free world going to begin doing this? When are they going to realize that those who direct the way do not know the way, let alone realize that they must make a 180-degree turn before they find it?

Until they understand the *basic forces* which determine the international and national economies, they will never find the way. This necessitates a discussion about problems which may seem far removed from the balance of payments. But we must understand why there are payment deficits before we can stop them, and those who are in the driving seat at the moment seem blissfully unaware of how the motor (which drives them along) operates. Modus Operandi Ignoramus.

#### THE CAUSE OF THE PROBLEMS

Our governments are fighting basic economic forces and wonder why they do not win. After World War II each currency was given a fixed price versus gold and versus each other; i.e., the value of goods and services in each country was fixed versus those in all other countries and exchange rates were the rates at which trade could take place.

Now it would have been very *clever* if all these rates had proved just and proper at that time (which they were not), but for them to have truly reflected the value of each country's goods and services *forever* would have been a *miracle*. Individuals *change* continually, economies *change* far more continually and less predictably (they are run by governments), so how can exchange rates, or the tradable value of goods and services remain the same forever? No rational person should have expected that they would, and indeed they have not.

The reason they have not done so is that the value of money in some countries has been eroded faster than in others. Governments find themselves unable to resist offering their electorate greater and greater benefits (mirages) in an effort to stay in power, but in order to carry out these promises even partially they have had to find a lot of money from somewhere.

They have taxed part of it from the rich to give to the poor, but it has not been possible to get enough in this way and so

governments have been forced to borrow. There is a distinct limit to the amount they have been able to borrow genuinely from private individuals who wish to save and trust the government with their savings. In fact, this source seems now to be drying up on them completely.

As confidence in the British and American governments has waned, the price of bonds has collapsed, thus forcing up the rates of interest payable on it. The governments can *dictate* the amount they want to borrow, but if they do this they give up all control over interest rates. And for both political and economic reasons it makes no sense (even to our mad hatters) to force interest rates into the sky.

No, they have been unable to tax enough or to borrow enough from genuine savings, so they have had to resort to the lowest of the low, and in a court of law it could be called stealing, but in polite political circles the end product is called inflation.

Governments have borrowed from the banks, who have used the resulting government bonds as *collateral* against which to increase their reserves. These measures have been undertaken in part in pursuance of the mirages "everything for everyone" and in part on the neo-Keynesian theories of keeping the economy buoyant. The moment there appears to be a downturn on the way, badly financed government expenditure is undertaken to try to alleviate the situation.

Unfortunately, however, the second prerequisite of deficit financing is conveniently forgotten. In the ensuing upturn the money created during the depression is never recouped. The money supply rises *constantly* (In Great Britain it rose by 9.9 per cent last year) and if you increase the money supply, prices must rise.

It may be fashionable to say here, "Ah, yes, but not, if the velocity of circulation is reduced," and this is theoretically true, but the pressures of inflation increase velocity rather than reduce it. The private sector sees the value of money falling so it will not increase savings and will not invest unless interest rates, potential capital gains or tax benefits are huge. It tends to spend now in case prices are higher next year.

The government in the U.K. has, over the past 20 years, tried to blame inflation (i.e., the fall in the value of money) on the banks which it was said were able to increase the money supply by constantly increasing loans. But this is no longer produced as their alibi. Banks can increase the money supply, but they are also bound to decrease it again. They cannot permanently increase it unless they have a permanent increase in deposits.

The politicians have realized that they can no longer hold the banks responsible for our inflation, so they have turned to the theory that the spendthrift individual citizen constantly increases the velocity of money turnover.

Admittedly, the faster the rate of inflation the faster will be the velocity of circulation, as witnessed by the 1920's hyper-inflation in Germany, but—and it is a big but—why should velocity of circulation increase when the value of money is not falling? In other words, monetary circulation only increases after inflation has set in, but will not start it by itself. Indeed, it can only increase indefinitely if inflation is rife because under normal circumstances; i.e., with no inflation it may alter slightly (seasonally) but it returns to normal again.

To hear the modern politician speak, you would think that velocity of circulation proceeded upwards and only upwards by a ratchet-like process. This is nonsense and it is quite ridiculous to blame it for an inflation that has plagued us for 20 years.

Demand cannot pull up prices unless there is a permanent increase in the money supply over and above any increase in output of goods and services. Neither can costs pull

them up unless the same situation prevails. Since the banks cannot cause this increase nor can anyone else, we are left with government as the only possible culprit. Governments have done this either because it was the *only* way they know or because it was the *easy* way to finance the schemes that they judged their electorate needed or demanded. So they have had a vested interest in attempting to convince us that their expenditure produces wealth and equality while at the same time persuading us that we are the culprits; that we, not they, are to blame for causing inflation.

Henry Hazlitt in his mini-book, *Life and Death of the Welfare State*, goes into the relationship between the idea of a welfare state and the value of money in some detail, and I urge you to read it. Perhaps it suffices to say that any effort to introduce a welfare state (or a free or semi-free state providing welfare for all) cannot produce either wealth or equality. It cannot do so because it cannot offer a *choice* of service to the individual and it produces no *competition* between suppliers. It is expensive to run and has no built-in efficiency incentive.

A voucher system of providing social services for the *really* poor (as advocated by the Institute of Economic Affairs) would be much cheaper and would offer choices. In America a very costly social program is being undertaken to help all families below the official poverty line. In fact, 43 per cent of these families own an auto and 4 per cent own *two*—they would be the upper middle classes in England and would be the *rich* almost anywhere outside Europe.

It is because all these well-intentioned schemes waste resources and also put continual pressure on governments to create money that we are in such trouble now. The Viet Nam war is often blamed for all American problems, but this is quite stupid, as it is only responsible for a quarter of the gain in government expenditure since 1960. Civilian outlay has risen 50 per cent faster than the military and eight times faster than the population itself.

Herr Blessing has said that gold crises will occur *continually* until and unless the Anglo-Saxons stop inflating. In Henry Hazlitt's words, "All these schemes are unsound and in the end all of them will prove futile. The truth is that no solution of the monetary problem, national or international, will be possible until inflation is stopped and that will not be stopped as long as we have the Welfare State."

So long as we insist upon inflating we must have payments problems. When the value of money is reduced faster in one country than in another, that country must lose exports and increase imports. Its goods will, at the fixed rate of exchange, seem ever more expensive to the foreigner and vice versa.

Because the overseas accounts of each country must balance in practice, gold or convertible currencies must leave the country in the event of a so-called balance-of-payments deficit. As the reserves dwindle, so does world confidence in the ability of the monetary authorities concerned to hold the parity of the currency. This position was reached in the U.K. in November 1967 and devaluation took place.

Since then there have been endless rumors about the waning strength of the dollar and ultimate disaster was only warded off temporarily by the erection of the two-tier facade.

France also, despite seemingly enormous reserves, was nearly brought to her knees by internal troubles. Had she *not* put her faith in gold over a period of years one does not like to think what might have happened during the spring riots of 1968. She lost \$1.4 billion worth of gold during that spring but still had \$4.6 billion left with which to stave off a further crisis in November 1968.

When any major power reaches the sort of position outlined above, there must always be a crisis under our present gold exchange system. No one wants to see their savings de-

valued and so they must remove as much as they are able from the offending currency as soon as its devaluation seems likely (or even possible). The system is inherently unstable and the instability is usually blamed on an "irrational" preference many people seem to have for holding gold rather than paper money.

Government actions (whether joint or separate) to alleviate the position of various currencies as they became weak, have tended to have entirely the wrong effect, simply because the governments and monetary authorities involved do not understand what is causing the trouble. They are not generally bad men, but sophisticated ignorance can create as much havoc as evil intentions and certainly this has happened in the international monetary sphere. World authorities seem to look on investors and dealers of any sort as the big bad wolf who is just waiting to eject the whole world into chaos so that they can benefit.

Every man has a right to protect his property and most people would agree that creation of this climate *should* be the first role of every government. But most governments today are doing precisely the opposite. They want to *forbid* people to do it themselves, which must add up eventually to national and/or international suicide.

None of the controls imposed in the name of payments surpluses can fulfill their objectives. If funds are not free to move around the world, the world in general will not benefit from the successes of individual countries whether technical, managerial or whatever. The poor nations remain poor and most of the richer nations see their riches wither away. Also the individual payment position will not be improved.

The first point is that any such act is likely to invoke retaliation and this in turn leads to a general movement towards isolation, protectionism and shrinking world trade. Secondly, it may improve the immediate position while creating a future position that is untenable. In other words, we are slowly mortgaging the future to hold a present position that cannot possibly last. Both the U.K. and U.S. offer numerous examples.

The United States recently released, or at least claimed it was releasing, all its remaining gold stocks for payment of its international debts. This was done to give her creditors confidence that she *could* pay her debts. But since it meant abolishing her gold reserve requirement *behind* the dollar it is hardly likely to inspire confidence in anyone. It has freed her to meddle with her currency more than ever and thus worsen her payments position.

The U.K. has done just as badly by limiting overseas investment and now even prohibiting U.K. capital from going abroad to finance world trade; i.e., to act as the world's working capital. This will restrict world trade, which is certainly not in her interest, and it will have a catastrophic (and catastrophic is too weak a word) effect on the future payments position. The U.K. has traditionally had a trade deficit with the world but has counterbalanced it with an "invisible" surplus, a surplus in such things as banking, insurance and investments.

Had it not been for her Victorian investments abroad, the U.K. would be in an even worse state today, but her government appears too short-sighted to understand or admit this. Instead of encouraging the sector which has *always* proved to be her life-line, the government has chopped it stone dead and turned instead to cajole and beat the sector where they have rarely been in a surplus and where there is less likelihood of one in the future. The economy has been subjected to more controls and taxes than can easily be counted, and all this in the name of a trade surplus which no one should suppose could be achieved anyway.

Another burden that the U.K. economy has been made to bear by its Socialist mas-

ters (and, incidentally, the Conservatives do not escape all blame here) is the nationalized industry sector.

All countries have to support a public sector of *some* sort, but the nationalization of many major sectors is too much for any country to bear. Out of four major industrial countries, the percentage of the working population employed by the public sector (excluding the armed forces) is 24.1 per cent in the U.K., about 15 per cent in the U.S.A., about 12 per cent in West Germany and about 7 per cent in Japan. While the U.K. burden is by far the heaviest, growth in the public sector since 1960 has risen by about 39 per cent in the U.S., over 20 per cent in Japan, 12 per cent in West Germany and only by about 10 per cent in the U.K.

This means that 76 per cent of the working population in the U.K. are supporting 24 per cent, many of whom are completely unproductive in terms of producing goods and services that people want and for which they are willing to pay. The rest, those employed by the nationalized industries, produce under conditions which are free of competition and so there is no yardstick by which to measure the efficiency of their use of resources and no reason to suppose that they use them efficiently. Other sectors of the economy, such as agriculture, are highly protected in both the U.S. and U.K. and any form of protection must mean that production is less efficient than it is in other countries.

Gibbon summed up our predicament very well when he spoke of the fall of Athens and unless we learn from Athens' failure we too must expect to follow her. He said, "In the end more than they wanted freedom they wanted security. They wanted a comfortable life and they lost it all . . . security, comfort, and freedom. When the Athenians finally wanted not to give to society but for society to give to them, when the freedom they wished for most was freedom from responsibility, then Athens ceased to be a free society and never was free again."

#### THE CURE

There are two parts to the solution of any problem. The first is to *understand* the problem and the reasons why there is a problem. (The previous section was intended to do this.) Then the second part is to define what is wanted in *place* of what one already has, because until one knows in which direction to go, there is absolutely no hope of getting there.

We do not like the instability of the present system because it disrupts trade and interferes with our living standards. We want a system that is stable, one that is not going to change or to need changing. We want one that restricts governments' abilities to inflate and does not allow them to point accusing fingers at other people when they (the governments) get into trouble. Such a system would encourage trade and overseas investment because it would stimulate confidence in government and the future.

At the moment we have a situation in which all currencies are fixed vis a vis each other and all are fixed at their present level vis a vis gold (at least this is how it is all meant to be.) The internal values of the currencies change, but their external values in relation to each other cannot. So the quantities of goods and services moving from country to country change to compensate for the changing value of money itself. This produces imbalance in the external accounts. As these imbalances grow, the likelihood of major currency revaluations grows, and each and every national crisis brings a major international monetary crisis nearer, as people holding weak currencies try to unload them on an already overloaded market (in return for gold or stronger currencies).

The kernel of the problem is that two currencies, which are at present very weak, form the greater part of the *world reserves*, so that with each rock of the boat the *whole* system

(rather than just two currencies) is liable to collapse. South American currencies, by contrast, can be permanently near to devaluation and it does not really matter (except to the residents of the country concerned) because world trade does not depend on such currencies and in addition, the currencies concerned do not attract the savings of other nations.

There are two ways of tackling our problem, which is a dual one. The system is one where two currencies are weak and this fact threatens the entire world's money arrangement. It is also one in which there is no self-correcting mechanism.

There are two possible solutions, the first of which would be to set up a system whereby the world monetary structure does not depend on two currencies but has an automatic mechanism which slowly corrects the problems as they emerge. The second would be to have a system whereby the two key currencies cannot become weak.

The main industrial countries have tried endlessly over the last few years to improve the two reserve currencies, in an effort to support our crumbling international edifice. As the reserves of the U.S. and U.K. have dwindled, loans have been made to push the day of reckoning further away. The per capita public debt of the two countries has climbed as the reserves have wasted away.

