

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GSA HEAD HELPS ADVANCE FAIR HOUSING

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to invite the attention of Congress to an article that commends the effort on equal opportunity and fair housing that is being conducted by Robert L. Kunzig, head of the General Services Administration, who was formerly my administrative assistant and long-time friend.

As William Raspberry writes in the Washington Post of June 11, 1969:

GSA thus could strike the same kind of blow for fair housing as the Pentagon did with its 1967 order to place off-limits to all servicemen apartments that refused to rent to Negro servicemen.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW GSA CHIEF CURBS AGENCIES' TREND TO "DECENTRALIZE"

(By William Raspberry)

For several years, the General Services Administration—partly unthinkingly and partly as a result of an old Eisenhower edict—has been "decentralizing" low-level government employees out of work.

The decentralization trend was in some measure the outgrowth of an official preoccupation with atomic war. The idea was to make it difficult for a single enemy attack to immobilize the government.

But it also stemmed from GSA's efforts to meet growing demands for modern, well-appointed office space with parking and greenery. And since the building growth was heaviest in the suburbs, GSA started looking in that direction, unmindful, one supposes, of the hardships it was working on the government's low-grade black employees for whom transportation was inadequate and moving was out of the question.

The trend continued, however, long after these hardships had been called to GSA's attention. GSA kept pointing to the Eisenhower decree as its justification.

Now GSA's new administrator, Robert L. Kunzig, has moved to stop the agency from riding roughshod over the poor folk. He has done so by ordering revisions in the Federal property management regulations.

Rules apply both to construction of public buildings and the leasing of privately held space now include this provision:

In selecting sites for building or leasing office space, "GSA will avoid locations which will work a hardship on employees because (1) there is a lack of adequate housing for low and middle income employees within a reasonable proximity and (2) the location is not readily accessible from other areas of the urban center."

The new rule, which became effective upon its publication in the May 29 Federal Register, represents a major advance in GSA's thinking.

Less than two years ago, the agency was locating Federal agencies in such complexes as Arlington's Crystal City which were refusing to rent apartments to Negroes. After some official pressure, GSA worked out an

agreement whereby Crystal City would rent to Negroes who worked for an agency housed in the complex. And this limited agreement was interpreted as narrowly as possible.

For example, although the Food and Drug Administration had offices in Crystal City, a Negro FDA employee was denied opportunity to rent an apartment there because he worked at another location.

Kunzig's recent decree may help to avoid that kind of nonsense. It may also help to desegregate the suburbs. The people who are developing the office building complexes around the Beltway know that the Government makes a very good tenant, and they can be expected to do what they can to convince GSA that they are worthy landlords.

GSA thus could strike the same kind of blow for fair housing as the Pentagon did with its 1967 order that placed off limits to all servicemen apartments that refused to rent to Negro servicemen.

The GSA rule change goes even further than the Pentagon edict. The latter was concerned primarily with racial discrimination. GSA's order speaks not only to the availability of housing without regard to race but also to the availability of housing within the price range of the affected employees.

Kunzig said his order is in line with President Nixon's directions to "provide maximum job opportunities for persons in less advantaged groups." He thereby indicates his awareness that housing opportunity is an integral part of job opportunity.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 486

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution by another city in my district, the city of Lomita, Calif., urging the creation of a Presidential Commission between the United States and Mexico to help control the flow of narcotics and dangerous drugs between our two countries.

This resolution asks the President to set up a joint commission with the Mexican Government as Congressman DICK HANNA and I proposed in House Joint Resolution 486.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and that of many people in California, that President Nixon can be persuaded to take the necessary steps to set up such a commission. This is vital in order to halt the abusive use of harmful drugs. If we ignore this threat to our society, then the future cost to society will be immense in terms of crime, and human degradation. I am including in the RECORD a copy of the resolution by the city of Lomita and a copy of the bill which we have introduced:

RESOLUTION No. 69-24

A resolution of the city council of the city of Lomita

Whereas, the most effective way to stop the illicit traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs into our community is to cut off the supply at its source, there should be established a joint presidential commission between the United States and Mexico to undertake an

action program to control the flow of narcotics between the two countries; and

Whereas, in 1959, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles requested President Eisenhower to establish a control commission to which he responded by sending a fact-finding team to Los Angeles and other cities to investigate the drug traffic problem; and

Whereas, in 1962, President John F. Kennedy called the first White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse, and, while there was much discussion and debate, little action resulted; and

Whereas, in March, 1968, Supervisor Kenneth Hahn urged President Lyndon B. Johnson to continue to seek at the presidential level the establishment of a joint commission with, but he could not include it in his program at that time; and

Whereas, in 1947, a joint presidential commission was established to set up controls for hoof and mouth disease which was plaguing cattle on both sides of the border, such a commission is even more needed for the health of our young people whose lives are daily influenced by the ready supply of marijuana, barbituates and other dangerous drugs which must be cut off by striking at the steady stream of illicit traffic across the border with Mexico.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the City Council of the City of Lomita respectfully requests the President of the United States, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, to establish with the President of Mexico, the Honorable Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, to halt the illicit flow of narcotics and dangerous drugs between our two countries, and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Secretary of State William P. Rogers, Attorney General John N. Mitchell, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch and to California U.S. Senators and Representative Glenn Anderson in the Congress.

Approved and adopted this 5th day of May, 1969.

CLYDE S. BERNHARDT,
Mayor.

Attest:

DAWN R. TOMITA,
City Clerk.

H.J. RES. 486

Joint Resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico

Whereas Mexico is the primary source of supply for narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs brought into the southwestern part of the United States; and

Whereas these narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs are subsequently distributed throughout the United States; and

Whereas 100 per centum of the marihuana seized by the enforcement officials in the southwest part of the United States comes from Mexico; and

Whereas the smuggling of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs into the United States poses the largest single problem for collectors of the customs and for the Federal courts in the southwestern part of the United States; and

Whereas the use of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs by juveniles has greatly increased due to the easy accessibility of such drugs from Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is

requested to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between said countries.

EULOGY OF BEN LEVINE BY JOSEPH BELSKY

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 11, 1969, Mr. Ben Levine, a long-time leader in the trade union movement in New York City, passed away. Mr. Levine was business representative for the Hebrew Butcher Workers Union for over 40 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a eulogy of Mr. Levine delivered by Mr. Joseph Belsky, international vice president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, be printed in the RECORD.

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

Ben Levine was a big man! Big in many ways. Large of stature but of far greater importance was the bigness of his heart, his compassion and his spirit!

This loved and loving husband—father—grandfather was my friend and colleague through all of the 43 years that we shared together. He had unlimited energy, a genial, delightful personality and possessed of the generous instincts of a fine, gracious gentleman.

Ben was a fine family man—he loved to be with his family. He was a devoted husband to Tibie. He was an affectionate father to Marsh and Sylvia. He maintained a close relationship with his sons-in-law Teddy and Mel. He adored his 4 grandchildren and they returned that love in full measure.

During his illness, his children and grandchildren were with him continuously—all of them. Tibie, Marsha, Sylvia, Mel and Teddy were daily visitors to his hospital bedside—and when he returned home, they saw to his every need and desire—not out of any sense of duty but with full proud hearts bearing their love with great, great dignity.

No one whose privilege it was to know him is likely to forget the candor of his faith, the warm and glowing brightness of his friendship.

What he preached, he practiced. What he believed, he believed fully and completely with all of his heart and soul. He fought very hard for every cause in which he enlisted—for they were good and right. And others learned to know the rightness of these causes for Ben never gave mere "lip" service to such circumstance. We were proud to join with Ben and he rejoiced in the sharing of his causes with others.

I first met Ben Levine in September of 1926 some 43 years ago when I became Secretary-Treasurer of Local 234. At that time Ben Levine had already become a member of the Union back in 1922 when he was a worker in a kosher butcher shop.

Our Union was far from what it is today. We had no money in our treasury. So Ben Levine who worked 14 hours a day brought his wages to the union office and shared them with me. Since I was married and had a small son, Ben's first concern was how I

was going to feed my family. And only until Ben made certain of that did his thoughts turn to his own needs—that was the Ben Levine way back in 1926—and he never changed from that moment on.

He became an elected representative of the Union in June of 1932 and served the Union and its membership with honor, with pride—with distinction and with love. For each and every day of these past 37 years he loved his Union and his members and they returned that love with full and total devotion.

How can anyone forget his speech at the 60th Anniversary of his Union held at the Americana Hotel—he came from a sick bed to attend. His speech that evening was a great, glorious speech tinged with the famous Ben Levine wit and humor. How few of us really appreciated the pain that wracked his great body. But he neither sought nor accepted sympathy or pity—for that was not his way of life.

Ben always was interested in the "other person". His own personal needs came last—if at all. During the days of his illness, a fund raising affair was held at this very Community Center. Ben Levine telephoned countless friends from his sick bed to secure their contributions to this love of his heart and light of his eyes. That his friends of the Community Center esteemed him is self-evident in their naming their ballroom the Ben Levine Auditorium.

Ben's mind was keen and sharp to the very end. My colleague Phil Borus visited him daily at the hospital and then at Ben's home. Philip gave daily reports to Ben. And if Philip couldn't call for an hour or two, Ben would quickly call Philip at the office to find out if any problems had been encountered.

There were four. Then there were three. And now there are but two. Two who will never ever forget the love, the faith, the courage and the total dedication of a great, wonderful, delightful giant of a man.

It would not be a fitting service to recall Ben Levine with words of sadness or sorrow for his goodness, his humor and his compassion recall moments upon moments of proudful happenings brought about because of his having been such an important part of us all.

Words are futile and inadequate at a time like this. We can but bow our heads to the will of God, who is the Father of us all, and but say in our hearts and mind: Is there beyond the silent night an endless day? Is death a door that leads to light? We cannot say! The tongueless secret locked in fate! We cannot know! We can—but watch—and wait.

We pray that his beloved family will derive a great measure of comfort in the knowledge that we, too, share their loss of a great, great, wonderful man.

STRATEGIC POWER OF THE U.S.S.R.

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the Marine Corps Gazette contains an article by Lt. Col. Richard F. Staar on "The Strategic Power of the U.S.S.R." The author, who is on active duty with the U.S. Marine Corps, has authored several articles and books and has been a professor of foreign affairs at the National War College since 1967. On July 1 he will become associate director of the Hoover Institution on War,

Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University.

This well-conceived and illuminating analysis of the Soviet Union's alternatives and capabilities is all the more important, coming as it does, at a time when concerted efforts are being made in this country to depreciate external military threats and to debilitate the efforts of this Nation to maintain a strong defensive posture. I strongly recommend this fine article to my colleagues and invite their attention to the following quotation which in the original article appeared with a photograph not reproduced below:

STRATEGIC POWER OF THE U.S.S.R.

(By Lt. Col. Richard F. Staar)

(NOTE.—The views and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author and should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the Department of Defense.)

"The Soviet Army is educated in the spirit of friendship of peoples and of proletarian internationalism. That spirit of proletarian solidarity, friendship, and mutual aid comprises the very essence of our army." Chief-of-Staff Marshal M. V. Zakharov, Sovetskaya Rossiya, (February 23, 1969).

According to an official Soviet definition, military doctrine represents a conceptual framework which provides the means and methods for solving military tasks in the interest of politics. Its basic principles are determined by the political leadership¹ i.e., in reality by the Communist party. Doctrine is influenced by geographic location, the national characteristics of the people, economic resources, ideology and foreign policy. Strategy remains dependent upon doctrine, because the latter formulates overall policy and basic principles.

Starting out from these general guidelines, Soviet military strategists then work on problems concerning the nature of war in the future, preparation for different types of conflict, organization of the armed forces, and methods for conducting warfare. Marshal of the Soviet Union V. D. Sokolovskii and the co-authors of *Voennoye strategiya* (3rd edition, 1968) certainly exaggerate, however when they claim that²—

"Soviet military strategy is guided by the progressive, rational, and completely scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, by the philosophy of dialectic and historical materialism, which makes possible scientific investigation and appropriate utilization of the objective laws determining victory in modern war."

The well-known and often repeated dictum that "war represents a continuation of politics by other [violent] means" derives from Karl von Clausewitz (1780-1831) and not Marx or Lenin, although the latter borrowed it. The concept of an "international duty" for the Soviet military has been publicized by Western journalists as something relatively new. Five days prior to the invasion of Czechoslovakia, however, the daily newspaper of the USSR defense ministry quoted from a 1920 speech of Lenin standing before troops departing for Poland about their "international obligation."³

The same newspaper only three weeks later printed a photograph of Soviet tanks and crews on the front page, with the caption that they were "fulfilling their international duty to assist the brotherly Czechoslovak people in maintaining Socialist achievements against attempts by counterrevolutionaries."⁴ Over the past 50 years many such examples can be found. There also has ap-

Footnotes at end of article.

peared an editorial statement in *Pravda* (26 September 1968) to the effect that formal ideas of sovereignty and national independence will not present USSR intervention in Communist-ruled countries, threatened by "counter-revolutionaries" (the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine).

CATEGORIES OF WAR

Other than the Czechoslovak type of police action, rarely mentioned as a contingency, writers on Soviet military affairs envisage the possibility of three categories of wars: (1) general or world war; (2) a local or geographically limited war; and (3) national liberation or civil war. Depending upon its nature, a conflict may be described as just or else unjust. Both adjectives have been applied to at least one and the same war. Thus, during the Hitler-Stalin Pact (1939-1941) the world conflict was defined as having been "unjust" and the Western allies as imperialist aggressors. Over-night, on 22 June 1941, the war suddenly became "just" with the Anglo-French (after Pearl Harbor, also the Americans) henceforth and until May 1945 helping to defend Russia.

During the current "epoch", authoritative Soviet military writers stress the necessity of avoiding a world war by means of conducting a policy of peaceful coexistence as reaffirmed by the political leadership at the most recent (23rd) congress, held by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. However, according to Marshal Sokolovskii,⁵

"The principle of peaceful coexistence does not apply to the internal processes of the class and national liberation struggles in the capitalist countries and colonies. Struggles between the two social systems are and must be carried out by peaceful means—economic, political, ideological, but not military."

The foregoing Soviet attitude may and probably will change if the political leadership decides that overwhelming military superiority has been attained. The key to such a situation could be a powerful future scientific-technological and industrial base now being emphasized by the party.

Soviet writers on military strategy emphasize that the principal means employed in a general war will comprise nuclear-missile troops, i.e., ICBM's.⁶ These weapons of mass destruction allegedly make possible direct attainment of objectives. Nevertheless, a qualification is immediately added that ultimate victory requires all other types of armed forces, such as ground troops, air, navy, and anti-missile defense. Large reserves for actual warfare and as replacements support the requirements for mass armies, to which would be added mobilization of the entire people in time of war.

USSR strategic objectives certainly include the simultaneous destruction of the enemy's armed forces and his politico-military centers at home. The main Soviet effort obviously would be concentrated on the latter, in order to eliminate the enemy's capacity for directing and conducting warfare. This initial period is of special importance during a thermo-nuclear conflict, because the USSR probably envisages that the maximum number of ICBM's will be launched and that most of its troops will be thrown into battle. Hence, military operations will be most destructive in this initial phase.⁷ Considering the potential capabilities, tenacity, and determination of the United States, however, other Soviet writers have indicated that it is necessary also to anticipate the possibility of a long and protracted war.

GENERAL WAR

Although hoping to avoid a thermo-nuclear exchange, USSR commentators state the American policies may precipitate it for one of several reasons: (1) a faulty estimate that the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) intends to strike; (2) a critical confrontation,

where NATO crosses the invisible line as a result of a perceived threat to its prestige; (3) escalation from a local war, due to a conflict between vital interests; (4) an accident based on misinterpretation of an order, a mental breakdown, or a military *coup d'etat*.

A surprise Western attack under any of the foregoing conditions assumes extraordinary importance, since it may be decisive for the outcome of the war. Therefore, according to this Soviet logic, one should anticipate a surprise attack in the form of a nuclear strike by the United States. Not only must USSR armed forces be prepared to respond through their second strike capability but, according to certain military writers, even break up an American attack by launching a preemptive strike.⁸

Since there will be tremendous pressure for decisive action in an attempt to seize the strategic initiative, some Soviet military writers believe that it is vitally important for the USSR to strike first. The following priorities in targeting would seem probable: (1) the main region with the greatest military and economic potential, i.e., the United States, especially its north-eastern and west coasts; (2) the next strongest country, namely the Federal Republic of Germany, which is second only to the United States as a great industrial power; and (3) third in military importance is Britain, with its skilled human resources. Simultaneously with these ICBM, medium range ballistic missile (MRBM) and intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) strikes, conventional rapid combined arms operations would be launched to conquer and invest the West European bridgehead. Such an invasion might follow two routes:⁹ (1) across the North European lowland from Warsaw via Berlin to the English Channel, and (2) south along the Budapest-Vienna-Munich axis.¹⁰

Such an occupation of Western Europe (if undertaken) would have as its probable objectives the destruction of NATO's main forces, denial to the United States of a beachhead for subsequent return, control over resources as a substitute for a badly damaged USSR, and a possible safe haven for Soviet troops in case the United States were reluctant to launch nuclear strikes against such cities as Berlin or Paris or Rome. Obviously, such operations would mean crossing Eastern Europe or even utilizing Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) forces to invest Western Europe.

Until recently, most discussion about the Warsaw Pact considered the so-called Northern Tier (comprising East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia) to be generally reliable from the Soviet point of view. The loyalty of the last country has become highly questionable since the 650,000 troops crossed into Czechoslovakia during late August 1968. USSR propaganda continues to portray the Federal Republic of Germany as follows: "With the aid of their American protectors, West German revenge-seekers are making great efforts to obtain nuclear weapons, hoping to exploit them for the purpose of revising the existing frontiers in Europe."

The West Germans alone, with their population of sixty million pose a relatively small threat to the USSR if unaided. However, in Soviet eyes both Red China and the Federal Republic of Germany are seeking to enlist Eastern Europe as part of a potential two-front coalition against the USSR. During the early 1960's Peking attempted to exploit the dissatisfaction among the East German leadership with Khrushchev's vacillating policy on Berlin. Radio Peking has been attacking the Soviet Union in Czech, Polish, Romanian, and Slovak language broadcast because of the invasion of Czechoslovakia and reportedly praising anti-USSR demonstrations in the latter country.¹²

Hence, the concern over a two-front threat based on Chinese-West German (not neces-

sarily coordinated) efforts to influence the East European countries to leave WTO and to revive latent territorial claims against the USSR. Already as far back as 1964, Mao Tse-tung, in reply to a question about the Kurile Islands posed by visiting Japanese parliamentarians from the Socialist Party, had enumerated Karelia, the three Baltic Republics, former East Prussia, the eastern part of Poland, Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Bessarabia, and Northern Bukovina as lands that should be returned by Russia in addition to the Kuriles. He mentioned his own, as yet unspecified and unsettled, claim to territories seized from China by both tsarist and bolshevik Russia. Five years later, in April 1969, the communist Chinese embassy in London began distributing a map which shows 400,000 square miles of land inside the USSR as having been detached from China on the basis of "unequal treaties."¹³

LIMITED WAR

Obviously, no commentator in the USSR has suggested the possibility of a national liberation war to recover any of the above Soviet annexations. (That eventually is restricted to Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia by Soviet writers.) This kind of war has been recognized as "limited" due to the fact that more than 70 conflicts or interventions have taken place since 1945 but not one has escalated to a major confrontation between the two super powers. Communist military commentators admit that a local or limited war may even be fought in Central Europe, if NATO does not employ nuclear weapons in such a conflict. Once such weapons have been used, even at the tactical level, rapid escalation will occur.¹⁴

National liberation wars to date have taken place only in the so-called Third World. USSR policy-makers realize the difficulties of the West in fighting these wars. They point to Algeria, from which the French withdrew in 1963 after seven years of fighting, and to Vietnam,¹⁵ where the Americans have been involved since 1961, as examples of such fiascos. In Soviet eyes, the West cannot end these wars quickly but rather sustains great losses in manpower and money. The West also suffers from a decline in political prestige throughout the world.

In addition, national liberation wars provide limited possibilities for the effective employment of modern weapons like tanks, heavy artillery, and aircraft. Finally, the USSR probably believes that tactical nuclear weapons will not be used by the West in such wars because of the escalation risk, the absence of appropriate targets, and the danger that the less developed countries (even those in Latin America) would turn against the United States.

U.S.S.R. MILITARY CAPABILITIES

As suggested in the foregoing, it is envisaged by the Soviet High Command that all five branches of the Soviet armed forces would participate in a general war. The most powerful of these are the Missile Troops for Strategic Designation, established in October 1961 as a separate branch. They had four different commanding officers in as many years (Marshals Nedelin, Moskalenko, Biryuzov, and currently Nikolai I. Krylov). This may have indicated a certain amount of dissatisfaction by Khrushchev or growing pains or both.

At any rate, it is estimated that these Strategic Rocket Forces now total about 200,000 men and had about 900 ICBM's on 1 September 1968, i.e., nearly the same as the United States.¹⁶ In addition it is believed the USSR Strategic Missile Forces control about 750 MRBM's and IRBM's, with ranges of 1,100 to over 2,000 miles respectively, which are targeted probably against the Federal Republic of Germany, Britain, and even France. They may be supplemented by mobile solid-fuel missiles, publicized in photographs appearing from time to time in Soviet military newspapers and periodicals.

Footnotes at end of article.

The largest in size among the branches, with about two million men organized into 140 divisions, are the ground forces. Their separate command had been abolished by Khrushchev and apparently subordinated directly to the Chief of Staff. Reestablished soon after his ouster in October 1964, these troops are now commanded by General of the Army Ivan G. Pavlovskiy who has been one of the deputy USSR defense ministers since April 1967. He was identified¹⁷ as the commanding officer for the Soviet occupation forces which entered Czechoslovakia.

Only approximately half of the 140 ground divisions are estimated to be at full strength, with about a quarter of the total in need of major reinforcement, and the remainder requiring only a short time to become combat ready. It is interesting to note the location of these ground troops. Normally some 30 divisions have been stationed in Eastern Europe (the West Germans claimed 42 USSR divisions were west of the Vistula River in October 1968), with 20 in East Germany, four each in Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and two in Poland; some 59 divisions in the European part of the Soviet Union; about eight divisions in Central USSR; about 28 divisions in southern USSR (Caucasus and Soviet Central Asia); and 15 divisions in the Soviet Far East (i.e., east of Lake Baikal).¹⁸ It is obvious that the great majority or at least 89 of the 140 divisions are facing NATO; thus, NATO seems to represent in USSR eyes the major threat, not Red China as has been speculated upon. The clashes during March 1969 along the Siberian border do not change the foregoing assessment.

Some 43 of the Soviet divisions are armored; those in Eastern Europe together with other WTO forces, have twice as many tanks as NATO. These are considered the main striking force, due to their mobility and firepower plus capability of crossing terrain contaminated by radioactive debris. According to USSR Chief Marshal of Armored Troops, Pavel F. Rotmistrov:

"The tank's good invulnerability to [tactical] nuclear strikes and its capability of surmounting contaminated areas and water obstacles makes [tanks] the ground weapons with the best prospects. And if one realizes that the Air Force is capable of supporting tank maneuvers from the air, it is not hard to understand how important coordinated actions now are between armor and air."¹⁹

Tanks in the 43 armored divisions would be employed, thus, to exploit Soviet nuclear strikes.

Although most of the ground forces (88 of the 140 divisions) comprise motorized infantry, the USSR also has seven airborne divisions with a total of some 50,000 paratroopers. Based on present airlift, only three of these units and support elements can be moved simultaneously across short or medium distances. However, the large AN (tonov) 22 "air bus" flown at the July 1967 air show in Moscow may increase this capability, when it begins to come off the assembly line in large numbers. The Soviet airlift into Czechoslovakia on 21 August 1968 demonstrated landings at 50 second intervals by some 250 USSR four-engine transports which brought a full division into the Ruzyně airport near Prague.

Of more immediate interest from the strategic point of view are other categories of aircraft in the USSR Air Force, commanded by Marshal Pavel S. Kutakhov. Long-range aviation disposes of about 155 intercontinental bombers,²⁰ although the 50 tankers might be converted to similar use. In addition, about 750 medium-range bombers could reach the United States with en route refueling but on one-way missions only. The TU (pelov)-144 supersonic circular transport made its maiden flight on 31 December

1968 and probably could serve as a bomber after modification in time of war. About 150 long-range Aeroflot passenger aircraft already now in service might be converted to wartime use for strategic purposes. Seven new models of Soviet aircraft were flown at the 1967 Moscow air show.

Turning to the Soviet navy, it has established fleets for independent operations on two seas and two oceans. In tonnage, it is second only to the United States and has 1,326 ships plus another 1,000 auxiliaries and support vessels. Commanded by Fleet Admiral of the Soviet Union Sergei G. Gorskikh, the USSR navy has no aircraft carriers and only one helicopter carrier (the *Moskva*, now on station in the Mediterranean) commissioned and a second one, the *Leningrad*, undergoing sea trials. The last cruiser was built in 1957, but this type of ship has been modernized and equipped with surface-to-surface cruise and surface-to-air missiles. The concentration has been on submarines which now number 380, but only 50 are nuclear powered.²¹

The four submarine fleets are distributed as follows: some 70 U-boats in the Baltic Sea, 170 in the Arctic Ocean, 40 in the Black Sea, and 100 in the Pacific Ocean.²² A new type of submarine, similar to the U.S. *Polaris* is being produced at the rate of one or two every month. It will carry 16 missiles compared with an average of only three each on the 13 nuclear and 30 conventional boats now capable of firing from a submerged position. In addition, another 25 nuclear and 20 conventional submarines each carry an average of six anti-shiping cruise missiles with a range of 300 miles.²³ These too can be considered a potential threat to American coastal installations and not only shipping.

One should at least mention here the USSR's sea infantry which comprises only about 8,000 men compared to half a million during World War II. It has been reconstituted and is equipped with special transport shipping and about 100 amphibious landing craft, patterned after those in use by the U.S. Marine Corps. Units of the Soviet sea infantry are serving with all four fleets. New tank-landing ships appeared already in 1967, and some of these are now in the Eastern Mediterranean.²⁴

Among the weaknesses of the Soviet navy and its sea infantry is the lack of well-defended bases outside the Bloc and, hence, the necessity for long-range operations. The possibility of remedying this deficiency in the United Arab Republic or Algeria to begin with, for example, should be remembered. Submerged launch ballistic missiles are behind the United States in quantity, quality, and range, but all of these characteristics probably are being improved. Two of the four fleets (Black Sea and Baltic) would have limited operational capabilities, unless they could break through the Bosphorus-Dardanelles and the Kattegat-Skagerrak, respectively. Finally, the extensive length of maritime borders creates a problem for defense.