The gnomes of Zurich have always realized that no loan can solve the problem but can only give a "breathing space" (a phrase we hear far too frequently) and in the case of the U.K. it is hardly even a breathing space any more but rather one loan to pay off another which has fallen due. Unless the internal economies of the countries concerned can be put right, these breathing spaces (loans) achieve nothing, or perhaps worse than nothing. With each new loan the British economy has been subjected to endless temperature-taking by the IMF and the gnomes. Taxes and controls have been piled on in the attempt to plug the payment gap. Devaluation itself was a dismal failure and yet we all continue to plod along the same old road.

Our governments must understand that taxes do not reduce public spending power when there is a government deficit or when the extra money only goes back again into people's pockets. The only way that taxes would help is if this revenue were used to reduce the public debt and if government spending were cut. Then the money supply would be reduced instead of redistributed and there would be the cutting back of effective demand that has ostensibly been the aim, for example, of most U.K. economic measures since Labour took office.

Another reason that the tax measures for the purpose of maintaining the parity of sterling cannot succeed is that the level of taxation is far too high and the disincentive effect of it must reduce rather than increase production.

Government spending was 18.5 per cent of GNP in the U.S.A. in 1968, 16.7 per cent in the U.K., 15.4 per cent in West Germany, 13.4 per cent in France and only 9.5 per cent in Japan. The high figures for the U.S. and the U.K., combined with the high percentage of the working population employed by the state, goes a long way towards explaining why the currencies are so weak.

Then we come to the controls which were imposed for the same reasons as the taxes, and with just as little success. The price and wage controls in the U.K. are the most blatant and obvious example. A Briton can no longer negotiate wages, nor can prices reflect the forces of supply and demand. The government has in effect removed all the signposts that should guide the economy.

There are no longer any forces left directing resources to their most efficient use, and so the resources stay immobile and unproductive. Yet these controls were imposed to improve mobility and productivity. What

the U.K. desperately needs is competition to force geographical and occupational mobility onto its resources. What it is getting is a system that discourages enterprise, investment, saving and productivity.

Throughout the world the hand of Big Brother is making itself felt everywhere, every time we think or move. In the international sphere there has been a cutting back of individual liberty, a stifling of competition and loss of good will. All of this will in the end prove disastrous to world living standards, as country after country turns inwards to solve its problems. Unless the trend is reversed, international trade and investment must collapse and everyone will suffer.

The Chase National Bank's comment on the latest round of controls over international financing operations: "It would be difficult to think of a strategy more damaging to our economic interests or better calculated to play into the hands of those in Europe and elsewhere who wish to see U.S. influence diminished."

Thus world monetary authorities have fallen far short in their efforts to strengthen the currencies because they have totally failed to understand what has weakened them. We see government overexpenditure and a government sector which grows like a cancer and which directs resources in directions which will not be productive. Only by having stable internal governments with sound currencies will the present system work, and enough governments have proved for sufficiently long periods that this is impossible.

Governments seem unable to avoid growing. They have done so since history began and there is no reason to suppose that they will stop doing so now unless there is some automatic mechanism to check them. The French body politic is perhaps the only major government that has finally realized that government expenditure is closely related to currency crises. They have cut public expenditure severely, but whether they will stop inflation and reintroduce competition in all sectors remains to be seen.

#### AN ALTERNATIVE SYSTEM

Since there appears to have been complete failure to make the present gold exchange system work, and since it seems unlikely that it will ever succeed (because it cannot adjust to a changing world), then we must look for another system.

There is much talk in the world today that it should be possible to create a currency that could be used for all international transactions. All currencies would be exchangeable for it and it could be expanded as the need arose. Many economists feel that there is a shortage of international liquidity and hence the payments crises and the drift to isolationism.

Any idea along the lines of an international currency is, however, totally impractical and undesirable. It would merely inflict on us more of the same crises as we experience now. Who would create the currency and expand or contract it as the need arose? Why, an enlarged IMF, of course, which could expand it every time a crisis was imminent.

The answer here is that there is no shortage of international liquidity but only an uneven distribution because there is no force working for international balance. If some countries run permanent payments deficits (for the reasons discussed above) while others are extremely competitive and run surpluses, then the deficit countries should find themselves short of money.

Just as an individual who spends more than his income will eventually find himself facing bankruptcy, so a country should find the same and it will not be because there is a shortage of money.

Germany's chief banker, Herr Blessing, says that world trade does not depend on international liquidity. What causes trouble is "the pursuit of grandiose political, eco-

nomical and social objectives which militate against price stability and balanced international settlements."

Any system under which it is possible for an organization or body to produce money will not work. The pressures from deficit countries to increase the money supply by making loans to them would be unbearable. The supply will spiral and the value of it and confidence in it will collapse. Sir Leslie O'Brien, governor of the Bank of England, finds "the attack on gold to be ironic, for it is not gold which is the root cause of the present uneasiness, but doubts about the alternative reserve assets. Let us concentrate on containing the role of the alternatives first and leave to the last any discarding of gold in which most of the world, rightly or wrongly, still firmly believes."

Another proposed system that received wide support is adjustable, or floating, exchange rates. At least it has wide support from economists, but is regarded with great suspicion in banking circles. Bankers like to know exactly how much money they have rather than to feel that its value can change constantly. Despite their views, however, the system does have its merits. All currencies would be free to fluctuate versus other currencies and versus gold.

So instead of having traumatic devaluations from time to time (and the threat of them more frequently) any currency which was inflating relatively fast, or which was losing in relative efficiency, would find its value falling in world markets. It would buy less and less abroad and comparative prices of domestic goods and services would be cheaper to foreigners. There would then be an automatic reduction in imports and an increase in exports which would tend to push the price of the currency back up again.

To take today's German mark as an example: demand for it would rise as demand for German goods and services rose. The price of the mark is thus pushed up, which in turn reduces exports and increases imports and so balance is restored.

There would be no need for the rest of the world to clamor for a revaluation of the mark: it would happen slowly and automatically. It is claimed there would also be little or no need for gold or large quantities of currency reserves to be available to support currencies at a fixed level and that there could never be a shortage of international liquidity. This is surely an exaggerated claim. If not, the idea is suspect. It could work only if every currency is convertible into gold.

But the main disadvantage would be that the value of any currency could not be known in advance and this might easily hamper trade. Importers and exporters would be hard pressed to calculate the price they would have to pay for the currency they need. It is claimed this hurdle is comparatively small. Traders should always be able to buy currency forward and thus know "a price" in advance, and a healthy exchange market would soon develop for this purpose. (It would be an additional expense for businessmen, of course.)

Also, arbitrage operations would expand to equate currencies throughout the world and so eliminate cross rates. Future currency markets are insufficient today for the floating exchange system, and their worldwide development is an unknown quantity, especially with respect to the cost. For currencies in trouble the cost might restrict trade badly. In any case, trade could hardly be more restricted, it is claimed, by the uncertainties of future exchange rates than it is at present through government actions to correct payment deficits. There would be no need or excuse for any tariffs, or quotas or exports subsidies.

Another criticism of this system is perhaps equally important. It is that there would be nothing to restrain governments from inflating even faster than at present. If they did this, residents might begin to

demand more goods from abroad (as happens now), but almost immediately the value of the currency would fall, restricting imports again.

If the country continued to inflate, the value of the currency would continue to fall but it would be *seen* to be falling and residents would see their living standards falling too. Surely when such governments were no longer able to hide the fact that inflation was "devaluing the pound (or dollar) in your pockets" the electorate would stop clamoring for the welfare state and all its attendant expenses. Of course a currency can fall quite far before this happens.

Floating rates seem unlikely of adoption. More popular is the "crawling peg" system, which still requires reserves, is more accommodating and perhaps, more realistic for the times. It won't do much good nor much harm, thus political odds favor it. In short, it is a compromise. Compromises usually win the most votes but seldom solve problems permanently.

The last system that must be considered to provide a sensible substitute for our gold exchange standard is the good old gold standard that worked so well for the Victorians. It has its opponents, but it also has a large band of advocates.

My friend, the late Prof. Wilhelm Roepke in his book, *Crises and Cycles*, says, "The abandonment of the gold dollar by Roosevelt must be viewed as one of the most disastrous acts on record of any government and any country in modern times, both for itself and for the world."

Then T. Jefferson Coolidge, once undersecretary of the treasury, said in the book, *"Why Centralized Government"*: "Free enterprise has made us great and prosperous and free enterprise is an essential of democracy.

"Consider certain principles deemed through the centuries as vital for free enterprise under (sound) governments: the gold standard, so that money is free and stable and cannot be ruined by unwise government."

When there is no gold standard he felt that: "We have no assurance of future convertibility into gold or anything else. The Administration is all-powerful as regards monetary values. No sound principles have been established. Rather, past principles considered sound for centuries have been laid aside and in their place the Administration is the dictator of what is to be done from day to day."

Many opponents of reintroducing the gold standard object on purely political grounds. Why, we are asked, should countries that have continually rocked the boat by hoarding gold (e.g., France) benefit from the imposition of a gold standard? And why should Russia be given a built-in advantage (as she is known to have large stocks)? Then again, why should the world's major gold producer, South Africa, receive such a bonanza when she undertakes policies that are politically unacceptable to so many? Why indeed, when those countries which have forborne from collecting gold (or converting their dollar and pound holdings into gold) would lose out so badly? But then, why cut off one's nose to spite one's face when the gold standard could solve all our problems?

Under a gold standard all currencies must be backed by gold to a certain fixed extent and the gold which backs the currency also acts as the country's reserves. If there is a payment deficit, gold leaves the country and this causes an immediate contraction of the money supply and internal deflation. This would be a true deflation and not the cock-eyed deflationary "measures" undertaken by politicians at the moment. Then, if the country had a surplus on its foreign accounts, gold would flow into the country and the internal currency would be expanded against it. Prices and imports would rise and exports would fall, thus restoring the bal-

ance. Under this system imbalance is simply not possible, *nor* is internal inflation.

The general grouse against it is that no government can inflate to get its country out of a depression. But surely having watched this fallacious Keynesian principle at work for so long, people must soon begin to associate deficit financing with the balance-of-payments deficit and monetary-foolly mess we are in today.

A gold standard has other advantages over our present system. Currently the price of gold is fixed versus the dollar and although there is *meant* to be a free market as well, the price there tends to be kept down by certain political pressures. Because the free price has so far rarely been more than \$42 an ounce, the amount of gold now available would not finance world trade (another of the arguments put forward by the anti-gold standard brigade). If the gold standard were brought in, the price of gold would doubtless rise by agreement and this would stimulate production.

At the moment Russia is mining large quantities of the ore because production cost there is ignored and in addition she is very short of foreign exchange. If the free world insists on keeping the price of gold down, it will find that soon Russia will be the *only* country still mining gold.

Most people feel gold is valuable and would prefer to trust it rather than paper money. Since this is a fact of life and is unlikely to change, it would be sensible to institute a proper gold standard. This is the only system which will *last* because it regulates economies automatically instead of having to rely on politicians with their eyes on the next election.

Getting back to our simile of rock versus sand, as a foundation, gold is like a rock; it respects the principles of sound money and *until* we build our international monetary edifice on bed rock it will *always* be liable to collapse.

In the words of George Bernard Shaw, "You have to choose between trusting to the natural stability of gold or to the honesty and intelligence of the members of a government and with due respect for these gentlemen I advise you, as long as the capitalist system works, vote for gold."

#### AGAINST WISCONSIN HISTORY AND AGAINST DEMOCRACY

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years State legislatures throughout the country have passed resolutions, in one form or another, asking Congress to call a constitutional convention in an effort to overturn the Supreme Court's ruling that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned according to population.

If a constitutional convention for the purpose of changing our national Constitution were held today, it is doubtful whether only one part of that Constitution would be open for change. A convention of that sort could be a Pandora's box, opening up even the basic foundation of American freedom, the Bill of Rights, to possible and serious attack.

Because the Milwaukee Journal has printed an excellent editorial on this subject, I am inserting it into the RECORD

for the benefit of the Members of Congress.

The editorial follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal,  
June 1, 1969]

#### AGAINST WISCONSIN HISTORY AND AGAINST DEMOCRACY

So far gone in right wing domination is the legislative joint finance committee, that it let itself be a vehicle to get a measure introduced that is not only outside its purview but pure mischief making.

It is the same old proposal to support the "Dirksen amendment" to abolish fair representation in one house of state legislatures. It would petition congress to call a constitutional convention to frame an amendment by which the United States would expressly reject the principle of one man, one vote.

This unworthy subject embroiled the three previous legislatures, and each house passed it at one time or another before it got killed or pigeonholed in the other. Its revival this time was engineered by Assemblyman Merkel of Brookfield, a John Birchite and finance committeeman, who found 14 like minded co-sponsors.

Diehard opposition to the rule of equal populations in election districts is nothing more than a plea for a lawmakers' right to gerrymander, to rig districts with regional or partisan crookedness. It is an antidemocratic cause that ought to be repugnant as well as obsolete. Even in their own interest, right wingers are the silliest of all to pursue it because the biggest population shift supposed to be reflected in fair redistricting is to the suburbs, where they get most of their own votes. They should quit when they are ahead!