The armed forces also include *PVO-Strany* or Anti-Air and Anti-Missile Defense of the Country. Established in late 1959 as a separate branch, it is commanded by Marshal of the Soviet Union Pavel F. Batitskiy. The surface-to-air missiles used by *PVO-Strany* and tested over North Vietnam reportedly could only down 76 U.S. aircraft after the first 4,000 had been fired.²⁵ From the strategic point of view, more important is the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) deployed around Moscow. The *Galosh* multi-stage, solid fuel missile used here is believed to carry a warhead of one to two megatons and have a range of several hundred miles.²⁶

CONCLUSION

Although trends and goals are difficult to project with any assurance of accuracy, it does appear to this writer that the decision makers in the Kremlin have begun to give

more emphasis to strategic offensive goals. In addition to the growth in numbers of ICBMs, there is the fractional orbit bombardment system (FOBS) mentioned by the current U.S. Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird at a press conference and before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both in February 1969. The 13th FOBS test was reported to have taken place on 2 October 1968, under cover of the *Cosmos-244* space shot.²⁷

Another disturbing trend since Khrushchev's ouster can be gleaned from the growth of the Soviet defense budget. (See Table.) The totals probably should be tripled to reflect actual expenditures. For example, they do not include the cost of nuclear warheads which is hidden within the budget of the Ministry for Medium Machine Building. Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., chief of Pentagon research estimated that the USSR during 1968 would spend the equivalent of thirteen billion U.S. dollars on defense, nuclear, and space research alone compared with only around nine billion by the United States.²⁸ The implications of the foregoing are obvious.

SOVIET DEFENSE BUDGET, 1965-69

[In billions of rubles]

Year	Total	Percent national budget	R. & D.
1965.....	12.8	(12.6)	5.4
1966.....	13.4	(12.7)	6.5
1967.....	14.5	(13.2)	7.2
1968.....	16.7	(13.5)	13.0
1969.....	17.7	(13.2)	*13.0-17.0

¹ Estimated.

Sources: SSSR v tsifrakh v 1967 godu [The U.S.S.R. in figures for the year 1967] (Moscow: Tsentralnoe Statisticheskoe Upravlenie, 1966), p. 29; Business Week, No. 2046 (Nov. 16, 1968), p. 115; and Pravda (Dec. 11, 1968), pp. 4-5, Moscow.

FOOTNOTES

¹ V. D. Sokolovskii (chief editor), *Military Strategy* (Moscow, 1968), 3rd edition, p. 42 of the English translation.

² *Ibid.*, p. 50.

³ Colonel General S. Vasyagin, article on "Loyalty to International Duty," *Krasnaya zvezda* (15 August 1968), p. 3; Moscow. If Warsaw had fallen in 1920, nothing could have stopped the Red Army from occupying Germany.

⁴ *Krasnaya zvezda* (8 September 1968), p. 1. According to reliable informants the number of Soviet divisions in Czechoslovakia has been increased by three, for a total of 115,000 men. *The Washington Post* (5 April 1969), p. A 16.

⁵ Sokolovskii, *op. cit.*, p. 180. Italics added. Note also the implication that peaceful co-existence belongs to the past in V. G. Afanasev, *Nauchnyi Kommunizm* [Scientific Communism] (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Politicheskoi Literatury, 1969), pp. 152-153.

⁶ Colonel of Engineering Troops P. T. Astashenkov, *Sovetskie raketnye voiska* [Soviet Missile Troops] (Moscow: Voennoe Izdatelstvo Ministerstva Oborony SSR, 1967), pp. 274-277.

See also Major General Yuri Novikov's article, entitled "An Incomplete Solution," *Krasnaya zvezda* (28 June 1968), p. 4, which reviews a new book on *Nuclear Weapons and the Development of Tactics*.

⁷ Major General V. Zemskov, article on "The Time Factor and Combat Preparation of Troops," *Krasnaya zvezda* (11 October 1968), pp. 2-3.

⁸ USSR Defense Minister Andrei Grechko in an article for *Armed Forces Day*, entitled "Ever on Guard," *Pravda* (23 February 1969), p. 3, accused the United States of preparing to plunge "the world into the abyss of a third world war."

Note the interview with Sec Def Melvin R.

Laird and the implication that the USSR is developing a first-strike capability in ICBM's. *U. S. News and World Report* (7 April 1969), pp. 33-36.

⁹ Andro Gabelic, "Has the Balance been Disturbed?" *Borba* (7 September 1968), p. 8; Belgrade. This is a Yugoslav commentary which may not reflect Soviet thinking.

¹⁰ The provision for permanently stationing USSR troops along the Czechoslovak border with the Federal Republic of Germany represents a considerable strengthening of these southern Warsaw Pact positions. The status-of-forces treaty does not specify the number of Soviet divisions which will remain in Czechoslovakia. Text in *Krasnaya zvezda* (19 October 1968), p. 1.

¹¹ General of the Army Ivan G. Pavloskii, commander-in-chief of Soviet ground forces, talk entitled "On Guard over Peace," broadcast by *Radio Moscow* (22 February 1969), 12:15 GMT, in Russian.

This remained absent from an "Appeal" issued at the tenth meeting of the WTO Political Consultative Committee in Budapest. Text printed by *Krasnaya zvezda* (18 March 1969), p. 1.

¹² *Radio Moscow* (31 March 1969), Domestic Service in Russian. See also the article by A. Grigoryants, entitled "In One Rank With Double-Eyed Reaction: Whom is Peking Playing Up To; Nuclear Hullabaloo on the Rhine," in *Trud* (11 March 1969), p. 1; Moscow.

¹³ *The Washington Post* (5 April 1969), p. A 5.

¹⁴ Wolfgang Wuenschke article, entitled "For the Joint Defense of Socialism," *Neues Deutschland* (23 November 1968), p. 5; East Berlin.

¹⁵ Both the USSR and Red China signed agreements to aid North Vietnam, reportedly amounting to one billion dollars each for 1969. *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (26 July 1968); Munich.

¹⁶ The Institute for Strategic Studies, *The Military Balance 1968-1969* (London: September 1968), p. 5. The writer's use of statistics from this publication does not imply his acceptance or endorsement of the relative accuracy of these figures.

See, however, Department of Defense, *The 1970 Defense Budget and Defense Program for Fiscal Years 1970-1974* (Washington, D.C.: 15 January 1969), p. 42, which gives the same figures for ICBM's. Note also testimony by Sec Def Laird before the Senate Foreign Relations Disarmament Subcommittee on 21 March 1969.

¹⁷ *The New York Times* (28 September 1968), p. 15.

¹⁸ *The Military Balance 1968-1969*, p. 6; modified as of March 1969. Federal Republic defense minister Gerhard Schröder was cited by *The New York Times* (9 October 1968).

¹⁹ Article written for "Tankman's Day," in *Izvestiya* (8 September 1968), p. 1; Moscow.

²⁰ See U.S. Senate, Committee on Armed Services, *U.S. Tactical Airpower Program* (Washington, D.C.: 4 October 1968), p. 3, for comments on the USSR Air Force.

On 1 April 1969, eight to ten TU-16 twin turbojet Badgers flew within 65 miles of Alaska. This was only one of about 36 such incidents near North America over the preceding 15 months. *The New York Times* (9 April 1969), p. 3.

²¹ "It is believed that Soviet submarine yards have the resources to build more than 20 nuclear submarines per year." House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services, *Status of Naval Ships* (Washington, D.C.: 1969), p. 227; U.S. Navy Testimony.

²² *Aerospace International*, IV, No. 6 (November-December 1968), p. 14; citing *The Military Balance 1968-1969*, p. 7.

²³ U.S. Senate, Committee on Armed Services, *United States Submarine Program* (Washington, D.C.: 23 September 1968), pp. 1-2, gives details on the Soviet build-up.

²⁴ See Vice Admiral Friedrich Ruge's ex-

cellent analysis "Der Drang der Sowjets zum warmen Meer," *Die Wehrkunde*, XVII, No. 7 (July 1968), pp. 338-342.

²⁵ *The New York Times* (2 October 1967).

²⁶ *Aerospace International*, op cit., p. 12.

²⁷ *The New York Times* (9 October 1968);

U.S. News and World Report (3 March 1969),

p. 12.

Cosmos-276 and 277 were launched 4 April

1969, both on the same day. *Krasnaya*

zvezda (5 April 1969), p. 1.

²⁸ U.S. Senate, Committee on Armed Services, "Statement of Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense." *Hearings on the Status of U.S. Strategic Power* (Washington, D.C.: September 1968), p. 90. The United States figure appeared in *The Washington Post* (6 January 1969), p. A 13.

METHOD FOR CONTROL OF UNRULY YOUTH

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Shenandoah Herald, of Woodstock, Va., recently published an editorial describing an interesting method of controlling unruly youth adopted in Pescara, Italy. While the editorial is somewhat tongue-in-cheek, I believe it has a message for us, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The editor of the Herald is George W. Cooper.

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

[From the Woodstock (Va.) Shenandoah Herald, Apr. 24, 1969]

LOGIC, ITALIAN STYLE

We have just run across what could be the greatest Italian export since pizza and Sophia Loren.

It is called parental discipline. If it catches on, it could bring a new renaissance in human relations.

It all happened in the Italian town of Pescara where a group of rebellious students decided to fight it out with the local fuzz.

The students had stockpiled rocks and empty-headed slogans. Across the campus the Police stood ready. They had fortified themselves with shields, rubber truncheons and long draughts of wine.

Suddenly disaster struck the student ranks from the rear. An angry crowd of mothers, fathers, grandparents and older brothers swept in. According to the news story, the relatives began slapping the students and hauling them off by the ears.

Even the most heroic left-leaning Luigi isn't much when his mother has him by the ear. A father's kick is an action slogan understood by all.

A little more of this might not be amiss in a world where serious drug use is found in Front Royal, Boy Scouts rebel in Chile and even rural crime is up 12 percent in a year.

Such a march would make first class TV viewing on U.S. campuses where students halt classes and spill blood to urge that their black brothers have the segregation of their choice.

It may seem silly to make a child stand in the corner because he's main-lining with heroin or plans to shoot the sheriff.

But discipline has to start somewhere, and nobody's ever found a substitute for the home.

WELCOME TO HIS EXCELLENCY, DR. CARLOS LLERAS RESTREPO, PRESIDENT OF COLOMBIA

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, our country is honored by the visit of His Excellency, Dr. Carlos Lleras Restrepo, President of the great country of Colombia.

We are exceedingly proud and indeed grateful that President Lleras would be so gracious as to accept the invitation of President Nixon to make his visit an official state visit.

We have many ties which link us to Colombia, Mr. Speaker. They are indeed a great people, a progressive people, who have tried and are trying with a great amount of success to improve their country with reforms in economics, and social justice. Throughout the major part of this endeavor there always has been very prominent the name of Dr. Carlos Lleras Restrepo, as a student leader, as a member of the Assembly of Cundinamarca, as a member of the National Assembly, first as a Deputy, then as a Senator, as a Minister of Finance under several governments, as Vice President of the Republic, and now as its illustrious and very able President.

We, the Western Hemisphere, indeed, the world owes much to the personal efforts of President Lleras in making Colombia, the hemisphere and the world a better place to live, for with all its problems, trials and tribulations, it is indeed a better place to live than that which a few generations back enjoyed. Again I say, it was indeed in great part to the efforts of men of vision and courage like President Lleras that credit is due for making this possible.

Also, we can never forget, Mr. Speaker, that during the Korean conflict when our country and our boys were sharing a major part of the United Nations effort, there alongside was a detachment of infantry from Colombia. A country and its people can never be forgotten when they share with us the burden of preserving freedom and liberty on the battlefield; for this we again salute you and your people, Mr. President.

Your country and your people are not strangers in my area of south Texas, Mr. President. Just recently Mrs. Martin Garcia, a very gracious lady member of the Pan American Round Table, advised me that her topic for next year's discussions on the Pan American Republics would be Colombia, and she was thrilled and excited with her research on your country. We have tried to help her in every way possible and your embassy here has been most helpful in this respect. At her request I respectfully extend to you her greetings and those of all the ladies of the Pan American Round Table—indeed, from all the people of the 15th District of Texas.

And so we are honored, we are happy you came. We respectfully ask of you that you take our greetings and our best wishes back to your countrymen. May

your stay here be a pleasant and fruitful one.

Bienvenido, Sr. Presidente, está entre amigos, está su casa.

HIGH TIMBER YIELD FUND

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on May 23, Dr. Edward C. Crafts presented a statement before the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Committee on Agriculture relative to the bills which purport to establish a high timber yield fund. Dr. Crafts presented his testimony on behalf of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, having been appointed to the board of directors of that organization subsequent to almost 40 years of Government services in the field of conservation. Dr. Crafts was employed for 29 years by the Forest Service 11 of which were as the Assistant Chief in charge of Program Development and Congressional Relations.

In his capacity with the Government, Dr. Crafts on more than one occasion predicted just such a period as we are now experiencing. His suggestions as to how to effect sound policies in order to alleviate our present timber shortage without abandoning important conservation principles of multiple use and sustained yield management are so succinctly presented that I am sure Members of the Senate will find his analysis informative.

In view of the many persons who are sincerely concerned regarding the relationship of timber shortages to low-cost housing and other needs, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Crafts' testimony be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWARD C. CRAFTS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: My name is Edward C. Crafts and I am presently a self-employed conservation consultant.

It is a pleasure to appear again before this Committee after a lapse of several years.

Subsequent to my resignation from the Department of the Interior several months ago, I was appointed to the Board of Directors of the Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources and represent that organization before you this morning. I do so on a wholly volunteer basis and without any compensation whatsoever.

The Citizens' Committee opposes H.R. 10344 for reasons stated subsequently.

As to qualifications, I was employed 29 years by the Forest Service, serving the last eleven from 1951-62 as Assistant Chief in charge of Program Development and Congressional Relations. For 25 years, it has been my privilege to work with the Congress on numerous legislative matters. I was deeply involved in enactment of the Forest Service Multiple Use—Sustained Yield Act of 1960, directed preparation of the Timber Resources Review prepared by the Forest Service in the late 1950's, and wrote a substantial part of the "Development Program for the National Forests" issued by that agency in 1961.

In 1962, I transferred to the Department

of the Interior and served seven years until this past February as the first Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

My long association with the Forest Service does not mean that I am functioning this morning as an unofficial spokesman for that agency saying publicly what the Forest Service may not be allowed to say officially. Should this be true with respect to any aspect of my testimony, it is purely coincidental. The Forest Service did not request that I testify, nor has it seen the testimony. My only contact with the Service was to request a few items of factual information.

I believe the Administration and other witnesses have largely established the facts of present and prospective housing shortages, high demands for softwood lumber and plywood, extremely high prices for these products, and how major exports from the West Coast of softwood logs to Japan and other countries continue despite strong demands and high prices at home.

Accepting the facts about softwood lumber and plywood with respect to demand, supply and prices, the problem is what to do about it in the next ten years insofar as the National Forests are concerned. Actually the solution is rather simple—but not easy to attain. It means funding the Forest Service—not only timber resource management—but other activities as well in accord with recommendations outlined in the report submitted by President Kennedy in 1961 for a "Development Program for the National Forests" with adjustments for updating and inflation. It also means adequate personnel ceilings. Actually little or no new legislation is needed. However, in view of the competition for money within the Executive Branch, this has not happened and in all likelihood will not happen. Failure to implement the National Forest Program is the real reason, therefore, why I am here this morning.

It is my feeling that the Forest Service has been, and is being pushed dangerously close to the brink with respect to timber management on the National Forests. I do not believe in brinkmanship when it comes to depleting the natural resources of the United States.

The bill before you this morning, if enacted in its present form, would ignore and override insofar as timber is concerned, the 1960 Multiple Use—Sustained Yield Act reported out by the Committee and passed by the Congress. That Act was supported by some of the far-sighted leaders of the timber industry.

The Forest Service has been pushed and pushed under tremendous pressures during the last 10 to 20 years to increase the cut on the National Forests, and it again is being pushed by the pending legislation.

For many years in connection with its periodic reassessments of the timber situation, the Service has predicted a prospective shortage of softwood sawtimber and this is exactly what is facing the industry now and why it is turning to the National Forests as its own lands have been depleted of mature timber.

There is a time gap until second-growth matures when the industry must depend more heavily than in the past on public timber. That time gap is now. There is also excess sawmill capacity in relation to growth productivity, and no one wants to go out of business.

I compliment the larger forest industry operators for their generally progressive forest practices and for the growth on industry lands which is more than that on National Forests although on a smaller acreage. Nevertheless, the fact remains that industry lands are short of softwood sawtimber.

Forest Service lands have not been fully developed nor have age classes and species composition been regulated adequately in a technical forestry sense. Intensive forest

management is greatly needed. Right now the Forest Service is cutting about twice as much softwood sawtimber as it is growing. This situation cannot last. The problem is to get enough money to do the intensive job and still resist the pressures to over-cut.

On the other hand, the Service can reduce its needed inventory of mature timber by simply shortening rotations, but there is great risk involved, as I said, to not go over the brink and overdraw the bank account.

The Forest Service has responded to pressures and need by increasing allowable cut from 5.6 billion board feet in 1950 to an estimated 12.8 in 1969. In other words, in 1969, the cut of sawtimber will reach what the Forest Service estimated several years ago should happen by 1972, and without full implementation of the National Forest Program. This demonstrates how rapidly the increase is occurring.

The Forest Service over the past two decades has made two serious mistakes in connection with its timber management. First it has allowed its timber cut to be linked to appropriation justification. And this, of course, puts it under serious pressure to increase the cut in order to get more money. Former Forest Service Chief Lyle Watts told me that he considered this to be the most serious error of his career.

The second error is that the Service has largely allowed the term "allowable cut" to be substituted for and supersede the term "sustained yield." The first term is not defined by statute and is flexible in meaning. For example, allowable cut used to be the ceiling above which cut would not be allowed to go. Now it is generally considered to be the floor below which cut will not be allowed to fall. On the other hand, sustained yield is defined by statute and the Forest Service should stay with it. The agency may have gotten itself trapped by being drawn away from sustained yield and the statutory protection it gives.

For the reasons expressed below, the Citizens' Committee recommends against H.R. 10344 in its present form:

1. The bill ignores and appears to override the Multiple Use—Sustained Yield Act of 1960. By establishing a special fund for timber management only, it places timber in a first priority situation with respect to other resources. This is exactly what the Multiple Use—Sustained Yield Act endeavored to forestall. Foreseeing the pressures on timber and certain other natural resources, the Forest Service deliberately sought the Multiple Use—Sustained Yield Act and endeavored in the definition of multiple use contained in that Act to give due consideration to all resources and to arrive at the best combination of uses, not giving any of them priority over others.

Also reference to "optimum timber productivity" in the pending bill would seem to give timber priority. The 1960 Act specifically says that multiple use does "not necessarily (mean) the combination of uses that would give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output." Therefore, this bill, if enacted as is, would establish timber as the first priority, maximum output function in the National Forests rather than equating it as is now done with the other resources and purposes of National Forest management.

2. Section 7 of the pending bill could be interpreted as opening the door to directing the Secretary of Agriculture to "immediately establish programs" to carry out the provisions of the bill without making such programs contingent on appropriation of moneys from the Fund. In other words, this is the section of the bill which could be used against the Forest Service to pressure it to do the things that the bill intends even if the money is not appropriated. This could be corrected by making this section subject to: "good forest practices and the availability of appropriations from the fund."

3. The establishment of a special fund for timber purposes will make it harder to obtain regular appropriations for other purposes. It will do this because if the Fund is appropriated, the money available for the purposes of the bill would increase from its present annual appropriation level of about \$63 million to an estimated \$175 to \$180 million. Such a large increase for timber would invite the Appropriation Committees to offset this increase somewhat by reducing or not increasing the amount of money for other management purposes.

4. Section 5 of the bill places moneys into the fund only for two years. If the money is not then appropriated, it is transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This means that the Forest Service will be under continuous pressure to make the cut as high as possible in order to have money in the Fund for appropriation. This defect could be remedied by leaving money in the Fund until appropriated as the Congress did last year with the mineral receipts in the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

5. The requirement in Section 6 of the bill that the money in the Fund be appropriated to the particular National Forest from which the receipts are derived on a forest-by-forest basis, is most unfortunate and would interfere with good forest management. Most of the softwood sawtimber is cut from the Rocky Mountain and West Coast States, but the recent cut-over areas are not necessarily where there is the greatest need for forest management money for seeding, fertilization, restocking, etc.

Under the bill the moneys as distributed by the Forest Service currently would be drastically altered. The northern and southern regions combined of the Forest Service would receive only 12 percent of the Fund whereas at the present time they receive about 35 percent of timber management money. The South would get only 9 percent as against 22 presently.

This should concern the southern timber industry and southern members of Congress.

Conversely, the Rocky Mountain and Pacific States would receive about 87 percent of the Fund whereas presently they receive 67 percent. In other words, this provision of the bill would mean that the money would necessarily be spent where the need is not greatest. The 3 Pacific Coast States now get about 35 percent of the money and would end up with 75 percent. This bill is tailor-made for the West Coast timber industry.

Following are the regional allocations of all timber management moneys on a percentage basis:

	Fiscal year 1968	Proposed under H.R. 10344
Pacific.....	38	76
Rocky Mountain.....	29	11
North.....	12	3
South.....	22	9

There are other aspects of the bill of concern which presumably the Forest Service has mentioned, although I was not privileged to hear Forest Service testimony. These relate to such questions as the effect of the bill on the automatic availability of Knutsen-Vandenberg money for timber stand improvement and reforestation, the 10 percent road fund, the definition of commercial forest land as used in the bill, and related matters. However, the preceding items are the principal concerns of the Citizens' Committee.

In an effort to be constructive, the Citizens' Committee offers the additional recommendations with respect to both the situation in general and this bill in particular:

1. If necessary to meet domestic timber needs and not overdraw our National bank account of timber resources, exports to Japan should be restricted, eliminated, or voluntarily reduced. I know that this is a com-

plicated matter involving foreign relations and balance of payments. But in this situation domestic needs would appear to come first and the Nation's bank account of timber resources should not be over-drawn. Exports of softwood logs in 1968 were 2.5 billion board feet. If the same amount had gone into domestic consumption, the pending bill probably would not be before you today.

2. If the situation becomes sufficiently tight, consideration should be given to allocations of softwood lumber and plywood to particular uses as well as price control measures.

3. The Administration should recommend and the Congress should appropriate moneys to fully implement the National Forest Development Program referred to earlier and as updated by the Forest Service.

4. The Congress should respond favorably to the request for funds submitted by the Administration to permit an increased sale of 910 million board feet of timber from the National Forests in the next 15 months as announced in March of this year. This request for funding is before the Congress at the present time. But the Administration should not direct this increase from the Forest Service unless the funds and personnel ceilings are forthcoming.

As an illustration of just how far behind the Forest Service is in utilizing the potential productivity of the National Forests, it is my recollection that several years ago, there was a 60-year backlog of needed reforestation. At that time the Forest Service was just keeping up with planting current cut-overs and burns and was not reducing the backlog on non-productive lands that had built up over a long time.

5. For many years, the Forest Service has considered the possibility of a National Forest Development and Management Fund into which would go 65 percent of National Forest receipts and which would be available for appropriation only for National Forest purposes. This, of course, is a form of earmarking similar to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. However, the Forest Service never has felt it had much chance to obtain this either in the Administration or in the Congress. Such a Fund could be beneficial.

Therefore, if the Committee decides to establish a special fund for the National Forests, it should include all unearmarked National Forest receipts; it should be available for all National Forest development and management purposes, other than roads; it should be available for expenditure as specified each year by the Appropriations Committees or wherever the Forest Service believes the need is greatest for whatever purpose; and receipts once in the Fund should be available until appropriated. Such a measure would be a very major forward step.

6. If H.R. 10344 or an amended bill is favorably considered in this Committee, it is recommended that particular reference be inserted in the bill to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, that it be made clear this bill is intended to be in conformance with the provisions of that Act, and that if any conflict develops, the provisions of that Act prevail.

7. This Committee should request from the Forest Service two major program reports with recommendations: (a) an updated program for the management and development of all National Forest resources, and (b) a program for the development of all forest lands for timber purposes including not only public lands but also all private lands. It is most significant that the greatest potential for timber production is on the farm and miscellaneous private lands which include 60 percent of the total commercial forest land area of the country but support only 18 percent of the inventory. The Forest Service, in about 1962, developed a small woodland program but never released it.

If the Committee were to have before it the two items just mentioned the Congress

would then be in a position to act effectively and wisely on all National Forest resources, and with respect to the timber supply situation considering all forest land ownerships.

8. There is a backlog of uncut National Forest timber, sold and under contract, of 27 billion board feet in the 48 States. This Committee could either admonish, or better yet, require that existing contracts not be extended by the Forest Service until the shortage is alleviated. There is a long-standing custom for the industry not to cut National Forest timber for which it holds a contract until the price is right and the time propitious.

There is also a long-standing tendency by the Forest Service to rather automatically extend timber sale contracts. Such a requirement to utilize the timber that is already sold without contract extensions or lose the cutting rights would bring a flood of timber to the market.

It has been a pleasure to appear before this Committee and I hope these comments and recommendations may be of assistance to it.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF HON.
GERALD R. FORD, AT ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, WINOOSKI, VT.

HON. ROBERT T. STAFFORD

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, June 8, the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, delivered a commencement address to the graduation class at St. Michael's College in Winooski, Vt. It is an excellent address, very timely, very well thought out, and much to the point. I am very pleased to place Mr. FORD's speech in the RECORD. It is as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE
GERALD R. FORD, AT ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE,
WINOOSKI, VT.

Most reverend clergy, faculty members, honored guests, parents and graduating seniors of this outstanding institution of learning:

I am delighted to be with you here in the exhilarating atmosphere of the Green Mountain state and one of Vermont's finest colleges.

I am most grateful for the honor you have bestowed on me. I hope I am deserving of it. And I pray I may live the rest of my days in keeping with your confidence.

This is the first time I have spoken to an all-male graduating class and I find the experience most interesting. I would guess that the lack of feminine distraction on campus has something to do with St. Michael's reputation for scholastic excellence.

I have a son in college, and I find that when he sometimes looks tired and peaked he is just suffering from a co-ed in the head.

I sense an independence of spirit at St. Michael's. This reminds me that although Massachusetts annexed Maine in 1652 and it took a British Royal Commission to separate New Hampshire from Massachusetts in 1680, Vermonters managed to fight off territorial claims by both New York and New Hampshire in the middle 1700s. A lot of people think the Green Mountain Boys got together to fight the British but the truth is they first combined forces to protect Vermont from the colony of New York.

But I did not come to Vermont to tell you about the history of this proud state. The point I make is that America today desperately needs the kind of pioneer Vermont

spirit and the rugged courage that triumphed over the British and land-grabbing colonial neighbors as well.

America needs, too, the kind of moral courage and devotion to human rights that prompted Vermont to become the first state to end slavery and to enact universal male suffrage without property qualifications.

I am fond of reading early American history because I believe it tells us much that is instructive today. We can learn much from it—from the suffering the early American settlers endured, from their incredible struggles simply to survive and to worship God as free men.

Those were incredible times. But so too is the era in which we are living.