If this were merely something to divert a busy legislature for a while, then to be discreetly forgotten, that would be disservice enough. But its passage in Wisconsin just now, perish the thought, could plunge congress and the whole country into constitutional crisis.

That is because one more state legislature would make the required 34, which have acted similarly over the years, to force the issue of a convention for the first time in national history—a can of worms that no wise people would poke around in. Congress would get entangled in disputing over validity of the petitions; over uncharted procedure for calling a convention, over the risks of its running off in all sorts of equally dangerous directions.

Wisconsin lawmakers should not permit this state—which has had a one man, one vote rule for 121 years—to push the country over this brink, and in so rotten a cause at that. The Merkel resolution does not even deserve debate time before getting buried.

#### YONKERS NEWSPAPER TELLS THE COMMUTER'S STORY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in no part of the Nation is the plight of the commuter railroads and the public they serve better dramatized than in New York. The commuter rail crisis—and it is exactly that—has developed through a complex set of circumstances that must be unraveled before too much longer or our metropolitan areas will surely strangle in their own traffic.

Two enterprising and perceptive reporters for the Yonkers, N.Y., Herald Statesman have authored an informative series of articles on the Penn Central Railroad and the people whose daily lives it affects so profoundly. I commend the series, written by Mark Flaumen and Sarah Dowson, to the attention of all those concerned with the problems of transportation in the United States today, and congratulate the Herald Statesman for the space it devoted to this series.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 19, 1969]

WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT PENN CENTRAL  
(By Mark Flaumen and Sarah Dowson)

"I'm a cook, contortionist, and fireman," said the graying businessman with the alligator attache case as he boarded the local to Manhattan, "you have to be to stay alive on this railroad."

If you're a commuter, a member of that tightly knit fraternity forged with the glue of misery, you know the story.

You say you just want to read the paper, maybe catch a nap, and most of all get where you're going on time, but you also know that life on the Penn Central just isn't that simple.

You're called on to put out a fire when this heater under your seat gets hotter than called for; to cook your own dinner when the roast your wife broiled is four hours old; and to squeeze into a corner while 90 frantic commuters battle for 60 treasured seats.

You're frantic, impatient, and entirely disgusted. But is the Penn Central really that bad?

The public service commission, which regulates the operations of all utilities in the state, has issued a set of standards for Penn Central service, but the railroad falls far short of most of the requirements.

The standards focus on better on-time performance, cleanliness of trains and stations, more adequate seating, proper maintenance of machinery to prevent service failures, and safety requirements.

A look at a recent incident, which is matched with a similar sideshow almost every week, provides an example of how deaf the railroad is to its obligations and why commuters talk of their experiences like old war buddies at a combat reunion.

The commuter catastrophe went something like this:

Commuters arrived at the Ludlow station at 7:30 a.m. and were told trains would be delayed 30 minutes to an hour due to a derailment at Spytten Duyvil. Waiting until 11 a.m. without sighting a train, they called Penn Central information and a recording repeated the original message they'd heard four hours before.

Shortly after 11, a train was spotted chugging up the rails, but before the now angry group on the platform could fantasize the feel of a seat, it moved half empty through the station without stopping.

This was only the first of a four-act show that finally ended when a crammed train pulled in around noon, and the "Ludlow Losers" stood all the way to Manhattan.

Poor service, while the most frustrating, is not the railroad's most important deficiency. Inadequate safety precautions is a matter of more immediate concern to many commuters, railroad workers, and politicians.

Commuter groups have expressed this concern to the PC and the PSC, and a typical complaint concerns another incident at the Ludlow station.

According to commuters, an unscheduled train passed slowly through the station at 8:05 a.m. one day this winter, scraping a stone wall with a screen protruding from a tilted coach car.

Stones were dislodged and hurled at people waiting on the platform, observers report. They say there would have been serious injuries had the train been moving fast.

Union officials have for years echoed the commuters gripes on bad service and dangerous conditions, and charge the present situation is the result of neglect, not "unfortunate mishaps" as the railroad often explains.

The unions have charged that most locomotives are too heavy for the PC's light-weight rails, and the clumsy swaying motion of many coaches caused by worn wheel axles are jolting the rails dangerously out of line.

Others have testified that when they tag cars for the Harmon repair shops for maintenance the tags are simply ripped off.

Martin Shapp, a PC control tower operator, admitted at March PSC hearings that large stretches of track are left unsupervised on weekends. Mr. Shapp, who is leaving the railroad and felt free to speak, said he has seen at least three derailments in the last six months.

"Rats, rust, garbage a must" is among the other phrases painted on the banners of the commuter revolt.

The reference here is to P.C. suburban stations, which one commuter said "destroy the old cliché of 'its a nice place to visit,' because the only thing they're nice for is a roaring bonfire."

A spot check of several area stations showed that while the trains and platforms are surprisingly clean and neat, some stationhouses have become actual dumping grounds with old stoves and broken pieces of furniture strewn around, huge holes in the walls, cracked sidewalks, and exposed electric wires and rails.

Worst of all shortcomings is the attitude of Penn Central officials. They have continuously proven their ability to be indifferent.

This only escalates the conflict between commuters and the railroad because people who feel they are being denied common courtesy are rarely willing to be understanding or ready to reach a compromise.

Examples of poor attitude are as common as late trains. At the Ludlow incident, when trains were delayed more than four hours, Penn C. spokesmen said police and the local radio station were notified of the delays, but both sources denied receiving any information from the railroad.

WCBS Radio, which broadcast daily mass transportation reports, has complained in a series of editorials. "The Captive Commuter," that the P.C. constantly covers up its mistakes at the expense of the truth.

"It has become common place for spokesmen for the Long Island Rail Road and the Penn Central to say their trains are running on schedule," said general manager Joseph T. Dembo, "when they are not. Whatever system the commuter railroads have for channeling and coordinating train announcements, they seem to be directed to keeping the commuter in the dark."

When the P.C. announced a new schedule on the Hudson Division last year, officials proudly announced that "it is designed to improve morning rush hour service."

Rep. Richard L. Ottinger, who is an active commuter supporter, retorted after studying the schedule and being besieged by letters from constituents that "it actually results in a loss of certain services. The new schedule doesn't allow commuters to get to their jobs on time."

What lies beneath the railroad's failure to provide good and courteous service?

Besides the claim that the PC loses millions of dollars a year in passenger service, James M. Loconto, chief of the passenger division, has blamed much of the problem on Vandalism.

At a PSC hearing, Mr. Loconto asserted

that Vandalism results in continuous damage to equipment, which in turn causes failures, lateness, and derailments. Union officials have agreed that vandalism is a major problem.

But there are others, including Rep. Ottinger, who are unwilling to remove the burden of responsibility from the shoulders of the railroad, and who say the PC is purposely attempting to downgrade passenger service.

Mr. Ottinger believes this plot stems from the desire of PC officials to get out of the reportedly unprofitable passenger business.

"The railroads," he said, "particularly the PC, have for years followed a policy of deliberately downgrading passenger service so that declining revenues could be used as justification for discontinuing trains."

Rep. Ottinger's comments have received some proof of validity by the discovery of a PC interoffice memo, stating the company's intention to eventually phase out some types of passenger service.

Whether the claims are true or not, the commuter-PC controversy is not totally the fault of the railroad.

Many commuters are white collar workers who live in nice, suburban homes and work in plush Manhattan offices. They compare these surroundings with an outmoded and unprofitable means of transportation. They simply have come to expect comfort and convenience and this accentuates much of the disappointment and annoyance.

What the prospects are for a railroad which has been blamed for everything from rats to water pollution, it is difficult to say. PC officials are becoming fiercely defensive while commuters are gaining increasing support from politicians.

Continued commuter action may be showing some results as a check of a new schedule, effective April 1, showed most trains running within five minutes of due time.

Perhaps it is a sign of better things to come.

Perhaps it is only a mirage.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 19, 1969]

RIDING THE PENN CENTRAL HOME—A  
NIGHTMARE ON WHEELS

(By Mark Flaumen)

It all began with a blast of wet snow in the face, an ominous announcement, and a nagging feeling that it was going to be a long time getting home.

And it was. It was an evening on the Penn Central in the midst of a February storm.

You walked bravely out of your mid-Manhattan office to make your way through the swirling drifts to Grand Central Station, where the journey back to Yonkers would begin.

You knew it wasn't a normal day and you didn't expect service to be spectacular, because on the Penn Central it never is anyway. But the difference between what you expected and what you experienced. . . .

Grand Central was in a state of bedlam. The scene was similar to a frontier revival meeting with people dashing in circles, and writhing, and cursing themselves for ever trusting the PC to get them home on time.

It was a Bufferin commercial, a nightmare, a science fiction story on "The day after."

Lines of 20 stretched out from the two open cashier windows and commuters waited hungrily for tickets like the jobless on depression bread lines.

You finally put your soggy money before the cashier, only to be told that though there were no signs, you "are on the wrong line, buddy. Tickets to Yonkers on your left."

You control yourself. You know it will take all of your energy just to get home.

An hour has crawled by and you have your tickets tucked in the pocket of your overcoat, which in the heat of the station

feels like you're wearing an Eskimo suit in a steam room.

Now to catch your train. You want to check the time on the station clock, but you're going against the stream and the crowd drags you upstairs to the mezzanine.

Back down on the main floor you check the wall schedule and notice that your train is due in five minutes.

You're in luck, or so you think.

On the platform, you check with the conductor to be sure.

"Train to Yonkers, yes sir," he blares, "leaving in three minutes."

So you sit back and read your paper thinking it wasn't that bad after all. You read the front page, the editorials, and the sports section and you notice that the train is now packed: standing room only.

The engines have cooled, no longer hissing and belching, but heat in the coach is building up. A hushed mumble passes through the car and the man next to you echoes the question: "Why aren't we moving?"

The PC isn't one to keep its customers guessing and so a minute later the same confident conductor ducks his head in the car with the message that the train for Yonkers, two platforms over, is about to leave.

Two hundred commuters spill out of the wrong train and run in every direction, pushing and clawing at each other to be first on platform 28.

Arriving at the promised land, you find a hundred others already there battling it out with five conductors who are huddling in a corner.

"When's the train coming?" the crowd chants repeatedly, and it sounds like the chorus from a protest song.

Two trains line the sides of the platform. A repairman is tinkering around under one and the other is locked with the lights out.

You watch a fellow commuter reach the breaking point. He leaps out of the crowd, waving his arms and coming face to face with a conductor who is casually smoking his pipe.

"Which train," the commuter barks. "I demand to know which one of these trains is going to Yonkers!"

"This one" says the conductor, pointing to the right.

"No, this one here's being repaired," says his colleague, pointing to the left.

The crowd growls.

A railroad supervisor, dressed in a business suit, pushed through the waiting commuters like a fullback on his way to the goalpost.

He yells at the conductors. He yells at the commuters. He slaps his hands at his sides. "Don't tell me that," says a conductor.

"I'll tell you that," says the supervisor.

A fight breaks out between a commuter and a conductor.

A policeman rushes in and gets lost in the crowd.

The repairman says the train needs major repairs.

The clock strikes 9.

Someone shouts that a train is leaving on track 32.

The commuters turn around, walk off the platform, through the main floor, out the main door . . . into the cool comforting storm to a local hotel for a meal and a room and the promise to try again tomorrow.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 19, 1969]

**PENN CENTRAL RELATIONS DEPARTMENT  
DOESN'T WANT ANY RELATIONS**  
(By Sarah Dowson)

If anyone wonders why so little has been written about Penn Central, credit might go to its Public Relations department. In the words of one employee, it exists "just to keep down information."

During February, WCBS radio station put

out three press releases—editorials on their involvement with commuter railroads. One said their information from the railroads, Penn Central in particular, was often incorrect. Penn Central said it was operating on a normal schedule during the aftermath of the storm, which was not the case said the station.

WCBS was embarrassed to give out wrong information, and said it would carefully qualify schedule reports by naming their source in the future.

When asked about the editorials, Norman Stone, PR head, said, "That's absolutely untrue. I don't know why the radio stations are doing this. It must be for some purpose of their own that we don't know about."

"The descriptive literature on the Westchester trip ticket was misleading," said R. Raleigh D'Adamo, Mass Transit Coordinator Counsel for New York City.

"This ticket was actually good for Putnam and Dutchess counties, as well as Westchester," he said, "but the advertising gave the impression that it was only good for Westchester."

D'Adamo said he had conferred with members of the Public Service Commission and Penn Central's management, and that "everything is going to be worked out at a meeting."

When reporters try to work through Penn Central's public relations department, they usually get nowhere. Secrecy is the rule of thumb, and when questions are asked, spokesmen claim they don't know the specifics.

When asked about increasing the time between the departures and arrivals of trains, Robert Patterson, Director of Transportation said, "I don't know the particular case you're talking about, but it must have something to do with rearranging schedules to coordinate the coming and going of all trains."

He promptly switched the subject to his home and children.

When asked why so many stations were closed over the years, a spokesman said, "Which ones?" When several were identified, he said, "Why, most people aren't buying tickets at the ticket agent's offices any more. They're buying the commutation passes through the mail."

A PR spokesman was quite willing to call up the personnel director and get information about management trainees, but during the conversation he said, "Of course, we'll respect your wishes. She's just getting it for her personal information, I'm sure, and it won't be publicized."

The PR spokesman kept modifying the statistics about management trainees to reflect a lower turnover rate . . . and these were only estimates. And they couldn't be released for publication. Neither could the salaries of different levels of employees.