Americans are living in an age which is in itself a fantastic paradox. It is the most advanced of eras, both technologically and in terms of social progress, and yet it is stained by unrestrained savagery, widespread violence, official corruption and revolting licentiousness. It is an age which has produced marvels in medicine and in space exploration—and also fiendish war machines capable of destroying all of mankind.

If I may depart from the serious for just a moment, perhaps it is small wonder that many Americans are unhappy with our system today. After all, when the first settlers came to this country there was no national debt and there were no taxes. The Indians were running the country, and they made the women do all the work. How could anyone improve on a system like that?

Few of us would want to go back to living as the pioneers did, clearing the land to grow a few crops and shooting game to put some meat on the table.

Yet the truth is evident that man is toughened by severe hardship and his character annealed to the strength of steel in the fires of adversity. Today many of us find life too easy.

The young men and women of today have been spared much of the hardship and adversity of the past. For instance, they know nothing of the Great Depression but what they have read in history books. It is inconceivable to them that a whole generation of Americans could have grubbed around for scraps of food or waited in line at soup kitchens and relief warehouses.

I worked part-time in high school, and I worked my way through the University of Michigan and Yale Law School. I am not complaining, and I am not preaching. I am simply trying to understand today's young people. And to do that I have to look at the world they live in and ask myself how it is different from mine.

This is the age of affluence. People are appalled at poverty in the midst of plenty. In my youth even men with great talent and ability were out of work, and one of the popular songs of the time was "Brother, Can You Spare A Dime."

Until Vietnam, the young man and woman of today knew nothing of war. Many of them obviously agree with Benjamin Franklin when he said, "There never was a good war or a bad peace."

My generation for four years fought the first truly global war in history to cleanse the world of Nazism and fascism and saw America prevent a Communist takeover in South Korea.

Today's pacifists wrap themselves in robes of self-righteousness. Do they think they are alone in hating war? Anyone who loves war is insane.

It was a great military man, Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman, who said: "You cannot qualify war in harsher terms than I will. War is cruelty, and you cannot refine it. War is hell." But Gen. Sherman also said—and this is important—"The legitimate object of war is a more perfect peace."

Is nothing worth fighting for?

Some young people sneer at patriotism

and what men like me call Americanism. I would like to see all of our citizens rededicate themselves to the Americanism described by President Theodore Roosevelt when he said: "Americanism means the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity and hardihood—the virtues that made America."

Americans of my generation look at young men and women who wave the Viet Cong flag, throw fire bombs, assault deans and faculty members in our schools of higher education, commit public fornication, and shout and write obscenities and we ask ourselves: What do they want? Who are they? What has America spawned? And why?

These young people scream that America is racist, capitalistic and imperialistic and the system must be torn down.

There are answers for these charges, but how do you reply when radical leaders shout you down or rough you up and mouth meaningless phrases borrowed from Marxist-Leninist and Maoist writings?

We have great need for a dialogue in this country—a quiet reasoned dialogue dealing with the Vietnam War, injustice to Negroes, corruption, materialism and the ultimate purpose of life.

This kind of dialogue goes to the basic purposes of a university—a place where faculty and students engage in an unfettered search for truth and new answers to depressing problems.

But how can you have a dialogue when radical leaders launch violent attacks upon the university itself with the avowed objective of destroying what they call "The Establishment?"

What is "The Establishment?" The Establishment is you and me and everything that has gone into the building of America. It is our democratic system of government. Imperfect as it is, I believe it is the best form of government ever devised.

I am fully aware that there is a lack of adequate communication between young people and the over-30 generation today—a lack of sufficient communication between students and faculty and administration even at peaceful colleges such as St. Michael's. Communication we need—and need desperately.

But violence is not the answer. Shutting down our great universities is not the answer. Black separatism is not the answer. Destroying college admission requirements so that our college and universities become remedial institutions is not the answer.

We don't solve problems by running away from them or abandoning our values or degrading ourselves with completely uninhibited life styles.

The problems today are essentially the same for all Americans. They are not easy problems and there are no easy solutions.

Vietnam. A tragic war. I don't believe it proved that America was wrong in seeking to thwart Communist aggression. I believe it did prove that our foreign policy in relation to Communist expansionist probes should be one of selective involvement and of carefully reasoned judgment as to whether possibly minimal results would justify the investment.

I also believe that for the first time in four years there is real hope for peace in Vietnam.

Racism. It is now a two-edged sword. Guilt feelings serve no useful purpose. We have made substantial progress. The only ultimate answer is to make a living truth of the words that make the Declaration of Independence a glowing testimonial to man's aspirations: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

The framers of the Declaration of Independence were not talking about black men. Slavery was practiced in the United States

at the time. But we must apply their words in the context of today's world and clothe them with the truth that all men are equal in the eyes of God.

Have you ever considered how often the drafters of the Declaration of Independence referred to the Deity?

They began by stating: "When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect of the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

And after ascribing to the Creator the endowing of men with certain unalienable Rights, the drafters of the Declaration of Independence concluded their statement of the causes of separation from England by proclaiming "a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

In every age, in every time and in every clime there are doomsday sayers who run about predicting the end of the world. Most people just smile tolerantly, shake their heads a bit and say to themselves, "Poor fellow."

One of the recent popular song hits is a calypso tune about California sliding into the sea. I think it has a deeper meaning.

Many members of the older generation today are comparing the abandonment of inhibitions, the excessive emphasis on sex and the general decline in morals in the United States to the biblical stories about Sodom and Gomorrah and to the fall of ancient Greece and Rome.

I can understand such feelings. Values change, yes, but certain truths are immutable. And we live today in an age when the New Barbarians seek to destroy truth, and the pornography peddlers are everlastingly engaged in pursuit of the fast buck.

There are truths that are not debatable—the truths that are laid down in the Ten Commandments—the truths that give rise to codes of ethics among civilized peoples—the truths that cause men to speak of integrity, honor, and virtue.

When men abandon these truths, they lose all sense of value. They live a life in death. Their lives are a waste, and they carry hell around with them in their hearts.

St. Thomas Aquinas said: "Three things are necessary for the salvation of man: to know what he ought to believe; to know what he ought to desire; and to know what he ought to do."

Today America is shaken by doubts about the meaning of education, about the ideals of the college generation, and indeed about the stability of American society.

College students, adults over 30, all of us who still engage in the use of reason should look at our lives and at America as a nation and ask: What are we? Where are we going? Where do we want to go? And what is the best way to get there?

We are living in the midst of revolution in America today—not one revolution but many. At the center of one of our political revolutions is the Students for a Democratic Society, the core of the New Left Movement.

Leaders of Students for a Democratic Society have concluded—in the words of one of them—that the "seemingly separate problems of racism, urban poverty, authoritarianism in the academies and the Vietnam War are all the offspring of a single parent . . . capitalism." Simple, isn't it? Destroy capitalism and you will solve all of America's problems, SDS leaders seem to be saying. They might more aptly call themselves Students for a Demolished Society.

This Nation doesn't need a new revolution. It needs to build on the old one, the

revolution in which the Green Mountain Boys fought so valiantly.

We need a return to moral values. This should be our revolution. This should be our answer to the crushing materialism that is robbing our lives of meaning.

Consider what good the radical student leaders could accomplish if they would mobilize moderate students into an army to clean up and repair slum dwellings instead of exhorting them to an assault upon the citadel of reason itself: the university.

American college students today are among the most privileged and fortunate individuals in the world, whatever their complaints about the relevance of current curricula.

And here at St. Michael's you are doubly blessed because you have received a college education rooted in moral values and the steadfast belief that man is only a little lower than the angels.

I congratulate you, for you are now prepared to live a life which recognizes that love of family is of paramount importance, that marital fidelity is a necessary foundation for happiness, and that nothing is more precious than the integrity of the individual.

These are some of the truths that America has lost in the whirl of this atomic age, the fear of imminent nuclear annihilation, the pursuit of hedonistic pleasure and the throwing off of reason and restraint.

I do not believe America is doomed. As I look at this graduating class, I see the birth of a New Morality in this country—not in the narrow sense but in terms of new strength of character both in Americans as individuals and in the United States as a Nation.

There is such an entity as National Character. It is a composite of all the strengths and weaknesses of the individuals who make up a Nation.

I feel you are strong men, and there are many more Americans like you throughout this great land of ours. And so I do not despair.

I believe that you and others like you will go out into the communities and build on the old revolution—make of America a nation which unmistakably stands for justice and decency and reason, for equality and opportunity and hope.

I believe you agree, as I do, with Plutarch when he counseled that "perseverance is more prevailing than violence; and many things which cannot be overcome when they are together, yield themselves up when taken little by little."

So let us, each one of us, light a candle instead of cursing the darkness—so that together we will make a great light which shall illumine the world for ourselves and for all men.

DEATH OF JUDGE JOHN S. SIMMANG, GIDDINGS, TEX.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I learned of the sudden death of one of Texas' greatest county and district judges, John S. Simmang, of Giddings, Tex.

Lee County has lost a true friend, and I, too, have lost a close, personal friend. A loyal Democrat, Judge Simmang continually managed my campaigns for the Senate, in addition to being instrumental in the election of another fellow Texan, Lyndon Baines Johnson. A true statesman of our times, John Simmang will long be remembered for his humanitarian

efforts in behalf of the people of Giddings, Lee County, Tex., and the Nation.

For over 30 years, John Simmang practiced law in Texas. He began his practice in Corpus Christi but later returned to his native Lee County where he served as Lee County judge, Lee County attorney, and finally as district judge. He was appointed to the district judgeship in January 1969, by Gov. Preston Smith.

One of his greatest accomplishments for rural Texas, the farm-to-market road system, was realized during Judge Simmang's tenure as president of the Texas Association of County Judges and Commissioners. His leadership for this road system was perhaps one of his greatest contributions to the rural communities of Texas.

Judge Simmang always had the interest of his fellow Texans at heart. Whether they were rich or poor, black or white, Judge Simmang always had the time to give aid or counsel when it was needed.

An avid outdoorsman, Judge Simmang worked for the continual betterment and preservation of Texas' natural resources.

As a family man, judge, humanitarian, and even more so a personal friend, Judge John S. Simmang will be greatly missed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extension of Remarks an editorial and a news article published in the Giddings, Tex., Times and News, which were written by the editor, Mr. Buddy Preuss, because they reflect the true spirit of and compassion felt for the late Judge John S. Simmang.

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

DISTRICT JUDGE JOHN SIMMANG DIES, BEGAN LAW PRACTICE HERE IN 1929

District Judge John S. Simmang, 62, of Giddings died suddenly Sunday at 1:40 p.m. at Newton Hospital in Cameron.

Judge Simmang, who ran unopposed in last year's general election for the position of District Judge of the 21st Judicial District of Texas, served less than five months in his new post.

He became ill Saturday night at his home in Giddings and was taken to the hospital in Cameron. His condition was not thought to be serious until shortly before his death when he was apparently struck by a heart attack.

Funeral services for Judge Simmang were held Tuesday at 2 p.m. at Phillips & Luckey Chapel in Giddings with the Rev. H. L. McLerran officiating. Burial was in the Giddings City Cemetery.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Mary Ellen Simmang; a son, Michael J. Simmang of Giddings; a daughter, Mrs. Mary Kay O'Brien of Dallas; a brother, Quintus Simmang of Houston; 3 sisters, Mrs. Milton York of Bella Vista, Arkansas; Mrs. Roy McClellan of Lubbock and Mrs. Dorothy Allert of San Antonio; and 5 grandchildren.

Judge Simmang was a native of Giddings and began practicing law here in 1929.

His father, the late E. T. Simmang, practiced law in Giddings and Lee County since the late 1800's. Judge Simmang was associated with his father until he died in 1953. Judge Simmang also was associated in the practice of law with his brother, the late Ted Simmang.

The Judge served as Lee County Attorney from 1954 to 1969 when he resigned to accept the post as District Judge. He and his son, Michael, has been associated in the practice of law the last several years until Jan-

uary 1 of this year when he took the district bench.

From 1938 until 1952 Judge Simmang also served as Lee County Judge and he was the Co-Counsel for Bluebonnet Electric Co-op, formerly the LCREC, for 27 years until his death.

During Judge Simmang's tenure as President of the Texas Association of County Judges & Commissioners, the Texas farm-to-market road program became a reality. This was one of Judge Simmang's greatest contributions to the rural communities of this area and the entire state.

For over 25 years Judge Simmang also was a member of the Giddings Volunteer Fire Department which did so much to protect the property and lives of those in this community.

He was also very active in the Giddings Chamber of Commerce all down through the years and served as its president at one time.

He was a member of the Giddings Industrial Foundation and Industrial Committee at the time of his death.

His most recent accomplishment for the betterment of this community was his service on the State School Committee which was instrumental in obtaining the Giddings State School for Boys.

Other organizations of which he was a member include the Sons of Hermann, Masonic Lodge, SPJST at Dime Box, Lee County Sheriff's Posse, Giddings Lions Club and Lee County Cattleman's Association.

He was also very active in the Lee County Fair Association down through the years and directed various charitable campaigns such as the March of Dimes.

He was a loyal Democrat and was instrumental in helping to elect Lyndon B. Johnson as Congressman in this district, also supporting him all the way to the Presidency.

Judge Simmang was a director at the First National Bank in Giddings since 1953 and was legal advisor for many years for the Giddings News.

Judge Simmang was born in Giddings in 1906, the son of E. T. Simmang and Tillie Schelnick.

He attended school in Giddings and received a degree from the University of Texas. He completed his legal training with a degree from Cumberland University Law School in Lebanon, Tennessee.

He practiced law for a few months in Corpus Christi but then returned to his native Lee County where he remained the rest of his life.