In the dispatcher's office, the dispatcher explained his job at length. Suddenly he grinned and said jokingly to the PR spokesman standing by, "I'm not talking too much, am I?"

"You're doing fine," the spokesman replied.

There are times when the reticence can hurt the railroad's image. After the Feb. 9th snowstorm. The Herald Statesman wanted to hear railroad's story on equipment and personnel problems during the storm.

The slant of the question was not negative, and the spokesman said, "I'll see if I can get in touch with the man who handles that." It was late the next day before the spokesman called back. It was unfortunate for the railroad, because the story contained the plight of the commuter only. Information did not arrive in time so readers could sympathize with the railroad.

Newspaper reporters aren't the only group that has trouble getting information from the railroad. Lawyers, too, can have a hard time.

"One thing always seems to happen at the Public Service Commission hearings," said a veteran sparring partner with Penn Central attorneys. "Every time we call upon the railroad for specific information, whether it be for ground rents or suburban service, they claim there is no expert present who can give us the information."

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 19, 1969]

**COMMUTERS PLIGHT: UNSOLVED COMPLAINTS**  
(By Sarah Dowson)

Commuters as well as Penn Central employees are worried about safety hazards—whether from vandalism or lack of proper maintenance.

When surveyed at random on the trains, about half of the commuters are satisfied with the service. The others complain about late trains, unclean rest rooms, discourteous conductors and dirty stations and car interiors.

The stations are dreary, the trains are uncomfortable, and conductors do occasionally growl at passengers who are a little slow at producing tickets or money.

"It's because there are spotters on the trains—railroad employees who act like undercover agents keeping an eye on conductors to make sure they collect all fares and don't pocket any money," said one employee.

Nobody really knows why the stations are eyesores, though, and nobody can really explain why the rides are so bumpy that a passenger holding a cup of coffee is bound to get it spilled.

One irate commuter has documented the plight. He is Rev. William Bangert, who teaches at the St. Andrew on Hudson Seminary and who is an occasional rider from Poughkeepsie to Grand Central.

On Dec. 29th, 1968, he says, he took the 5:50 train out of Grand Central. "A nauseating odor emanated from the rest room. A woman complained to a member of the crew, who courteously expressed agreement with the disgusting conditions."

"He said it had been reported but nothing had been done. He suggested she write a letter to the complaint department."

A few days later on January 3rd, he said, he took the 3:40 p.m. from Grand Central. His train left the station with the seats turned backwards and passengers sat that way, in discomfort, all the way to Harmon.

"Some people changed their seats while the train was in motion, and that was a very dangerous thing to do," he said.

On the 12th, commuters from Grand Central were inconvenienced at Harmon, a transfer point, because there was only one car waiting, said Rev. Bangert. In addition to the overcrowding, the train arrived 45 minutes late, he said.

Another commuter wonders why "between 6:30 and 9:30 a.m., half-empty trains completely bypass Spuyten Duyvil." Samuel A. Winston of 555 Cappock St., Riverdale, complains that even though there are 2,000 apartments under construction near Spuyten Duyvil now, Penn Central still goes out of its way to discourage passenger service.

"Ticket agents never get information from the dispatcher," complains Edward H. Zimmerman who commutes from Greenburgh.

"Why doesn't the railroad have any provision for substitute trains when one happens to be stalled? Why are there punitive single-passenger fares?" Irving Margola from Armonk has these questions on his mind.

Congressman Richard L. Ottinger, D-Pleasantville, summarized the commuters' plight when he said, "It's clear that Penn Central has no interest in commuter service. Robert Minor, a senior vice president of Penn Central, was unwilling to make one positive statement about passenger service at last fall's series of hearings."

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 20, 1969]

#### RAILROAD COMMUTERS ORGANIZE

(By Sarah Dowson and Mark Flaumen)

Commuter groups are within range of becoming the most powerful force combatting Penn Central's lack of interest in its passenger service.

At least three groups in the Westchester area have been able to pierce the smoke-screen. Members of each testified at the series of rate increases and standards of service hearings at the Public Service Commission last fall and this spring.

The groups are the Transportation Action Committee, composed of commuters from Westchester, Putnam, Rockland and Orange counties and some from Connecticut's Fairfield county; the Ludlow Commuters Association with Ben Morris of Yonkers at the helm; and a less formally organized group from Garrison, N.Y., spearheaded by Roy T. Kristensen.

Few commuters complain about fare increases. Maintenance, and decent conditions in the stations and on the trains are their major concerns.

"We're frustrated because trains are late, there's no heat, no air conditioning. The toilets, trains and stations are filthy, and there's no information about trains," said Milton Harth, president of the TAC. He is a Manhattan executive who formed the TAC in February.

Bernard Bierman, another company president who has testified at recent hearings, is a commuter from Croton who joined the group as its director of research.

Harth doesn't mince words when he says what the railroad should be doing, but isn't. "The railroad should order 83 new passenger coaches costing \$225,000 and \$250,000 apiece," he says, naming one of his group's recommendations.

About roadbeds, he says, "There's a program under way now to replace 20,000 rail ties. But at the April 16th hearing, I cross-examined the railroad's witness, William Glavin, and made him confirm that this was only about 2 per cent of the ties."

Other testimony stated there were 350 miles of commuter tracks with 3,000 ties per mile.

Ben Morris, an advertising executive in Manhattan, has worried for 10 years that Ludlow station would be phased out as a stop for Yonkers commuters.

In addition to being a frequent visitor at the hearings, Morris has launched the campaign "Operation Bulldog," explaining that the LCA "expects to hang onto the railroad" until grievances are corrected.

LCA represents commuter associations from the West Bronx northward to Croton-Harmon on the Hudson division. Morris says he wants to inform and enlighten the public—if not by obtaining information from Penn Central, at least by asking some probing questions.

He has asked:

How does the 1968 safety performance compare with that of previous years? When will public address systems be installed at stations?

Why has Penn Central stopped issuing individual figures on earnings from its railroad operations? Does the railroad credit suburban operations with some of the income it derives from its property around Grand Central Terminal?

What are Penn Central's real intentions with regard to suburban service?

"The answers to these questions seem to be in the negative," says Morris. "Penn Central officials just won't be specific about any of their plans, so we have to stay informed and turn on the pressure."

"We are 35,000 strong," proclaims Mr. Morris. "We demand decency of standards, and we shall use every lawful means at our disposal to embarrass, harass, petition and insist that we get adequate service."

A commuter for 15 years, Roy Kristensen is concerned about adequate train service for Garrison, better parking for commuters, and getting the railroad to take an interest in making a profit. He and his group have already put pressure on Penn Central to restore a train.

"Last April, Penn Central was planning to remove train Number 836, leaving Garrison at 6:49 and arriving at Grand Central terminal at 8:16. They wanted to bypass Garrison completely and use the same train for Ossining, but we got them to compromise, after a fashion. Now the train is a local, both for Ossining and Garrison, but it gets into New York late—never before 8:50," he laments.

Neither the railroad nor the towns has taken responsibility to provide commuters with adequate parking, Mr. Kristensen said, and added it's common knowledge the railroad is selling its land as soon as the towns will buy.

Peekskill Corporation Counsel Leone Pecoraro says Penn Central has sold some of its property, bought in the 1800's, to the town "to alleviate its tax problem and cut down on maintenance costs."

"Fifteen years ago, there was no room for cars to park at the Peekskill station," says Kristensen. "The town, which had bought the property, made a small lot, and put no parking signs on the street."

"Then, when more space was needed, they put in parking meters. Then they put in another lot. About five years ago, there was a rash of vandalism on the meters. The town took out the meters and prohibited parking again. Now, we have an honor system. Each commuter who parks is supposed to put 25 cents in a mailbox there. What a laugh!"

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 20, 1969]

#### TRAINS—COMMUTER WANTS A BETTER EXPLANATION

(By Sarah Dowson)

Walter T. Arnold, President of Alltex Machinery Corp. in Manhattan, has been a commuter on the New York, New Haven and Penn Central railroad for 18 years. He lives at 12 Leith Place in White Plains.

He became actively involved in criticism of the railroad in February, when his 7:58 train from White Plains arrived in Grand Central at 10:15. The conductors could give him no satisfactory explanation of the train's lateness, he says, so he figured that if half of the morning had been wasted, he might as well waste the other half and visit the railroad's executive headquarters at 466 Lexington Ave.

"They gave me the name of a person I tried to find, before someone told me he had retired six months ago," laughed Mr. Arnold. "So then I talked to another man who could only account for about 45 minutes of the train's lateness."

"The irony of the situation was compounded, though, because of what happened during those 45 minutes. Someone had discovered something hanging down from one of the cars. I remember that the fireman got off the train and spent almost the whole time looking for whatever it was."

"Meanwhile, the conductors just sat there and let him do the work. If they had helped, the job would have taken only a few minutes!"

Mr. Arnold recalled happier days in the dim and misty past when conductors, as captains of their trains, were proud of them and saw that they were in good working condition.

"A man who does his job well can be excused for grumpiness," said Mr. Arnold, "but when he doesn't, I certainly don't excuse him, and I certainly don't excuse the conductors today. I've seen conductors give the signal to leave when passengers were still getting on the train," he said.

Complaining that conductors designate

smoking cars according to their own whims, Mr. Arnold said that once he and a group of other commuters rebelled when a conductor made their train a non-smoking car.

"We felt that since we were there and smoking at the time he put up the sign, we were just going to relax and keep on smoking," he said. "At first he threatened to put us off the train but when he saw we weren't leaving, he said he wouldn't bother because it was too much work."

"Not only are the conductors rude to passengers, but they're rude to their employers," says Mr. Arnold. "You'd think they'd at least have some respect for the people who are giving them their paychecks, but when you ask them for information, all they say is 'What can I do if this railroad is lousy?' or some other derogatory remark."

Mr. Arnold does not think much of the promotional and public relations campaigns of Penn Central. "One thing they did to supposedly help us commuters out was to originate a batch of express trains between Grand Central and White Plains."

The trains began about five years ago and since then, he says, their arrival and departure time span has been lengthened a few minutes on every new timetable. "No wonder the Public Service Commission can always say Penn Central has maintained its 80 per cent on time performance," he concluded.

Two suggestions for improvement of the railroad's commuter service have occurred to Mr. Arnold. Brake tests should be performed properly. The engineers often forget to test their brakes completely, he has noticed. "One night the last three cars in our train had their brakes on. When the engineer started, we all got quite a jolt until he disengaged the brakes."

The second suggestion had to do with the loop in Grand Central Terminal. The loop half-circles around in extensions of tracks so that an incoming train on track 39 or 40 can disembark passengers and board again a few minutes later, circle the loop, and exit on an outgoing track at the other side of the terminal.

"There's a problem, though. It takes about seven minutes to negotiate the loop, and this is always a delay beyond the schedule. The whole process could be easier if Penn Central put a platform on the other side of the loop."

Then, after passengers disembarked at one side, the train could negotiate the loop without passengers, and board them on the other side. They would avoid a delay, it would be more comfortable, and much less hazardous should there ever be a break down in the loop."

If Mr. Arnold feels good about the railroad at all, he remembers the time two New Haven trains made a trip upstate because the regular tracks were closed from a derailment.

"This was about a month ago at the time of the mail train derailment. The New Haven trains ran out of Penn Station and took all of us back upstate. I got off at Mamaroneck and took a taxi home."

"This extra service was free of charge. I wrote a letter of praise to Vice President Goodwin, and got a cordial reply."

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 21, 1969]

#### THE SOUND AND FURY OF HEARINGS

(By Mark Flaumen and Sarah Dowson)

The Public Service Commission, a regulatory agency with the responsibility for supervising the Penn Central Rail Road and all state utilities, seems to be capable of taking only one kind of action—holding hearings.

The hearings, usually supervised by PSC Commissioner John T. Ryan, have been continuing for years. It is always the same cast—politicians, commuters, railroad officials; the same charges, the worn out defenses, the inevitable lack of action.

The PSC has done so little to exercise its powers for the improvement of commuter service, that most commuters refer to it as a "branch office" or a "rubber stamp" for the Penn Central.

The railroad must apply to the PSC for all fare increases. And like the henpecked husband replying "yes dear" to his growling spouse, the PSC has allowed fares to skyrocket in the past decade without comparable improvements in service.

The fare between New York and Yonkers was 52 cents in 1955 but has jumped 170 per cent to the present \$1.40 level. The monthly commuter fare, \$8.43 in 1955, is now \$28, a 232 per cent increase.

In October, 1968, the PC applied for fare increases amounting to \$500,000 a year for Westchester and Putnam riders including a \$1 a month increase for monthly commutation fares and 60 cents more for a one way trip to Manhattan.

The PSC called for a new series of hearings which began in January. Politicians and commuters filed in to protest the proposed fare hikes, citing instances of poor service and dangerous conditions as grounds for rejection of the proposal.

PSC inspectors back up the commuters claims. They reported a total of 56 safety defects, 32 service inadequacies in passenger cars, and four safety defects in locomotives for the year.

Inspectors also reported that though the PC is required to have an 80 per cent on time performance rate it met this requirement only one month, fell to a low of 37 per cent in December, and had a one day performance of 6.3 per cent.

All of these reports were violations of PSC directives issued in 1967, but instead of fining the railroad the \$5,000 per violation which is its power, the PSC approved the fare increases after slight modification.

A new set of directives was issued, but since the fare hikes were effective Feb. 1, there was no time to test the railroad's willingness to comply.

This latest PSC action prompted immediate protests from commuters and politicians.

Ben Morris, head of the Ludlow Commuters Organization, called for boycotts and other actions and asked the PSC for aggressive imposition of fines against the railroad.

Rep. Richard L. Ottinger, calling the PSC "a watchdog without teeth," echoed Mr. Morris' demand for heavy use of fines.

Feeling the heat of public pressure, the PSC brought a \$40,000 suit against PC for failure to properly maintain equipment.

The suit is now pending in the courts. When complaints began mounting that the railroad was not complying with the new directives for improved service issued at the January PSC hearings, the PSC did not back up its orders with fines.

What the commission did do was to call new hearings to "obtain information that could lead to new orders."

Rep. Ottinger, a railroad employe, and commuter groups scored the PC and the railroad defended itself at yet another hearing. The testimony of these hearings is being studied and no date has been set for evaluation of action.

The main argument the PC has used at the hearings is that it can not make a profit on commuter service and it therefore does not have the funds to make necessary improvements.

The PSC has backed this by essentially reiterating the argument in stating, "we are to be understood as meaning that it has been generally recognized . . . that railroad passenger business cannot be operated at a profit."

The primary reason for high costs, the railroad says, is that a full compliment of personnel and equipment must be maintained for what is essentially only 10 peak periods of use per week. Most transportation experts back the PC on this point.

The fact is that the PSC is not, on the basis of its own composition, ideally suited

for regulation of the railroad and commuters have realized this for years.

As far back as 1952, a committee of Westchester commuters called for reorganization of the PSC, saying it was too small to handle all public utilities and had become simply an apologist for them.

In the first place, the PSC is burdened with too many responsibilities.

It is charged with regulating rates and service of more than 3,000 corporations, municipalities, and individuals engaged in public service.

The commission is a political body. Appointments tend to be political.

Commissioner James A. Bundy is an example. He was appointed in 1959, after serving in industry as head of a corporation marketing petroleum naphtha products and serving six years as a Republican Queens Borough President.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 21, 1969]

#### CHICAGO & NORTHWESTERN RR PROFITS BY PASSENGERS

(By Sarah Dowson)

Just about everything Chicago & Northwestern's officials can say about their railroad, Penn Central management can't . . .

The Chicago & Northwestern railroad is the nation's second largest suburban service. It is prospering under private enterprise. In 1967, this railroad's suburban profits were \$2,250,000—without tax relief without state legislative aid.

But the picture wasn't always that bright for the Chicago & Northwestern. In years prior to 1956, their losses sometimes exceeded that amount.

New management took over the railroad April 1, 1956, assessed the situation and came up with three proposals for modernizing on the philosophy that rate increases alone were not the solution to annual deficits.

First, they closed 22 of their 88 commuter stations. These stations were mostly in Chicago and were duplicating mass transit service within the city. Certain stations, however, were maintained as interchange points with Chicago mass transit.

In another modernization step, the management revamped the fares and based all prices on the monthly unlimited ride ticket, rather than the one-way ticket. All other tickets were priced in some relationship to it.

Fares were increased 24 per cent December 1, 1958. For the next two years the railroad broke even, and after that it began to make a profit.

Diesel coaches were used and the old steam locomotives were eliminated. Management decided they wanted to transform their 417 old cars which had 64 to 78 seats into double-deck passenger units to avoid congestion of equipment.

In 1959 the railroad ordered 36 double-deck coaches and in 1960, ordered 116 more. To further avoid congestion, the railroad altered the construction in the trains to allow for more efficient movement in and out of terminals.

By 1961, Chicago & Northwestern had completed all of its modernization procedures, said one of their spokesmen. "We are expanding at 5 per cent a year buying new equipment to meet future needs," he said, "and we don't wait until we're forced to buy it from lack of facilities."

The Chicago & Northwestern is completely unsubsidized and also has one of the largest property taxes in the county, the spokesman said.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 21, 1969]

#### SUBURBAN SERVICE PROBED

(By Sarah Dowson)

New York officials were encouraged last fall when the Public Service Commission initiated a hearing to investigate Penn Central's

suburban service, after the railroad applied for a fare increase.

But they were not encouraged when the responsible official the railroad produced, Robert W. Minor, Senior Vice President, refused to commit himself to one definite proposal for improving the suburban service.

Minor kept stating that new equipment would become available through Penn Central's mergers, but he could not state exactly what the equipment was or when it would become available, the lawyers said.

The counsel examined the case and found that much of the equipment on the other lines was in even worse condition or could not be used on Penn Central tracks for technical reasons.

Based on the research of the Tri-State Transportation Commission, the official planning organization for the metropolitan New York area, New York City recommends to the PSC that present tariffs be realigned and new classes of commuter tickets be created.

In their experiment with stations on the Upper Harlem division, the Tri-State Transportation Commission found that when Penn Central reduced its off-peak fares, there was an increase in patronage of 119 per cent.

Penn Central claimed that higher fares will not result in a loss of off-peak patronage, and attempted to prove this through an experiment of raising fares in some stations on the upper Harlem division.

But, the city contends, Penn Central's figures were obtained by grouping stations with raised fares and stations with normal fares together.

New York lawyers separated the two types of stations, and found that patronage continued to climb where there was no fare increase, but fell off sharply where the fares were increased.

New York contends that the railroad's own passenger counts, when considered station by station, disproved the railroad's own pricing theory.

Since the Tri-State Transportation Commission has determined that as off-peak ridership declines, so does rush-hour patronage, the City says, therefore the disproportionately high off-peak fares now proposed by Penn Central should not be put into effect.

Penn Central, says the City, tried to justify this increase in off-peak fares by saying that the costs involved in selling and accounting on these tickets came to 92 per cent of their total ticket costs. This was a disproportionately high per cent, said the railroad, because off-peak tickets comprise only about 28 per cent of the rides.

But at the hearings, the City says, no railroad person could explain where these figures came from. Finally, on the last day of the hearing, Assistant Vice President James Lonto conceded that the identifiable ticket costs amounted to only 2½ per cent of the total cost of providing suburban service.

New York City witnesses testified that there should be tickets for occasional commuters in addition to the present monthly and individual ride tickets.

Mass Transit Coordinator Counsel, R. Raleigh D'Adamo, has worked to get the railroad to provide a counterpart to its Manhattan trip ticket for people in New York city who would like to visit the suburbs for a day at reduced fares.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 22, 1969]

#### PENN: RAILROAD AND MORE

(By Mark Flaumen and Sarah Dowson)

Historically, the Penn Central Corp. is a railroad company, but lately it is much more.

It is a ferris wheel in Texas, a hotel in Manhattan, a prize fight in the Garden, petroleum pipe lines, office buildings, and golf courses.

It is whatever is profitable, whatever its board of directors is interested in, whatever the stockholders agree to.

The Penn Central is a healthy concern that produced a profit of \$90.3 million last year, up 27 per cent from 1967.

This profit, railroad officials say, comes from freight service and corporate subsidiaries, such as the Buckeye Pipe Lines Co., the Macco Corp., a real estate and development concern, the Great Southwest Corp. of family amusement parks, and hotels such as the Biltmore and Barclay in New York.

The railroad claims on the other hand, that it lost more than \$100 million on passenger service last year and says it cannot continue this service without government subsidies.

The Pennsylvania Railroad merged with the New York Central System on Feb. 1, 1968, and the new name for the combined firm became the Penn Central Corp.

The PC also includes the New Haven and Hartford Railroads, carries nearly 300,000 passengers a day, and serves 16 states, Washington, D.C. and two Canadian provinces.

The railroad's reports on the future of its passenger operations have been contradictory.

In its annual report to stockholders, the PC not only emphasized losses incurred from passenger service, but also hinted there would be reductions in those operations.

"We are determined to reduce our passenger deficits to manageable proportions," the report states. "Our policy with regard to passenger service is to improve essential service but to phase out unneeded and unused trains."

But the report continues: "We are committed wholeheartedly to our responsibilities as a common carrier."

Though the report also states that "our railroad system is one of our most valuable assets," PC officials say this does not apply to passenger service and government subsidies will be required if this service is to be continued.

The railroad's attitude has been outlined by William H. Tucker, vice president of New England operations: "We are free enterprise oriented. We can't continue to operate with continued passenger deficits."

General Motors, for example, would not continue to manufacture passenger vehicles if it were losing money.

This is the way PC officials explain the situation.

But there are many factors which set PC apart from most corporations.

First, PC already receives funds and subsidies.

—A railroad tax relief law in New York exempts commuter railroads from some real estate taxes. The state estimates the PC has saved \$100 million since 1961 because of this exemption.

—In 1961, the state authorized \$100 million in Port of New York Authority bonds for the purchase of new commuter cars for leasing to the railroads.

—The Pennsylvania and New York Central merger, sanctioned by the Interstate Commerce Commission, will save the PC an estimated \$80 million.

Another fact that puts PC in a different situation than most corporations is that the merger made it a virtual railroad monopoly in the east. There are those, including Rep. Richard L. Ottinger, who feel this special status obligates the railroad to provide essential services even if they are not profitable.

Mr. Ottinger, along with other PC critics, has also questioned the railroad's bookkeeping methods, expressing doubts that passenger revenue losses have been as great as reported.

In a letter to PC officials, Mr. Ottinger said: "I really cannot believe the commuter operation losses are as great as they have been represented. Accounts tend to be fitted to prove whatever the railroad wants to prove."

Whether the railroad makes a profit on commuter service or not, it seems that the

PC no longer concentrates much energy or creativity on commuter operations.

In the railroad division, only freight service is the object of corporate innovation. In the past seven years, more than \$1½ billion in new freight equipment has been acquired.

In 1968, more than 4,600 freight cars were added to the fleet and multi-million dollar freight cars were added to the built in Ohio and Albany.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 22, 1969]

#### TOWNS PROTEST "DEPLORABLE" RAILROAD SERVICE

(By Sarah Dowson)

As Penn Central curtails service at stations along its Hudson and Harlem lines, the towns and village react with inquiries, protests and litigation.

As far back as the winter of 1948, Yonkers' City Council formed a six member committee to confer with New York Central on the need for better train service for Yonkers. They were successful to a certain extent, for in June, the railroad promised to have long-haul passenger trains make flag stops at Yonkers under a new schedule.

Passengers must signal the conductor they want to board or leave the train in a flag stop; otherwise the train will not stop.

Mayor Richard S. Hendy of White Plains has stated that the service at his town is deplorable, and has filed a complaint at one of the recent hearings. He does not believe that Penn Central management has lived up to its end of the bargain—providing better services to passengers after getting its fare increase.

Last year, Greenburgh Supervisor Nicholas B. Russo solicited commuters opinions on a question of tax relief on the railroad's property in Greenburgh.

Based on the replies, they made an application to Penn Central requesting better service, and appeared before the Public Service Commission on Dec. 16, 1968. Russo told the state officials that Penn Central should be denied the \$100,000 tax statement on the grounds that it is not meeting the standards of service set by the PSC.

Commissioner J. Burch McMoran decided that denial of tax relief would be inappropriate in view of the improvements the railroad was then considering.

In 1966, a fire gutted the Columbus Avenue station in Mount Vernon. Penn Central wanted to close the station, according to Arthur H. Ellis, Corporation Counsel for the City of Mount Vernon.

Mount Vernon residents wrote the PSC, he said, and a hearing followed. After a hearing the PSC determined to require a shelter with rest room, heating facilities and a ticket agent. In April, Penn Central appealed the decision. The case is currently on the May calendar at the state supreme court.

Some towns don't seem to have any trouble at all with the railroad. Scarsdale, which has one of the cleanest and most scenic stations on the Harlem line, was able to get the railroad to pay for sandblasting and painting its station last spring.

"We got hold of a good man for a similar job in another part of town," says Village Attorney Frances Cunnion, "so we got a darn good price on the bill for sandblasting and painting last spring."

Sheldon Wagner, Hastings' Mayor, has no knowledge of any litigation with Penn Central or the PSC. "Commuters just haven't complained very much," he said.

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 22, 1969]

#### VANDALISM COSTS PENN CENTRAL IN ACCIDENTS, INCONVENIENCE

(By Sarah Dowson)

Penn Central Hudson line commuters were jolted from their dozes and newspapers not too long ago when a shower of sparks and

dense smoke shot from the fuse box in the front of a car and was accompanied by loud hissing.

The train slackened in speed until it was crawling forward. Passengers muttered to each other and stirred uneasily. Suddenly another shower sprayed over the people sitting in front and they evacuated their seats.

Commuters started to cough as the hissing and the ominous smoke issued from the car. Would there be an explosion? Nobody knew, but that question was in one observer's mind at least.

Minutes after the train had stopped the conductor conferred with his assistant and the engineer. Then he told everyone to move to a car in the rear. Passengers needed no second urging.

When the move was completed, they kept conductors busy retrieving packages they had left in the front car.

A half hour later conductors were helping passengers cross platforms to the new train, a local which was sent to the rescue.

All things considered, the mishap was handled well, as all passengers were safe, and the train was only 45 minutes late.

The conductors were courteous, patient, and did their best to keep passengers informed. Railroad employes said a fuse blew because of a short circuit, though it was never ascertained if a foreign object on the tracks caused it.

Passengers are justified for being annoyed at inconveniences such as this one, yet there is very little that anyone can do when accidents are caused by vandalism.