LEE COUNTY HAS LOST A FRIEND

The people of Lee County have lost a friend with the passing of Judge John S. Simmang. This man loved Lee County and its people like few others I have ever known.

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

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

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

Countians and others who were using this park for recreation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One of Judge Simmam's most recent contributions to this community came just last year when the Giddings State School Committee, of which he was a member, helped

obtain the State School for Boys to be located at Giddings. Although the Judge did not live to see this become a reality, the School will be a monument to his untiring work for a better community. And it will employ several hundred people, most of whom will be the "common people" he cared so much for.

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

He was a servant of the people.

APOLOGY TO THE LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS OF SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend our colleague, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois, on his challenge of the position of the junior Senator from South Dakota, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, wherein Senator MCGOVERN proposed that Mayor Daley use his influence to have the indictments against the August rioters dismissed.

I want to point out to Congressman PUCINSKI that the position of Senator MCGOVERN does not represent the position and feeling of the people of South Dakota.

The people of South Dakota generally are good, law-abiding citizens and treasure the constitutional processes that have made this country great. They abhor the thought that politics can fix grand jury indictments.

I join Congressman PUCINSKI in commending Mayor Daley for telling Senator MCGOVERN in effect "to go jump in Lake Michigan with his naive suggestion." I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that the South Dakota Senator's suggestion that "Mayor Daley ought to use his influence to drop these indictments is to make a complete mockery of the judicial processes in the country."

I also commend the editorial staff of the Chicago Sun Times. The Sun Times said in part as follows:

Specifically, McGovern proposed that Mayor Daley encourage officials to dismiss all indictments growing out of the disorders so as to "end the anguish and heal the wounds."

McGovern, a professor of history and government, should recognize that his proposal was unacceptable morally or legally. Political pressure on the courts should not be tolerated. A court system free of politics is a goal this newspaper, McGovern and everyone interested in good government has been striving for.

With the indictment of demonstrators and policemen the judgment on the August disorders moved into the courts. And there they must be disposed of according to law. It may be that the specific federal law applied against demonstrators should be tested for its constitutionality. But all these questions should be hammered out in the courts.

Even if he wanted to, Mayor Daley does not have the right to grant amnesty to persons still under indictment. If the court action still pending is, as McGovern argued, keeping Democratic party wounds still open, the best prescription is swift justice, not political interference with justice.

I apologize for the position taken by the junior Senator from South Dakota. It is regrettable that his position has cast a reflection upon the good name of South Dakota and its law-abiding citizens.

PETITION BY STUDENTS FOR LAW AND ORDER ON CAMPUS OF UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in this day of tremendous turmoil on the campuses of colleges and universities all across the United States, it is important to keep in mind that the student dissidents and even outright militant revolutionaries represent only a very small minority.

An overwhelming majority of American youth and college students believe in law and order, and they are committed to the importance of higher education in our complex society.

Recently, at the University of Georgia, in Athens, more than 3,300 students signed a petition calling for the maintenance of law and order on that campus. This is probably the largest petition in the entire history of the University of Georgia. The petition was endorsed and the student signatories commended by the Agricultural Alumni Association of the University of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Education is the key to successful attainments in life, and

Whereas, A better education for their children has been the dream of all parents throughout the ages, and

Whereas, The State of Georgia was the first state in the nation to charter a state-supported institution of higher education, and

Whereas, The tax-paying citizens of our state devote a sizable portion of their income and wealth to providing educational facilities and programs, including those of the University of Georgia, and

Whereas, The educational progress of our young people can be seriously impaired by disruptive acts on the campus and the state's investment in education thereby negated by such acts, and

Whereas, The state and society need the services of young people who are eager to obtain an education, and

Whereas, Such young people who are desirous of obtaining an education should have every opportunity to acquire said education under the best possible conditions,

Therefore, be it resolved that students opposed to disruptive acts, such as the PRO-UGA Committee, be commended for their recognition of the need for a campus atmosphere conducive to learning, and for their support of the University administration.

Be it further resolved that the Agricultural Alumni Association of the University of Georgia, Inc., commends President Fred C. Davison for his firm position and leadership in such matters and urges him to take whatever action necessary to preserve law, order and decency on our campus, including legal action and expulsion, if necessary, against

any individual or group planning, organizing, condoning or carrying out disruptive acts.

Adopted this 10th Day of May, 1969 by the Board of Directors, Agricultural Alumni Association, University of Georgia, Inc.

HUGH A. INGLIS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

THOMPSON SCORES LIBRARY CUT

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate cuts in the President's budget for next year is that of Federal funds for the Nation's libraries. Unless Congress restores these funds, programs which provide assistance to elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and public libraries will be sharply curtailed. Some, such as construction of public libraries, will be done away with completely.

The proposed cuts amount to the approximate cost of fighting the war in Southeast Asia for 1 day. Yet this sum will jeopardize construction and modernization of libraries, acquisition of new materials, provision of services which increase the use of existing services and facilities—such as mobile libraries and longer hours—and training of librarians. Libraries are the laboratory of the humanists; they are the storehouse of basic educational materials. Two recent editorials, one from the Washington Post and the other from Saturday Review, eloquently pleaded the cause of the libraries—and all who wish to learn—of this country. I commend these pleas to my colleagues by inserting them in the Record at this time:

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1969]

THE COST OF ECONOMY

"Libraries," President Nixon said just a month ago in observance of National Library Week, "are the banks of our educational system. And they yield rich dividends in knowledge and in wisdom." The metaphor, however meritorious, was infelicitously timed. It was uttered just a day or two before the President announced savage slashes in the Federal budget for libraries and library services. These banks, apparently, are not going to have much money in them. And so their "dividends in knowledge and in wisdom" may be correspondingly meager.

It would be difficult to state with any greater eloquence than Mr. Nixon's the vital contribution made by libraries to the intellectual life of the Nation. "They are," he went on to say, "a summing-up of past achievement and a stimulant to future progress. Never have we had greater reason than this year to celebrate National Library Week. For never have our libraries played a more prominent role in our campaign against ignorance and for fullness of educational opportunity."

Unhappily, the Nixon budget allots to libraries no more than a fraction of what the Johnson budget promised. In funds for Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, providing library materials and textbooks for public and private schools, there is a reduction of \$42 million, leaving exactly nothing. The funds to be made available for furnishing library materials to help college and university libraries would merely be cut in half, a cut of \$12.5 million. And perhaps the unkindest cut of all is in

Title I of the Library Services Act, a matching program which usefully prodded state and local governments to spend money for the improvement and expansion of their library systems. This, too, suffered a reduction by one-half—\$17.5 million taken away, \$17.5 million left.

There are considerations of economy to support these cuts, of course, and they have an undeniable validity. But they entail serious social costs, whatever their money savings. Reading is indispensable to any self-governing society; and libraries are the fountainhead of reading. Mr. Nixon in no way overstated their importance; he has simply undervalued his own rhetoric. It is children who will bear the brunt of this "saving" and in the long run it may be dangerously expensive. It is one of those hidden prices paid for the war which, when added all together over time, can be ruinous to the Nation's security.

[From Saturday Review, June 7, 1969]

BOOKS ARE NOT EXPENDABLE

What if a coalition of extremists proclaimed their intention of fire-bombing every school and public library in the country?

The public outcry would, of course, be memorable. Not only would riot police hit the streets in force, but reasonable people everywhere would set up an anguished outcry and take the sternest possible line with the troublemakers. Our schools and libraries are, the cry would go, the backbone of the nation and the arsenal of democracy—who diminishes them diminishes America. And if, in the face of the riot guns and outraged public feeling, the extremists did manage to level a few libraries and classrooms, popular opinion would soon force the government to build ever statelier mansions of learning on the bombed-out sites.

But there is, of course, more than one way to put schools and libraries out of commission. There are ways of doing the job in broad daylight, right under the nose of a somnolent American public. Consider, for instance, the recently announced federal budget allotments for books and educational materials for the coming fiscal year. Where \$237 million was made available a year ago, the Nixon Administration has slashed that amount by a cool 87.5 per cent. Yet the public outcry has been, at best, muted.

Spelled out, this wholesale slash means that no federal funds at all will be given to elementary school libraries, and that only minuscule amounts will trickle down to the public and college libraries.

The libraries are, of course, far from being alone in their deprivation. The proposed federal cuts will bring the budget of the Office of Education down from \$4.1 billion in 1968 to a lowly \$3.2 billion in 1970—a steep, even dizzying decline, and one that is bound to leave wound-stripes on the country's educational bodies for some time to come.

Ironically, Washington's budget slashers have chosen to hack away at federal grants at a time when their counterparts in the cities and localities are also finding it expedient to skimp and scamp on educational services. The effect of this dual barrage may well prove devastating.

But surely no one in government is against education and the reading process? If, as Senators are forever telling us in commencement day speeches, education is the backbone of our country, why would sober, well-meaning budget experts want to bend their country's backbone to the snapping point? The unofficial explanation out of Washington has been that the programs hit were of "low priority" in this "period of inflation and budgetary stringency."

This "explanation" would be moving and persuasive if only the pesky daily papers would stop printing stories that give such explanations the lie. Recent news stories tell,

for instance, how the Air Force, sans congressional authorization or appropriations, approached an aircraft company and ordered up fifty-seven monster-sized C-5A transport planes, without having any clear idea of how much the planes would cost. The price will depend, it came out, on how much an earlier order of fifty-eight C-5As costs to build. If the first group of planes turns out to cost more than expected, no sweat: Under its contract with the Air Force, the aircraft company is free to jack up the price of the second group of planes as much as is necessary to insure a tidy profit.

This breathtaking display of the juggler's art has moved Representative Otis Pike, of New York, to exclaim that the Air Force was "playing Mickey Mouse with figures." The contract arrangement is so loose-limbed and amiable, in fact, that no one seems sure just how much money may be involved. Thus, the Air Force says its original understanding was that all the planes would cost some \$4,348,000,000 but that of course the estimate has risen since by \$1,382,000,000. Yet one Air Force expert concedes that the cost increase will probably run something on the order of \$2 billion. This amount could give the United States the finest library facilities and services in the world. Meanwhile, each week we read other reports of massive military waste and sloppy bookkeeping that do little to convince the electorate that the values of the society are in happy balance. Fortunately, various groups and individuals are currently pressing Congress to restore these budget cuts—which is to say, they are trying to restore the nation's educational backbone to its original shape. During this month and July, the Congress will be holding hearings and voting on the 1970 appropriations bill. If every American who feels strongly about these misappropriations of educational funds would visit, write, or call his Representative and Senators, there is every chance that the cuts would be restored. If they are not, the bureaucrats—or, as the Germans call them, "desk-murderers"—will with a pen stroke have done more damage to the life of the mind in this country than a regiment of fanatics and incendiaries could do if they worked around the clock. Books are not expendable.

It is the fashion to think of teachers, librarians, and cultivated people generally as timid, sheeplike, and much too well bred to cry out when they are shorn. Perhaps it is time to remind our fiscal hatchet-wielders of Balzac's saying, "Terrible is the revolt of a sheep."

ARTHUR GODFREY DELIVERS A WARNING TO GRADUATING CLASS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for a good many years Arthur Godfrey has been one of the country's best-known entertainers. As such he has gathered a large following of people who admire his talents as a performer.

Mr. Godfrey has a deep abiding love for his country. He has taken an intensive interest in its natural resources and has become one of the most eloquent spokesmen for the preservation and protection of these resources. His concern for America and its people is of the highest degree of responsibility by a citizen.

On June 2, Arthur Godfrey delivered the commencement address at the Milton Hershey School in Pennsylvania. In it he

presented some disturbing facts and a warning of what may happen to our natural environment unless man changes his ways.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Arthur Godfrey's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

When President John Hershey came to visit me in my office last winter, I told him I would be delighted to come to speak to you tonight. But I must confess that as this date has come nearer and nearer, my dread has increased until over this past week-end it became something little short of sheer and complete panic!

But this is the first time I have been asked to make a commencement address since I was awarded an honorary degree in Aeronautical Science by Ryder College way back in the early fifties.

So I've been asking myself everyday for the past several weeks, as I was preparing this address: what in the world can I possibly say that you might find worth while or even interesting? I called my granddaughter on the phone about it. * * * She said: "I think it would be exciting to hear what you think the future has in store for us. We're tired of being lectured and warned all the time about booze and narcotics and sex. It would be nice to get some constructive advice about career possibilities and things like that."

I also asked some of the bright young men who work with me in advertising and television and radio production. Men in their late twenties and early thirties. They all said the same thing: "Tell 'em like it is, Arthur. Tell 'em what you've taught us about our environment, our attitudes and our disciplines."

Well, that's a long story, and I couldn't give it all to you if I gave you an hour's lecture every day for three years. It is ridiculous for us elders to try to give advice to young men based on what we think we remember about our own youth.

It's a different story today, I'm afraid. Today, because the material conditions of life have been vastly changed, too many people think traditional concepts of ethics and morals and political and social relationships are obsolete. What I'm going to tell you today are some unpleasant truths that may not be what you'd like to hear. But what I will tell you is truth to the best of my knowledge—truth untainted and uncolored by personal opinion.

Man—humanity—your ancestors and mine—seems to have appeared first in ancient Africa somewhere between a million and two million years ago. And for a long time—at least a million years—did all right.

But somewhere back along about the Neolithic period, we must have gotten too big for our breeches in the northern half of Africa, anyway, because that whole area became entirely denuded. What had once been a magnificent forest became the vast Sahara Desert—which is still pushing southward at the rate of about half a mile per hour.