Vandalism occurs every day. It costs the railroad thousands of dollars a year, and even lives. A trainman, George Burns, was killed last month by a rifle shot while his train was passing through Harlem.

John Miras, an engineer, runs across old couches, tires, bicycles and other discarded trash almost every day. "People throw things they don't want near the tracks, and kids who don't know what they're doing will put the stuff on the tracks."

Three weeks ago, when he was taking train No. 843 along the Hudson line, he accidentally ran over a bedspring lying under the third rail. "I didn't know I hit it until it was too late," he said.

"Passengers panicked when the third car in the train caught fire," he said. "I don't blame them. The flashes of light were from a short circuit, and people were jumping off the car before we got the power turned off."

"One guy jumped and landed on a sewer pipe. He got a broken jaw and had 26 stitches. I wasn't hurt myself, but our conductor was. He went to the third car to help passengers."

Ray Lane, the conductor, said his face was burned and he was temporarily blind for five hours from the flashing fuses.

"It was all I could do to get the train into the Spuyten Duyvil station," said Miras.

"The most dangerous thing, though," said Miras, "is these kids who throw rocks. One of our men lost an eye from that a few years ago."

Penn Central estimates that vandalism from broken windows alone costs them "at least \$50,000 a year."

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 23, 1969]

#### THE ROAD AHEAD FOR PENN

(By Mark Flaumen and Sarah Dowson)

Plans for the future of Penn Central Railroad's commuter service rests primarily with the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), but that organization seems to have little planned for the Penn Central.

In 1967, state voters approved a \$2.5 billion transportation bond issue recommended by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller for modernization and improvement of the state's transportation system.

When the bond issue was approved, Gov. Rockefeller ordered the MTA to study the

areas of vital transportation needs and draw up plans for allocation of the funds.

The MTA, headed by Chairman William J. Ronan has the responsibility of developing and implementing a unified mass transportation policy in the New York metropolitan area.

In 1968, the MTA prepared a two-phase "program for action" for improvement of the state's transportation system.

To Westchester commuters the report was simply a disappointment, for it proposed minor improvements for the PC.

Phase one, to cost \$1.6 million, calls for only 1 of 20 projects to be directed towards the PC, and estimates that the work will not be completed for at least 15 years.

The work involves the purchase of 130 new high speed electric cars, construction of high level platforms, and electrification to Brewster on the Harlem division.

Phase two, which will probably not go into the financing stage for at least a decade, proposes only 1 of 16 projects for improvement of the PC.

Phase two concerns continuation of PC modernization including extension of electrification to Peekskill on the Hudson division, modernization of the signal system, purchase of electric and dual powered cars, and improvements of signals and track.

While both reports sound somewhat promising, commuters know that you can't get to work on words alone. The latest report from the MTA is that even phase one is still in the "early talking stages."

The great bulk of MTA funds and projects is aimed at transportation facilities within New York City, especially the Long Island Rail Road and the subway system, even though the MTA recognizes that New York's population will remain relatively stable while surrounding counties will experience the greatest growth in population and industry.

This heavy concentration of projects in New York City has been severely criticized by commuters and politicians, including former state Senator Max Berking and Rep. Richard L. Ottinger.

Mr. Ottinger has charged the MTA policy is based on "deceit." He has said that Westchester voters were told the bond issue would be used for improvement of the PC and instead the funds are being concentrated elsewhere.

Charging that the funds have been used to build highways "which paved the suburbs with expressways," Mr. Ottinger has asked the state legislature to reorder priorities of bond issue projects.

While charges and countercharges ricochet between Washington, Albany, and New York, the average commuter appears skeptical of any progress.

PC officials insist they are hopeful of future improvement of the railroad, but base this optimism on the event that government funds will be forthcoming.

"We are hopeful," a spokesman said, "but we can't be expected to operate a good railroad on a non-profit basis."

The railroad's main defense has always been that commuter traffic occurs in only 10 peak periods a week but a full line of equipment and personnel must be maintained all day, even though there is very little use of the facilities.

This they say, results in an extremely expensive operation with very little funds in return.

But a demonstration project on the Harlem division, conducted for 28 months beginning July 1, 1964, proved that improved rail service—faster schedules, better parking facilities and more frequent service—does attract a substantial number of additional rush and off-hour commuters to the railroad.

The demonstration project indicated there is a future in suburban service.

The future of commuter service on the Penn Central therefore rests with one question: What does the PC want?

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 23, 1969]

PENN CENTRAL: FIGURES DON'T ADD UP FOR COMMUTERS

(By Sarah Dowson)

"The public address system has a low priority," Penn Central's Chief Regional Engineer for the New York region, William Glavin, said recently. "The money must come from fares, and we believe that track work, equipment renovation and refurbishing long haul coaches for comfortable suburban service must be given priority," he continued.

Stuart T. Saunders, chairman of the board, earns \$238,000 a year just in salary, and Alfred Perlman, president, earns \$176,000. The railroad claims it cannot afford \$21,135 for a public address system on the Harlem line, and \$84,392 for one on the Hudson line.

Lawyers, commuters and members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers have been fighting for better suburban service for years, but seldom, if ever, get straightforward answers out of Penn Central.

Until recently, no one had proof positive that the railroad was deliberately trying to phase out passenger service. But members of the Brotherhood discovered, and copied, a memo which proved to be a great source of embarrassment to Penn Central when it was brought to light at the PSC hearing in testimony April 16th.

Dated August 5, 1968, it was written by R. C. Harrison and reads, in part:

"We have been receiving an increasing amount of criticism of the condition of our passenger equipment. Of course, we all know our long range objective in respect to eventual elimination of our long haul passenger services, particularly the sleeping car segment of the business . . .

"All of us involved are well aware of the need for shrinking our passenger car fleet as quickly as possible and this is being done." The memo stressed the importance of maintenance for the remaining equipment. It's author has since been transferred to Indianapolis.

The City of New York always has representatives and lawyers at the PSC hearings, and Corporation Counsel J. Lee Rankin has compiled a strong case against the railroad.

"The deterioration of services is a planned conspiracy to drive commuters away from the trains," said R. Raleigh D'Adamo, Mass Transit Coordinator Counsel. "Penn Central would like to claim that because no one is using the railroad, they can't operate it. They'd like the state to pay them to operate it."

New York's case, like the memo, substantiates the suspicions commuters have had about the curtailment of passenger service.

New York City contends that Penn Central should not be granted tax relief on municipal properties because it has juggled its accounting to show more of a loss in suburban service than is actually the case.

"What the railroad has to do is keep passenger service income down, because if it shows sign of a profit, Penn Central will lose its tax breaks," said D'Adamo.

He was referring to the New York State Real Property Tax Law, section 489, which was enacted in 1959 and says the railroad should be entitled to tax abatements on all municipal properties.

The law ends with the statement: partial tax exemptions will grant "greater relief to the railroads that need it more by giving increasingly greater exemptions as the rate of earnings of a railroad system declines."

Genevieve Leary, a research analyst in the State Dept. of Transportation, testified that Penn-Central has saved \$184,947,121 on mu-

nicipal taxes since the law went into effect. Penn-Central spokesmen claim to have saved "13 or 14 million."

"Our case is to raise the question of the railroad's good faith when they ask for assistance. Instead of giving the best service possible, as the airlines do, they mismanage the railroad," said D'Adamo.

Two instances of possible equivocation on the part of the railroad were illustrated in Rankin's brief: the question of income from ground rents, and an accounting theory involving employees who ride free on trains.

Ground rents are the income Penn Central receives from buildings above its underground track facilities between 42nd and 59th streets in Manhattan.

Hotels such as the Waldorf-Astoria and the Biltmore are actually standing on stilts based on this underground property that Penn Central owns. Penn Central earns a great deal of money from hotels and other buildings which pay rent on their foundations.

The tax law, in section 489, allows tax relief only on railroad properties. The railroad so far has not included income from these ground rents as part of its suburban income.

The City contends that the passenger carrying service is denied sizable sums of money in rents because this underground track complex has been declared non-railroad property.

The second bone contention is one of accounting principle. Should free rides for employees be counted as an increase in cost, because more cars have to be used to accommodate additional passengers, or should the suburban operation be credited with the amount these employees would be paying if they were regular fare customers?

The railroad is trying to lose money, argues the City, and urges the PSC to make them credit theoretical income from employees to suburban service. The difference in theories is significant, says the City, because it could account for \$639,133 in additional credit to the suburban service, or almost 29 per cent of the railroad's claimed deficit.

The annual deficit in railway operating income was projected as \$2,228,712 as of Jan. 1, 1969, according to the City.

"It is one thing for the railroad to appeal for funds because it needs more revenues from higher fares to offset higher wages and costs." But it is quite another to seek higher fares based on a "unilateral whimsical change of theory . . . This is a paper loss at best, and cannot be condoned, defended or explained to regular fare-paying passengers," concluded the City.

The question is: what will it take to bring Penn Central, the PSC, and N.Y. State officials to their senses before more people are injured from accidents and more equipment is run into the ground?

New York observers are pondering this and also, what will it take before more thousands are spent on hearings that lead nowhere? (It costs \$100 for each volume of hearing transcript, for example. For this fall and spring it comes to a couple of thousand.)

He has several recommendations:

—The PSC should take more court action to bring suit against the railroad for violations of its standards of service.

—The State Legislature should set up a committee composed of members of both houses to study the problem of Penn Central's commuter service.

—More thought should be given to the Real Estate Tax law which actually rewards Penn Central for book juggling to show deficits.

—Some thought should also be given to corporation laws, which make it impossible to compel a company to divert income from a profitable venture to beef up a less profitable one.

Penn Central, he said, cannot be com-

pelled to divert funds from the salaries of its board members, its income from real estate and subsidiaries to suburban service because it is a corporation.

But can Penn Central, as a transit public facility which is franchised by the state, be allowed to downgrade commuter service?

Should there be a reappraisal of these corporation laws as to how they should be applied to a corporation which is also a public transportation facility, he wonders?

[From the Yonkers (N.Y.) Herald Statesman, May 23, 1969]

**HISTORY: THE RISE AND FALL OF TODAY'S PENN CENTRAL**

(By Mark Flaumen)

The history of the Penn Central Railroad is like that of a once glorious empire slowly returned to sand.

The men and machines that color the railroad's past read larger than life—brawling, building, flexing their muscles—standing tall and arrogant to the end.

What commuters see now is a crumbling anemic milk train version of the great road established in 1853 by long time Albany Mayor Erastus Corning and other businessmen.

It was the New York Central then, a combination of 10 little railroads that weaved through the isolated settlements along the Mohawk Valley and the Erie Canal.

And when the war between the states flared up in the 1860's, the Central's somber black locomotives chewed pine logs and spewed drifts of smoke across the banks of the Mohawk River, carrying Union troops to New York.

There was pride in the railroad in the early days—a pride that launched the test run of engine number 999 to reach a new speed record of 111 mph in 1893.

And there was arrogance and greed as well, exhibited almost defiantly by the captains of industry who ruled the railroad and the nation's economy before the days of the trustbusters.

Multi-millionaire Cornelius Vanderbilt, who gained control of the railroad in 1867, immediately voted himself \$6 million in cash and \$20 million in new stock issues.

Vanderbilt, and his son William who became vice president, filled their pockets with profits while stripping all the color and brass of the ornate locomotives, and the iron workhorses became known as Black Crooks.

Commuters feeling the high-handed tactics of the present leadership can take some comfort in the knowledge that the strong men of the past were no more polite to their customers.

Commodore Vanderbilt is reported to have said "Law! What do I care about law."

Son William told a group of reporters, "The public be damned," in inference to his belief that the railroad should be run for the benefit of the stockholders.

The heyday of the Penn Central and the other of the nation's numerous railroads was in the 1920's when passenger trains were on 90 per cent of the national rail system.

But the car, the train, and the bus soon began to gobble up large portions of the intercity transportation business and the railroads fell into periods of declining use.

In 1916 the railroads enjoyed 98 per cent of the intercity traffic, but by 1957 they held only 28 per cent as planes began to take what is now the lion's share.

The New York Central System had 235 passenger stations in 1934, but less than half that number by 1959, and the trend is continuing.

The Central merged with the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1968 to become Penn Central and the leaders that now run the corporation are more interested in motels and golf courses than in building good railroads.

A look at the title of the PC board of di-

rectors shows the heads of insurance companies, banks, and even Campbell's Soup, and that is all one has to see to know that the golden age of railroads is no longer.

**MEMORIAL DAY OBSERVANCE IN WILLISTON, N.Y.**

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the annual Memorial Day observance held by the Williston, N.Y., post No. 144 of the American Legion.

This annual observance is typical of the many fine such ceremonies held throughout New York's Third Congressional District and across the entire country.

The services in Williston were highlighted when Susan Brunner, a local student, read a poem from her own pen. Because this observance reflects the true spirit of Memorial Day and because Miss Brunner's poem is both thoughtful and well written, I have requested permission to include the program of this meeting and Miss Brunner's poem in the RECORD at this point:

**WITH A FRIEND**

Look, God, I have never spoken to You,  
But now I want to say "How do You do?"  
You see, God, they told me you didn't exist,  
And like a fool, I believed all this.

Last night from a shell hole, I saw your sky  
I figured right then they had told me a lie.

Had I taken time to see things You had made  
I'd have known they weren't calling a spade  
a spade.

I wonder, God, if You'd shake my hand,  
Somehow, I feel that You will understand.  
Funny, I had to come to this hellish place,  
Before I had time to see Your face.

Well, I guess there isn't much more to say,  
But I'm sure glad, God, I met you today.

I guess the "zero hour" will soon be here.  
But I'm not afraid since I know You're here.  
The signal! Well, God, I'll have to go.

I like you lots, this I want You to know.  
Look now, this will be a horrible fight,  
Who knows, I may come to Your house to-  
night,

Though I wasn't friendly to You before,  
I wonder, God, if You'd wait at Your door.  
Look, I'm crying—Me! shedding tears!  
I wish I had known You these many years.  
Well, I'll have to go now, God, goodbye!  
Strange, since I met You, I'm not afraid to  
die.

**THIRTEENTH ANNUAL POST EVERLASTING SERVICES, MAY 30, 1969, WILLISTON POST No. 144, AMERICAN LEGION, 1957-69**

**PROGRAM**

First Call, 9:30 a.m.; Bugler.  
Assembly, 9:40 a.m.; All units.  
Greetings: 1st. Vice Commander C. Katzer.  
Entrance Parade, "The Marine Hymn"; 1st  
Battalion Band.

Invocation: John Follmer.  
Introduction of Post Commander: 1st Vice  
Commander Charles Katzer.

Welcoming Address: Post Commander Robert Tucker.

Guest Speaker: Congressman Lester Wolff.  
Roll Call of Our Departed Comrades: Post  
Commander.

Jack Bartley, Thomas Fitzpatrick, Joseph O'Neill, Frank Graf, Frederick Ironside, Lewellyn O'Brien.

Roll Call of Our Departed Members: Unit President Marge Ross.

Aimee Barry, Marge McGrath.

Notice.—Front Row Chairs are reserved for representatives who will place wreaths. Chairs are reserved for the Disabled Veterans, Gold Star Mothers, and Distinguished Guests.

Posting of Brazier: Post Members.

Entry and Transmittal of Names and Records of Departed Comrades Into Post Everlasting Records: Post Chaplain and Post Adjutant.

Solo: Donald Paris.

Placing of Wreaths: American Legion Post No. 144, American Legion Auxiliary Unit No. 144, V.F.W. Cpl. Theo. G. Nier Post No 1688, V.F.W. Auxiliary Unit Cpl. Theo. G. Nier Post No. 1688.

Token Presentation to Next of Kin: Post Chaplain.

Salute to Our Dead: Firing Squad.

Taps: Bugler.

Solo: Donald Paris.

Recitation: Susan Brunner.

Benediction: Post Chaplain.

Dismissal of Colors: Post Commander.

Exit March: 1st Battalion Band.

**PARTICIPANTS IN 1969 POST EVERLASTING SERVICES**

Master of Ceremonies: 1st Vice Commander C. Katzer.

Post Commander: Robert Tucker.

Chaplain: John Follmer.

Adjutant: Frank Russo.

Color Guard: Post Commander John Haeckel, Jasper Mazzella, Phillip Romeo, John Sienkiewicz.

Firing Squad: Past Commander Harold Gelderman, Past Commander George Schiller, Peter Holowecki, Theodore Kertz, Phillip La Veglia, Charles Nielson, Thomas Wrenn.

Brazier Detail: Past Commander Richard Cosgrove, Past Commander Peter Mazzella, Arthur Buckhout, Robert Little, Arthur Locke.

Unit President: Marge Ross.

Unit Chaplain, Ann Katzer.

Soloist: Donald Paris.

Drum & Bugle: 1st Battalion Band.

Recitation: Susan Brunner.

Parade Marshal: James O'Keefe.

Program Chairman: James O'Keefe.

We wish to thank all of the organizations that participated with us on this Memorial Day.

**COOPERATIVE EDUCATION**

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year in the monumental Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Congress authorized vocational cooperative programs in high schools and junior colleges.

Due to the attention focused on cooperative programs by the amendments, the Christian Science Monitor is presenting a series of articles on the value of cooperative education.

I am inserting one of these articles in the RECORD in the hope that Congress will provide funds for this exciting new program as well as for all the other new programs authorized by the 1968 amendments.

The article follows:

## HIGH-SCHOOLERS JOIN CO-OP CORPS

(By Dorothea Kahn Jaffe)

(NOTE.—Every year, more and more youngsters looking to their futures are being enabled to start on congenial careers while still in high school. The doorway: cooperative, or work-experience, education. Encouraged by federal aid, "co-op" programs are expected to increase. Educators believe that more "co-ops" will mean fewer dropouts.)

**NEW YORK.**—The bored youngster who sits staring at his high-school history book or geometry text wondering "what's the use of all this?" now can take hope.

Cooperative education is coming to his rescue.

Thanks to funds which Congress has authorized for the work-experience (co-op) form of education, many secondary schools which do not now offer the program may soon launch it.

And the boy who finds his classes dull will have an opportunity to break out of the school routine by alternating periods of study with equal periods of full-time work in business and industry. Experience in an adult environment may show him why schooling is needed for a good career and thus give him greater motivation for study.

Some of the teachers and principals who have observed the program in high schools say it does this. "The kids come back from their jobs different persons—more mature, responsible, more interested in their academic work," says one teacher.

Statistical studies confirm these impressions. One appraisal made by Research Survey Associates for the New York high schools found the dropout rate for students in co-op over the years studied to be 5 percent as compared with a 30 percent rate for "comparable populations" not in co-op. The study noted also improvement in co-op students' reading intelligence over the period reviewed.

## FINANCIAL HELP PROVIDED

Congressional passage of the Vocational Amendments Act of 1968 will give needed financial help over a five-year period to those high schools wishing to expand their present co-op programs or to adopt new ones. The act authorizes substantial grants to the states for the purpose of promoting the program.

This financial help is needed. Many high schools do not have the money required to plan new programs and to hire the additional personnel which work-experience education demands. Co-op calls for a new kind of faculty member known as a coordinator, a liaison officer linking schools with the business world and supervising students after they enter it.

The coordinators must be well trained, well paid. The funds which Congress has authorized may be used in part to recruit and prepare them.

It is fortunate, in view of the planning required to make use of the new federal-aid money, that a considerable body of experience with the program already exists.

In addition to the general co-op courses long offered in a few schools are several effective special programs which have been developed under the George-Deen Act of 1936. One of these, distributive education, has long sent its high-school participants into retail establishments for part-time work experience. Distributive Education Clubs of America, composed entirely of these job-holding students, is approaching the 100,000 mark in membership.

At a recent convention of these clubs in Atlantic City, all 50 states were represented among the 3,200 students attending.

For all high schools sending students out on part-time jobs an administrative problem arises: How shall the school provide time for the work experience without causing students to neglect the academic courses required for a diploma?

Some schools give the co-op students double periods of academic subjects in special classes. Others use a half-day plan, assigning students to regular classes in the morning and to jobs in the afternoon.

In far-off Nova Scotia, Dartmouth High School sends 82 sophomores out for one full day a week while 148 freshmen work one-half day a week. Dayton, Ohio, which has one completely cooperative high school, makes it possible for students to spend alternate two-week periods on their jobs but extends the school year, holding classes through most of the summer.

The co-op plan in American high schools has had a spotty growth. In a few schools, such as those of New York City and Dayton, it has been flourishing for more than 50 years.

But it is still not available to thousands of boys and girls who need it. Many schools do not offer it at all, and others limit enrollment to pupils considered "good risks." This means that a student must have a good record of attendance, at least average grades, and an interest in working. Such regulations rule out the potential dropout who might be kept in school if given this chance to earn and learn.

## SELECTIVITY QUESTIONED

New York City's experience indicates that the program need not be so selective as some schools have made it. Many of New York's nearly 6,000 co-op students come from disadvantaged homes of the inner city. The program here excludes the college-bound students. It is open only to those in "general" courses designed for terminal students. This unfortunately hurts the image of the program, but it does open it to many who need it most.

Apparently it has not lowered the status of the program in the eyes of employers. Those with whom I spoke paid high tribute to their student employees.

At present, with business and industry crying for workers, placement is no problem, says Mrs. Renée C. Sherline, acting director of cooperative education for the New York City schools. Big employers such as Macy's, IBM, AT&T, and the New York Stock Exchange, as well as some smaller ones, make up the list of 150 private concerns cooperating at present. In addition, 77 municipal agencies and several state offices hire "co-ops."

Employers usually are eager to retain their co-op employees after they graduate. And a high proportion of high-school students take the jobs offered them by their co-op employers.

The percentage of those who remain often runs very high. The New York Stock Exchange reports that it keeps "almost all." One of the New York coordinators I met told me that among the 9,300 girls who have completed the co-op program at her school (Julia Richmond High), since it was introduced, 85 percent continued working with the same firm after getting their diplomas.

Other New York studies indicate that the co-op experience has been beneficial to the students.

One such study recently scanned the records of 50 high-school students before and after co-op, comparing their ratings for the first semester of 1968-69 when they went out to jobs with those of the previous year, when they attended classes full time.

Practically all students showed improvement in both studies and attendance after work experience. Although 37 students had records of previous "citizenship failures," no such failures were found during the co-op period. Ten who had previous academic failures made the honor roll after entering co-op.

## "I CAN BUY MY OWN CLOTHES"

While statistics are significant, comments of the students themselves may be more

illuminating. Mrs. Dorothy Janis, coordinator at Prospect Heights High School, New York, showed me some written by girls in an English class. Most of these students, coming from low-income families, emphasized the earning aspect which educators consider secondary.

"In my opinion the course is great," wrote Anita. "With the help of my job I can buy my own clothes, pay my transportation money, and try to help my parents. Like for insist [sic], last Christmas I had enough money to buy my mother a coat which she was much in need of."

Carlotta wrote: "When you are out in the world working you feel more grown up. You feel like you are somebody. Making the money, you don't have to ask anyone to give you anything. You really have become a young lady."

Unsigned: "It's really a great opportunity. Ever since I've been in co-op I've made quite a change, not only in making money but in appearance and really in manners. You learn to speak in a different way with business people."

Not everybody was as enthusiastic as the majority. Inez wasn't. Asked, "What do you like about the job?" she answered, "What I like about the job is not much. My job is okay, but I'm sure I can get paid more for what [sic] I'm doing."

Another girl found she didn't enjoy office work and was glad the experience had shown her what it was like. She'll find herself another career, she wrote. But the great majority expressed strong approval of the program.

Even where the program succeeds, however, it raises problems. A major one is finding jobs that not only pay wages but which are of real educational value. Business naturally wants production from its employees. The school agrees it should get value for the wages it pays, but it is concerned also that the student gets a broad education while he produces.

"We've battled and battled for educational jobs," said N. T. Whiteman, principal of Patterson Cooperative High School in Dayton. He has had considerable success in his struggle.

Some employers, on the other hand, complain that school people are so eager to find jobs for their students that they are not selective enough.

Another problem is union relations. Federal labor laws determine minimum wages for children over 16 years of age on the same scale as that used for adults. The law also states that a student worker must not displace a regular full-time employee.

Unions are vigilant to see that these provisions are observed.

Perhaps the greatest problem is to reach the children most in need of high-school co-op experience. Even in New York City, with its open-enrollment policies, a small proportion of those eligible participate in the program. Mrs. Sherline estimates that in a typical high school of 4,000 enrollment only about 150 students would be "co-ops."

## COORDINATORS SEE PRESTIGE REASONS

Why so few? Coordinators I met in New York say it is mainly because of the poor image of vocational education. Parents want their children enrolled in college-preparatory courses for prestige reasons, whether they expect them to enter college or not. Educators think a way must be found to change prevailing attitudes toward work-experience. Co-op rarely bears a stigma when offered in colleges, and it should not in high-school circles.

Another problem exists in rural areas where jobs in business and industry are few. Children in the Southern mountains and in areas of poor farmland and abandoned mines greatly need the opportunities offered by cooperative education. But 81 percent of the opportunities for co-op school jobs are in the

inner cities, reports Dr. Trudy Banta of the University of Tennessee. "Children in small towns need this experience just as much as city kids, if not more," she points out.

It is to be hoped that when funds begin to flow to the states in July, according to terms of the Vocational Amendments Act of 1968, those states which have the problem of educating disadvantaged children for useful careers will give particular attention to areas which are too poor to carry on cooperative education without government aid.

#### CONFLICT OF THE AGES

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, "Conflict of the Ages" written in 1932 by Dr. Arno C. Gaebelein, consulting editor of the Scofield Reference Bible contains an interesting revelation on the Stalinist plan for the destruction of our people.

Ever since this summary was published, nearly 40 years ago, we have heard bitter charges of the untruth of these predictions. Again and again patriots attempting to warn of the success of this conspiracy have been accused of conducting witch-hunts and discovering imaginary Communists under every bed. Any objective comparison of Dr. Gaebelein's predictions with the history of the last 40 years shows the startling success of a real conspiracy in every single one of the areas designated.

Because of the timely warning of "Conflict of the Ages," I present pages 110 and 111 of the chapter "The Russian Revolution" following my remarks:

To accomplish the "world revolution," the domination of the world by the demonized teachings of Karl Marx, this country must fall, they say, as Russia fell.