We—mankind—struggled along for thousands of years, throughout the rest of the world, until about the time of the Renaissance, with only two or three hundred million people—at most—on Earth. Then, all of a sudden, somewhere between 1830 and 1850, it was realized that there were about a billion human beings alive at one and the same time.

Seventy years ago, at the turn of this century, there were still considerably less than a billion and a half people alive on Earth. * * * By 1930, when I was 27, the

population had risen to two billion, but in only the next 30 years, by 1960, we had already well beyond 3.5 billion, with life expectancy up to 67 years in America.

If this keeps up, 31 years from now, when you lads will be in your middle and late forties, the world population is projected to be well over 7 billion human beings. Of course, we'll never make it. Why? This planet just isn't big enough to support 7 billion people!

Take just the United States, for instance. When I was born there were far less than 100,000,000 Americans alive. Today we have 205 or 206 million. Now, according to the best figures I can find, at 200 million people we have 2.6 acres of arable, usable soil per person. Double the population in the next 30 years, means half the usable soil per person—1.3 acres. You lads know that we cannot raise enough food on 1.3 acres to feed one person for one year.

So, by 1980 or 85, you, dear young people, are going to know the pangs of hunger—you and me and three hundred-odd million other Americans! It won't be just the poor people. Everybody will be hungry.

And don't let anyone tell you that technology is going to fix this. That's a lot of hogwash. Technology, as a matter of pure fact, is exactly what has caused the present human condition. Runaway technology! * * *

No, technology isn't going to help us until we adopt an entirely new set of definitions of what we have rather foolishly called progress up to now. My generation started it and the children of my generation, your sires and mothers, have carried it along in a wild, heedless drive. * * *

Let me illustrate with one or two small examples: technology some years back came up with a marvelous chemical called DDT for spraying insects. Without examining the ecological consequences, we all bought the stuff and sprayed it everywhere to get rid of mosquitos, flies, beetles and other pests. It killed 'em, too. No question about it.

But it also killed praying mantises, and lady bugs, and other wonderful insects that feed on those that are harmful to man. It wipes out entire species of birds, too, by making them incapable of reproducing. It kills the plankton and other tiny organisms in the waters upon which the lesser forms of marine life depend for food, thus robbing the larger creatures of their subsistence.

Incredibly, penguin eggs—thousands of miles away in the Antarctic!—have been found to be contaminated with unacceptable amounts of DDE which has prevented chicks from hatching. A big catch of coho salmon in Lake Superior was impounded last winter because it was found to be loaded with dangerous amounts of the same poison.

Would you lads believe that our filthy Hudson River in New York used to have annual salmon spawning runs? Yes! And great sturgeons, too. Believe it or not, we once exported caviar to Russia from our own Hudson River sturgeon! * * *

The very air we breathe is so filled with noxious gases that thousands of people die each year of emphysema, lung cancer and, in some instances, just plain every day suffocation.

Where does the air pollution come from? Factories? Yes, but only roughly 14% of it. Public utilities? Yes, another 16%. All of the remainder, 70%, comes from our automobiles, motorcycles, boats, airplanes, trucks, tractors, incinerators and home heating devices. All these "wonderful" things that technology brought us.

My hope is that American youth will not take it sitting down. My hope is that you who will one day take over the reins of this country, will do something about it. That's

why I accepted this invitation to speak to you today.

You young men about to leave this great institution, are living examples of the power of initiative and free American enterprise.

You who were graduated here today are equipped as no other young men in America with a priceless background that will stand you in good stead in the mighty struggle that is to come. The rules of conduct, the desire to learn, the love of country which are part and parcel of your bone and tissue will make you the great leaders of your day.

Too many of our young people today have been caught up in a senseless, lemming-like stampede to oblivion. This is no time for youth to blow up and seek hysterical escape. Long, filthy hair and rags bring nothing but skin troubles and body lice. Civilization is built on restraints and disciplines—preferably self-disciplines. There must be rules and regulations and civilities and niceties and manners and courtesies or there is no quality to life—and all is chaos.

We must do our own thing, you and I—but we must make it a positive, constructive thing, and we must be guided by rules, manners, formalities and standards of taste. We have to learn how to do that which man forgot how to do the day he fashioned the first tool—we have to learn to live unobtrusively within our environment. We have to learn to be a part of our environment instead of trying to be greedy, thoughtless, tyrannical masters of all we survey.

The world has changed in many ways, and man has wrought most of the changes, but he is still the slave of the very environment he has so heedlessly brought to the edge of ruin. We can go to the moon and we can go to the bottom of the sea—but we must take our environment with us—or we die. And yet we have muddled and polluted and ravished our environment—the very substance upon which we live and within which we live.

A long time ago, lads, I reached the conclusion that the only contribution a man can make that is really worthwhile is to leave the piece of ground upon which he was nurtured in better shape than it was when he found it. The whole world is a dirty, impoverished, badly polluted place today. I'm sorry you had to find it that way—sorry to the depths of my soul—and I have honestly tried to clean up at least a little of it. And I shall keep on trying by bringing these facts home to as many people as will listen to me.

Let me urge you young men to arm yourselves as quickly as possible with the facts which are now as available to you as they have been to me during the past few years. Then, individually, select that branch of ecological endeavor which appeals to you most and attack it with all your strength. Go—and take with you the apologies of those of us who realize now the error of our ways—and take with you also our love and support and our determination to make this world much cleaner and better than it is today.

ROMAN HISTORY OFFERS PARALLELS THAT ARE CHILLING

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith for printing in the Extensions of Remarks, an editorial by Brady Black of the Cincinnati Enquirer, entitled "Roman History Offers Parallels That Are Chilling."

The editorial follows:

ROMAN HISTORY OFFERS PARALLELS THAT ARE CHILLING

(By Brady Black)

The fall of the powerful Roman Empire long has been a historical yardstick for man's measuring and speculating as to whether the powerful United States could come to a similar end.

The Philadelphia Inquirer has published a series of articles by Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe, director of the Foreign Policy Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, which points out some parallels between the Roman Empire of 1900 years ago and the United States of today.

The implications, if one is inclined to be pessimistic, are frightening.

The Roman Empire, Dr. Strausz-Hupe noted, achieved its greatest prosperity and external security in the second century after the birth of Christ. The military strength deterred or overwhelmed foreign aggressors and, internally, the safety of individuals and their property was insured. There was a middle class which grew steadily in numbers and in wealth. All Roman citizens were liable for military service and all were equal before the law. Economic competition was actively encouraged.

"No foreign power could challenge her, and her growing middle class furnished the seemingly inexhaustible wellspring of progress," Dr. Strausz-Hupe wrote.

"Why did this splendid and benign civilization decline at all?" he asked. "And why did it decline so rapidly that, within another 100 years, the Roman Empire was plunged irreversibly into anarchy and penury, ravaged by foreign aggressors, and doomed to extinction?"

"Undoubtedly, one cause of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire can be found in the enduring nature of man: His capacity for self-delusion and complacency in good times."

The alarming trends, noted even at that time, were:

There was an increase of idle people in Rome, the idle rich and the idle poor. This trend was fostered by political rewards to favorites by some of the emperors and bids for acclaim of the masses by the inauguration of welfare measures and public services. A large part of the Roman citizenry lived on the dole in exchange for their votes.

The average Roman citizen, idle, pleasure-seeking and pampered, felt less and less inclined to do service in the citizen army, once considered a privilege of all free Romans.

The simple moral values which had made Romans invincible in war and which had ennobled their domestic institutions—frugality, gravity, directness, piety and patriotism—did not commend themselves to the sophisticated philosophies which swept Rome's intellectual market in the second century.

One group of alienated intellectuals was the Cynics—bearded, ragged and professing indifference to worldly goods. The Cynics heaped contempt and ridicule upon the steady values of the middle class. Another was the Sophists, the academics who fattened on the social and economic system which they denounced as they grew influential and rich.

By the beginning of the third century, Rome's towns and countryside had become unsafe places. Deserters from the army and escaped criminals beset the unwary traveler and robbed the tradesmen.

There were riots and fires which destroyed whole towns.

The authorities, unable or unwilling to cope with the disorders, indulged the masses of idle in the cities, seeking their political support as an offset against the growing discontent of the taxpayers—the producers.

Confiscatory taxation and creeping inflation occurred, depressing commerce and industry and beggaring the middle class. The

chief taxes paid by the lower income brackets were not raised but the income taxes and inheritance taxes paid by the propertied and well-to-do were sharply increased.

"What always happens as a consequence of excessive taxation also happened in the Roman Empire: Prices rose, and creeping inflation culminated in a scramble for real goods at ever higher prices and in the debasement of the currency," Dr. Strausz-Hupe noted.

"As always, the lower income groups, depending on the purchasing power of their daily earnings, were worst hit. The deterioration of the currency was the most tangible symptom of the increasingly serious financial situation of the empire. . . . Increase in taxation went hand-in-hand with the increase in bureaucracy. . . . The bill for their services had to be paid by the one population group that could be coerced into carrying the additional load; namely the producer, the taxpayer."

"A few generations earlier," he continued, "Rome had stood steadfastly by her commitments to her allies. . . . by the third century, the retreat of Rome from her forward positions. . . . had turned into an unseemly rout. . . . Rome's hostile neighbors turned more aggressive. . . . Rome confined herself to indignant complaints—and did nothing. . . . For awhile appeasement of her enemies brought Rome peace. Then her strongest allies defected and her enemies, encouraged by Rome's limp response to their provocations, renewed the attack and proceeded to ravage Rome's home territories, Italy and Gaul."

"Is this lesson relevant to us? Has any people ever grown stronger by growing weaker in the resolution to punish hostile provocations and to stand by its allies?" Dr. Strausz-Hupe asked.

"Has any people ever been able to improve its internal welfare at the expense of its external security? . . . No one can state convincingly where lies the limits of our wealth; as to whether, for example, a permanent tax burden, representing 25% of our national income, is bound to crush the incentive of the nation's products, whether chronic inflation will affect our future welfare of our poorer fellow citizen; and whether, in order to deal effectively with the blight of poverty, we must not first halt the inflationary rise in the cost of living and restore incentives to private enterprise."

REEXAMINATION OF RELATIONSHIP OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—RESOLUTION BY CITY COUNCIL OF YONKERS, N.Y.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks a resolution adopted by the City Council of Yonkers, N.Y., calling for a complete reexamination of the entire relationship of Federal, State, and local governments.

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

RESOLUTION No. 288-1969

By Councilman Eisen:

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Yonkers, in meeting assembled:

That it emphatically calls upon and urges our representatives in the State Legislature and the Congress to immediately press for

a complete re-examination of the entire relationship of Federal, State and Local Governments for the purpose of placing where there is power to deal with them—full responsibility for creating and implementing comprehensive and effective solutions for the increasing monumental problems, particularly financial, facing the cities. It must be recognized that the urban area—such as Yonkers—is being short-changed, at the low end of the structure of government, and by reason thereof is fast approaching the point where expenses can only be met by denying essential community services.

The Federal Government apparently is the only present source with sufficient resources to be able to quickly come to the aid of the cities to meet their almost insurmountable challenges. But this aid cannot wait and must be genuine and available, not frustrated by red-tape. Prompt and adequate commitment not lip service must come to the cities if they are to accomplish the task of re-building our decaying urban civilization.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to each of our Assemblymen, our State Senator, our Congressman, both United States Senators, the Chairman of the appropriate committees of the Legislature and Congress, and to the Governor and the President.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Yonkers, at a stated meeting held April 22nd, 1969, by unanimous vote.

JOSEPH A. KRAYNAK,
City Clerk.

State of New York, County of Westchester, City of Yonkers, SS.:

I, Joseph A. Kraynak, City Clerk of the City of Yonkers, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing Resolution No. 288-1969 adopted April 22nd, 1969, with the original thereof now on file in my office, and that the same is a true and correct copy thereof and the whole of said original.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the City of Yonkers, this 24 day of April, 1969.

JOSEPH A. KRAYNAK,
City Clerk.

MINE TRIP TAKES VISITORS BACK 300 MILLION YEARS

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the Christian Science Monitor contained a very informative article about a trip underground to an active coal mine in north central Pennsylvania. I myself have taken this trip through the Glen Burn Colliery mine and can attest to its amazing and inspiring effects. It is an awesome sight and a very exhilarating experience which I would highly recommend to anyone interested in American history and traditions.

The Monitor article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 10, 1969]

MINE TRIP TAKES VISITORS BACK 300 MILLION YEARS

SHAMOKIN, PA.

The huge Glen Burn Colliery, whose history dates back to 1793, opens its shafts to tourists on weekends and holidays from May to October.

From 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. certified mine foremen guide visitors on 50-minute tours of the mine's intriguing interior, featuring a

thrilling three-mile ride through the remarkable solid rock tunnel, plus an extra 20-minute guided tour of the colliery's surface sights, showing such marvels of hard-coal mining as the world's highest burning culm bank.

Tourists are also welcome to visit the new Anthracite Museum and view unusual exhibits of fossils, old mining gear, lamps, maps, photographs, and many reminders of life in early mining days.

Visitors take the tunnel ride in authentic motorized mine cars, specially equipped for tourist enjoyment. Floodlights atop the cars illuminate the tunnel's amazing solid rock and sights en route. Over loudspeakers, passengers hear mining lore and highlights of anthracite history, traditions, and geological development.

Tourists alight from mine cars in the high, wide, well-lighted "inside walking area," full of remarkable underground sights. The knowledgeable miner-guide leads the way, explaining how anthracite is mined at the Glen Burn, answering questions, pointing out gangways, loading chutes, such phenomena as a rich coal vein, rock strata, and brilliantly colored rock "painted" by acid water.