Joseph Stalin has published last year a detailed plan for the destruction of our country. This information was passed on to all the Communist District organizers and secretaries throughout our country. Read it! Then review in your mind what has taken place and what is increasingly taking place all over our country. Then decide for yourself the seriousness of the situation. Here are the devil's suggestions:

Religion: By philosophy, mysticism, the development of liberal cults, and the furtherance of atheism, to discredit all Christian creeds.

Ethical: Corrupt morality by advocating promiscuity and advising high school and university students to practice same; introduction of companionable marriage ideas; advocacy of legalized abortions; advancement of theoretical interracial practices—marriage of white women to colored men—by actual consummation through willing participants where obtainable. Destruction of the family, abolition of inheritance, even to the extent of names; destruction of all records of title, birth and family history.

Aesthetic: Cultivation of the ugly, futuristic and aberrant in art, literature, the drama and music; the practice of crude orientalism, modernism and degenerate perversion.

Sociological: Abolition of social opposition by subversive practices; the display of vulgar extravagance, promotion and exaggeration of all social and economic conditions, political corruption, etc., to create unrest, suspicion and revolt by the workers, intensify class war.

Industrial and Financial: Create mistrust of banks by circulation of rumors of instability and distress. Destroy ideals in crafts-

manship and pride of workmanship; set up—by series of public talks by professors of sociology and others—the picture of a golden serpent of profit. Standardization of the cheap and shoddy; advocate the state monopoly of ownership; exchange of all foreign currency at slight discount for U.S. gold and gradually withdraw gold from circulation, send all gold currency to Russia.

Political: Set up the ideal of thinking "internationally," so as to undermine national patriotism; weaken all government departments by corruption. Attack all political parties and create suspicion and distrust upon any and all occasions. Amplify facts by fiction and create startling exposures. Ridicule all patriotic effort and undermine all preparation for defense; carry out our set policy for world revolution outlined in Rykoff's position.

Rykoff, in "Pravda," said: "It is our duty to inculcate in the minds of all nations the theory of international friendship, pacifism and disarmament, at the same time, however, never for one moment relaxing our efforts in the upbuilding of our own military establishment."

Lenin said: "When a country is selected for attack we must first set up before the youth of that land a mental barrage which will forever prohibit the possibility of that youth being moulded into an armed force to oppose our invading armies. This can most successfully be done through creating 'war horror' thought and by teaching of pacifism and non-resistance. It will be found that powerful organizations of non-communists can be created for this purpose particularly with the aid of liberal-minded ministers, professors and lecturers."

Bucharin said: "Friendship of liberal-minded ministers shall be sought, as these men are at the present time the leaders of the masses."

"Conferences on economic conditions among the people shall be held from time to time with these ministers, educators and other liberal elements and through their influences the party shall aim to secure a more favorable hearing before the people."

Read it *once more!* All that is advocated by these enemies of God and man is being carried out today in the United States and elsewhere. Look deeper and see how the industrial and financial experiences of the world during the last three years are *linked up with this program*. It is not a new program. It is the program of the Illuminati, the program of the French revolution, of Babeuf and Karl Marx. And the liberal-minded ministers, educators and others, who call themselves "The Friends of the Soviet," have responded to this program. Hundreds of preachers of the modernistic-materialistic-evolution type, who are infidels, men who have abandoned the true Gospel of Jesus Christ and turned socialist, with hundreds more of college professors and high school teachers, are now playing into the hands of the reds, advocating the introduction of the devil-inspired theories of Marx-Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. How can any self-respecting man or woman, not to speak of Christians, advocate the recognition of the Soviets by our government, so that the flag of honor and glory, can be displayed alongside the red flag of blood, murder and ruin?

#### POLITICIANS URGED TO HEED SCIENTISTS ON ABM VOTE

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in all the clamor today against the proposed

anti-ballistic-missile system, we must not lose sight of what fate might befall us in future years were we forced to bargain with unfriendly or enemy nations from a position of weakness, rather than strength. I would like to share the following excellent article by retired Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby outlining the strategic merits of the ABM system:

#### POLITICIANS URGED TO HEED SCIENTISTS ON ABM VOTE

(By Ruthven E. Libby)

The spectacular success of the Apollo 10 flight leaves no doubt that there is very little that Americans cannot do if we put our minds to it.

The problem is to get us to concentrate on the things that are vital; to select the highest priority programs from among the myriad clamoring for our attention, and then to pursue them with the singleness of purpose, the energy, and the determination necessary to accomplish them.

Where our security is concerned, the process of selection is difficult at best. And it is made more difficult by the persistence with which some of our politicians operate on the basis that their skills in political science qualifies them to lead in matters involving the physical sciences, of which they know very little. The controversy now raging over the Safeguard antiballistic missile system is an example of the damage these people can do.

One of the foremost world experts on nuclear physics, Dr. Edward Teller, says of this debate:

"There is a need for affirmative action on our part to insure the future security of this nation. The dialogue so far has been dangerously one-sided. The opposition to the Safeguard system—a system which is actually defensive and nonprovocative—is articulate, organized and sustained.

"The opponents claim there is no defense against nuclear-tipped ICBMs (intercontinental ballistic missiles). In my opinion there is not sufficient scientific data available to definitely affirm or deny this claim.

"It is fair to say that there is not yet a sure defense against enemy nuclear attack. But this is certainly not the same as saying that there cannot be a defensive position against nuclear ICBMs. . . .

"If the vote is negative, an important avenue of defense will be blocked for a long period. The need for a favorable decision is urgent because Soviet Russia has caught up with us in offensive power and is rapidly forging ahead. In not more than five years they may have the ability to wipe out our retaliatory force with a sudden 'first strike.' Missile defense would at least cast a doubt into the minds of the Communist planners. If they cannot be certain of success they probably will not attack.

"There is barely enough time if we act now."

Another qualified advocate of the Safeguard system, the noted author and—in her own right, political scientist—Phyllis Schlafly, recently testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in support of the Safeguard system. Her testimony is recommended reading for every concerned citizen. Commenting on the contention of the opponents of the Safeguard system that the "best hope for ultimate security" lies in an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union, she warns:

"The delusion that America can be defended by treaties instead of by weapons is the most persistent and pernicious of all today's fallacies. We cannot put our hope for peace in agreements with the Communists who have broken their pledged word to every country with which they signed a major agreement. . . . A confirmed treaty-breaker is not cured by being invited to sign one more treaty. . . .

"The McNamara crowd was wrong in not

anticipating that the Soviets would betray the first nuclear test ban.

"It was wrong in foolishly believing that Khrushchev would not send his nuclear missiles into Cuba. It was wrong in thinking that the Soviets would not build supermega-ton weapons. It was wrong in believing that the Soviets would stop building missiles when they achieved parity. It was wrong in thinking that the Soviets have 'mellowed.' . . . There is no record of the McNamara crowd ever being right in evaluating Soviet capabilities or intentions."

In this particular testimony, she is directing her fire against the book sponsored by Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., released to the press on May 6, of which she says that "the dozens upon dozens of typographical errors in the 'hastily printed' report are exceeded only by its errors of historical fact, of logic, and of strategic analysis, and by its internal inconsistencies." Yet it is this sort of specious political reasoning that seems to be tipping the scales in the congressional maelstrom, against the deployment of what is really a pilot operation.

The Safeguard system will determine how best to capitalize on the \$5 billion already expended in research on the antimissile system, which even if not 100 per cent successful (which nobody expects it to be) will save a minimum of 50 million American lives in the event of nuclear attack. It also will serve as a powerful deterrent to such an attack by the simple fact that it exists.

The clamor against the Safeguard system is a part of what Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., another dedicated patriot, has characterized aptly as "a fatigue of spirit, malaise of the soul" resulting from our confusing military preparedness with the causes of war.

Americans, he says, "are fatigued with the necessity of national defense—the necessity not only to keep a large force of missiles, ships, and men, but to keep it ready, to keep it ever modern, to keep it in an adequate state of repair . . . This fatigue has led to a striking out against the military forces that defend us. Our military are attacked instead of the threat which makes the military forces necessary."

We must face the fact that powerful forces in this country are making strenuous efforts to turn public opinion away from facing up to stringent national security requirements. One of the arguments most often heard is that we must put more of our resources into meeting domestic needs, and hence must take funds away from military programs. There are two fallacies here: one, that the percentage of resources devoted to national defense is increasing; the other, that funds not spent on military defense are automatically available for more laudable purposes.

As to fallacy No. 1, the percentage of U.S. total goods and services spent on national defense is almost exactly the same as it was a decade ago—3.8 per cent in the year ending June 30, as compared with 3.7 per cent in 1960.

As for fallacy No. 2, Uncle Sam himself does not have a fixed income; the federal government produces nothing. Everything it has comes out of the hides of the taxpayers, who, if relieved of the requirement to buy new ships or tanks or airplanes, may not be prone to buy urban renewal instead.

In any case, as noted cogently by Mendel Rivers: "We have to have our national defense as a first requirement to create a framework within which our other serious problems can be solved." We evade this fact only at our extreme peril.

#### ANALYSIS OF U.S. POLICY IN ASIA

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 10, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time not only in terms of the directions our policies will take with respect to Vietnam, but also in terms of our present and future commitments in all of Asia.

An excellent analysis of the alternatives our Nation and its leaders face has been written for the New York Times by C. L. Sulzberger. It is worthy of immediate and careful consideration by everyone concerned with American foreign policy in general, and our commitments in Asia, in specific.

The article follows:

##### FOREIGN AFFAIRS: MORE OUT OF LESS

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

SEATTLE.—United States policy seeks to Vietnamize the Indochina war as quickly as possible by turning over to the Saigon Government responsibility for defending itself. Apart from political convenience suitable to the frazzled American mood, the object is to disengage from what has become a basic commitment.

##### WITHDRAWAL NOW?

Whether this can be achieved remains difficult to forecast. Hanoi has given no real indication it will permit withdrawal in either orderly or honorable fashion despite illusions carefully cultivated by those who, convinced the war is ruining the U.S. social fabric, are prepared to believe anything.

Yet it is worth considering whether the policy, should it succeed, might not anyway prove counterproductive. In the long run it could bring about more not less U.S. entanglement in Southeast Asia. For we are feverishly building the wrong kind of Vietnamese military force in order that Saigon can take over the burden from American troops as rapidly as possible.

We are foisting a complex, heavily mechanized and automatically armed military machine on a country that cannot finance, industrially sustain, or technically man such an establishment. In the hope of fairly swift departure from South Vietnam we are creating there a system bound to tie it to us for years to come.

For if Saigon is to take over the burden of a "Vietnamized" war it will have to depend on American equipment, spare parts, money and technical assistance—and this situation must continue indefinitely.

Already we have seen a similar trend in South Korea where U.S. involvement remains critical and extensive. South Korea has a very large army but it relies upon an American alliance and the continued presence of two American divisions plus weapons, parts, techniques and gadgetry that, despite a continuing economic boom, Seoul couldn't sustain alone.

Paradoxically, the means by which Washington seeks to reduce short-range Asian commitments actually insure their long-range continuance. The South Vietnamese Army, like the South Korean Army, is a microcosmic reflection of our own military establishment.

The North Vietnamese Army is much more of an infantry force rendered effective by highly trained soldiers, skilled tactics, and weapons that can mostly be repaired or reproduced by the local economy. Thus, North Vietnam is better adapted to stand on its own feet after the war.

U.S. involvement in Asia has brought differing commitments in the Philippines, Okinawa, Taiwan, South Korea, South Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and Japan. We are pledged to protect these areas under accords that are in no way harmonious. The strategic key is Okinawa which we have promised to return to Japan although we don't yet know how to provide a substitute for our bases and nuclear arsenal there.

##### JAPANESE OBLIGATIONS

Japan, which has an inadequate and constitutionally restricted defense establishment, is obligated under the Yoshida-Acheson agreement of Sept. 8, 1951, to support U.N. military actions in the Far East—meaning any U.S. military action in South Korea. Washington cleverly maintains the legal fiction that its commanding officer there is a U.N., not a U.S., general—thus keeping Japan tied to a commitment it isn't really obliged to maintain under its U.S. Security Treaty.

American Far East policy developed from a series of lurches starting with the 1943 Cairo Conference which promised Taiwan to China and involved us in the contest between Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek.

Subsequently we pledged the return of Okinawa to Japan and simultaneously made it the keystone of our East Asian defenses. We made Japan forswear rearmament in a constitution we imposed and thereby insured that we would have to protect that country indefinitely.

It is pointless to argue that if the United States doesn't keep forces in Japan, that country will rearm, allowing a militaristic class to seize control. In fact the Japanese gain immensely from these curious arrangements, spending a widow's mite on defense and using the consequent economic advantage in world markets.

##### TIME TO ANALYZE PLANS

Obviously it is time to reexamine our Asian commitments. While doing so, it would be wise to study the implications of contemplated policies which, in the name of reducing our involvement in Asia, could actually extend its duration. I am in no sense arguing for withdrawal but I am arguing that policy-makers should analyze the ultimate meaning of their plans.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 11, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord; that it may be well with thee.—Deuteronomy 6:18.*

Eternal God, our Father, with reverent

hearts we pause in the midst of the day's duties to lift our spirits to Thee, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid. Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit that we may love Thee more perfectly, serve our country more fully, and lead our people more diligently.

During these difficult days let us not add to the problems we face by our own ill will and our selfish endeavors, rather help us to become part of the solution by our own good will and our unselfish efforts to lead our people to wider areas of understanding, tolerance, and friendliness.

Direct the leaders of our Nation, our