Enhancing the authenticity of the scene are lifelike mannequins, dressed like Glen Burn miners, illustrating actual mining operations. It's cool inside the mine, an average 52 degrees.

On the outside tour, visitors actually walk the route taken by Glen Burn miners on their way to the drift mouth (entrance to the tunnel).

First stop is the old bath house, to see where 1,200 miners took showers after a day's toil beneath the earth's surface. Visitors then see and learn functions of such facilities as the pumping station, scale house, boiler house, railroad and mine haulage cars. They view a gigantic "tree trunk" fossil, judged by a noted geologist to be about 300 million years old.

Because the famed Glen Burn mine is such a huge complex of buildings and installations, with a wealth of unusual attractions above and below ground, there is much of interest for everyone. Tourist facilities include a snack bar, souvenir shop, and free picnic area.

KREMLIN CONFRONTATION TACTICS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks an editorial entitled "Kremlin Confrontation Tactics," published in the Washington Post of June 10, 1969.

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

KREMLIN CONFRONTATION TACTICS

If the United States, after occupying Mexico and opening a border war with Canada, then called a conference on hemispheric friendship and unity, it would be in about the pickle in which the Soviet Union finds itself today. An outsider might have thought that, at the least, the timing of an international Communist conference was a shade off, coming so soon after the occupation of Czechoslovakia and the opening of a border war with China. But that would be to overestimate the political subtlety of the Kremlin faction which rammed the conference through.

In Moscow these days the "contradictions" of the Communist movement are, like magnolia blossoms, unfolding and turning brown. To attract those few parties whose self-respect makes their attendance of value, the Russians promised not to use the conference to excommunicate the absent Chinese. But once the meeting began, Politburo chief Brezhnev feverishly denounced Peking. The Russians had gotten their hapless Czech clients to ask the brothers not to discuss the Soviet invasion. But one of the parties responsible to its public rather than Kremlin whim, the Australian, went ahead and raised the Czech question anyway. A captive of its own intolerance, the Soviet leadership has neither the power to suppress all dissent nor the wisdom to learn from it. Having abandoned the techniques of consultation for the shock tactic of confrontation, the Kremlin is at a loss.

If the Soviets want to make a hash of the International Communist movement, that is their privilege. Thoughtful Westerners, rather than smiling over Moscow's discomfort, will regret that the Russians are so pressurizing the international climate. Yet that is not all. Its performance raises serious questions about the maturity of the current Kremlin leadership. Can a group which abuses and alienates its friends be counted on to treat its rivals with the respect their tensions require? It would defy common sense and past history alike if other men in the Kremlin were not troubled by this strain.

DAY CARE CENTER FACILITIES ACT

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, there are some who claim that the most important social legislation of the next 10 years will be in the area of child development. Establishing day care facilities will be one of the important parts of that legislation. The existing need for more day care centers is staggering. Several million children in need of day care attention are without it, and each year, for the predictable future, the demand for day care services will increase.

According to the Department of Labor the number of working mothers has doubled since 1950; there are seven times as many working mothers now as compared to 1940. At present, almost two of every five mothers with children under 18 are working. A cultural change has occurred in the past 30 years, and we have not faced some of its implications.

One implication which now cries out for attention is the need for a national program to provide adequate care for the children of these working mothers. According to 1965 estimates, there were 4.5 million children under the age of 6 whose mothers were working, and 11 million children aged 11 or under.

The number of places in day care facilities—531,000 as of March 1968—hardly begins to cope with the problem. Present facilities are filled to capacity, and everywhere there are long waiting lists. Mothers are forced into makeshift arrangements for their children—a neighbor today, a relative tomorrow. Sometimes an elderly person is left in charge of many children from a

number of families. Sometimes the children are left with a sick person; sometimes they are brought to the mother's place of work. Evidence is available that many of these arrangements are detrimental to the child—and in the long run, to society—for we have come to recognize that the preschool child is going through important stages crucial to his future development. To take a simple example, the preschooler can be seriously slowed up in his language ability if he is left each day with an elderly person who talks very little to the child because of deafness, or a language barrier, or the tiredness of age. The detrimental effect here is cumulative. Without language skills the child learns poorly all that is taught to him through language when he begins school.

Shocking as it may seem, some children are left to take care of themselves. In a 1965 study of some 6.3 million working mothers, it was found that about a million children under 14 years of age were left without anyone to look after them; some of these children were under 6 years of age. The possible costs to society here are incalculable; how can we compute the cost of accidents which occur, the psychological damage and the juvenile delinquency which often result?

Federal funds are available for operational expenses of day care centers, but there is no general Federal program which would authorize funds for major renovation, or for construction of badly needed new facilities.

The actual demand for day care centers is indeterminable; while I have seen estimates which claim that about 3.5 million mothers are in desperate need of day care, this does not include mothers who would work if good child care services were available for their children. Surveys report that many women now on relief would seek employment of their own accord if day care arrangements could be found for their children. This is also true of many professional women, such as nurses, whose skills society badly needs. In addition, the Labor Department in 1965 predicted that the 1970's would see a 43-percent rise in the number of working mothers with children under 5 years, and this figure is now acknowledged as too conservative. The costs of new facilities are too much for the States to bear alone; centers will only be built in numbers that have any relation to the critical need if Federal assistance is forthcoming.

I am introducing legislation today which would authorize Federal funds for the construction of day care centers. While the funds could be used to acquire land and erect new buildings, preference would be given for the renovation of existing structures. The bill specifies that Federal assistance will supply two-thirds of the costs; the non-Federal share can be in cash or in some equivalent contribution such as land, a building to be renovated, labor or equipment. I am recommending an authorization of \$55 million per year for the next 4 years. The situation should be assessed again at that time.

The bill does not restrict facilities to a particular age group such as 3 to 5 years. Current research indicates that good day

care is not harmful to the 1 to 3 age group and can, in fact, be beneficial to many children. The centers could also be used for older children after school hours and during vacation periods.

Granted that there is a shortage of any kind of day care centers—either the poor ones that offer only custodial care or the good ones which provide a rich living experience for the child—the funds authorized here should be for centers which are actively concerned with furthering the child's social, physical and mental development. The money, then, is for an educational building, not for a shelter where a mother can safely park her child for the day. The design of the facility, consequently, is an important consideration; this is especially true because young children are involved. Because of the continuing development of new ideas on design, no specifications are included in the legislation. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is given authority to formulate and update regulations in accordance with the best practices in early childhood education.

We may well be at the beginning of a new era in providing for young children. While I have designated for priority funds for facilities which would serve families judged to be in poverty, the day may fast be approaching when all children, although in varying degrees, will be served by day care centers. Woman's conception of her role in society continues to change; before long the great majority of housewives may spend at least a part of their day in the work world. And complementing that trend are new ideas in child development. The experts in this area, conscious of how much the child learns even before three, are saying that a carefully designed and supervised environment outside the home for part of the day can be valuable for all preschool children. I suspect that the funds recommended in my bill, while they may be difficult to wrest from a budget-conscious Congress, vastly understate the needs of the future.

CONGRESS AND THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, 22 years ago the act creating the Indian Claims Commission was signed by former President Truman to settle, once and for all, all outstanding Indian claims against the Nation. At the time, President Truman said that the measure would allow Indians to "take their place without special handicap or special advantage in the economic life of our Nation and share fully in its progress."

Mr. President, 22 years have passed, and most of the claims have neither been heard nor determined. Furthermore, as the present Chairman of the Commission, Mr. John T. Vance, points out, Congress has given the Commission until April 10,

1972, to complete its work. That means that the Commission has less than 3 years in which to accomplish more work than it has in the past 22.

Mr. Vance has written an excellent article entitled "The Congressional Mandate and the Indian Claims Commission," published in the spring 1969, issue of the North Dakota Law Review, in which he analyzes why the Commission has failed. More important, he proposes methods by which the Commission could indeed accomplish its assignment in short order without a change in the act. Basic to the proposal is his suggestion that the Commission establish a vigorous Investigations Division to collect all pertinent evidence and findings of fact upon which Commission opinions could be based.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a complete text of Chairman Vance's proposal.

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

THE CONGRESSIONAL MANDATE AND THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

(By John T. Vance, LL.B., George Washington University, 1950; Chairman, Indian Claims Commission)

On August 13, 1946, the Indian Claims Commission was created when President Harry S. Truman signed the Act, saying, "I hope that this bill will mark the beginning of a new era for our Indian citizens. They have valiantly served on every battlefield. They have proved by their loyalty the wisdom of a national policy built upon fair dealing. With the final settlement of all outstanding claims which this measure insures, Indians can take their place without special handicap or special advantage in the economic life of our nation and share fully in its progress."¹

Congress assigned the Indian Claims Commission a life of ten years, five years for the Indian tribes to file their claims and five years for the Commission to hear and determine claims. Over twenty-two years after the creation of the Indian Claims Commission most of the claims have not been heard and determined.

On October 5, 1968, Presidential nominee Richard M. Nixon said "the sad plight of the American Indian is a stain on the honor of the American people." President Truman's hope had not been realized. Mr. Nixon pointed out that Indians have a high mortality rate, a low education level, an unemployment rate ten times the national average, an average family income often below \$500 per year, inadequate housing and suffer from unwise and vascillating federal policies.² In short, the Indians have not taken their place, without special handicap or special advantage, in the economic life of our nation.

Why has the Indian Claims Commission failed to accomplish the Congressional mandate? In my opinion, the Commission has failed because it adopted all of the procedures utilized under the various jurisdictional acts prior to the creation of the Indian Claims Commission; procedures which must in a large measure have contributed to the protracted passage of time which had so frustrated the Indian claimant and the Congress. They were procedures which were familiar to the lawyers who represented the claimants and the government before the Court of Claims. But if familiarity was a good reason to adopt the procedures in 1946 it is an equally good reason to abandon them in 1969. Congress has directed the Commission to complete the task of hearing and

determining the claims before it by April 10, 1972. In the three years remaining the Commission must complete more work than it has completed in twenty-two years.

Is there some for reaching innovative procedural change which could enable the Commission to accomplish the Congressional mandate? I believe there is. The analysis and views expressed in this article are my own. They are expressed as an individual and not as a spokesman for the Indian Claims Commission.

BACKGROUND

The creation of the Indian Claims Commission was the culmination of years of national discourse and travail. Americans sensitive to the problems of the Indian and aware of the seeming stain on the national honor were searching for a solution to the problem early in the nineteenth century. Up until that time, the treatment of the native inhabitants of North America equated to the rationale set forth in Thomas More's *Utopia* in 1516. There, native inhabitants who refused or were reluctant to dwell under Utopian law were driven off the land and if they continued to resist had full scale war made against them. The most just cause of war was "when any people holdeth a piece of ground void and vacant to no good or profitable use: keeping others from the use and possession of it, which, notwithstanding, by the law of nature, ought thereof to be nourished and relieved."³ A hundred years later Sir Walter Raleigh noted that people participate in mass deception when "a number can do a great wrong and call it right, and not one of that majority blush for it."⁴

Although Thomas Jefferson believed the Indian to be equal in body and mind to the white man, Theodore Roosevelt, who, if sometimes wrong was seldom in doubt, referred to the Indians as "the weaker race" and those concerned with the plight of the Indian as "foolish sentimentalists." In an all conclusive burst of rhetoric he said that "to recognize the Indian ownership of the limitless forests and prairies of this continent—that is, to consider the dozen squalid savages who hunted at long intervals over a territory of a thousand square miles as owning it outright—necessarily implies a similar recognition of every white hunter, squatter, horse thief, or wandering cattleman."⁵ Congress thought otherwise.

In 1855 the United States Court of Claims was established to permit suit to be brought against the government, but in 1863 the tribal claims based on treaties were excluded from the general jurisdiction of the court.⁶ The tribes were treated in the same manner as foreign nations and were required to obtain a special jurisdictional act from Congress in order to take a case to the Court of Claims. This was clearly discriminatory since all other citizens of the United States had the right to sue in the Court of Claims without a special act of the Congress. Yet it was a beginning. It was Congressional recognition of the existence of valid claims, and, if the process required to get a special jurisdictional act passed was disheartening, at least a record of recognition of the claim was being made and the Indian was being given an opportunity to state his case in a public forum.

In 1928 the Meriam Report pointed out "the conviction in the Indian mind that justice is being denied" and that any cooperation between the government and the Indian was rendered extremely difficult by the long period of time, sometimes up to forty years, required to hear and determine the claims, under the various jurisdictional acts.⁷

On January 6, 1930, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives calling for the creation of a United States Court of Indian Claims. It failed to pass. In April, 1934, a Senate bill was introduced providing for the creation of an Indian Claims Court. It was reintroduced in January of 1935, and

Footnotes at end of article.

then in March of 1935 a bill to create an Indian Claims Commission was introduced in the House of Representatives. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, preferred the House bill and in a letter to Senator Thomas, Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, dated March 27, 1935, wrote that the Senate bill "provides for a separate court to hear such claims, but I am reliably informed that the delay in handling such matters is not due to any congestion in the present Court of Claims, but rather to delays, apparently unavoidable, in other branches of the government in assembling the needed data for presentation to the Court of Claims through the Department of Justice."⁸ He then noted with approval that the House bill creating an Indian Claims Commission charged the Commission with the duty of investigating the claims and making an independent search for evidence and said: "It is believed that some legislation of that type would be preferable to the establishment of a new court for the adjudication of such claims."⁹

Apparently convinced, Senator Thomas introduced a bill in the Senate to create an Indian Claims Commission (S. 2731) in May, 1935.

Bills to create an Indian Claims Commission were introduced again in 1937, 1940, 1941, 1944 and 1945.

Then in May of 1946, a young congressman from the State of Washington, Henry M. Jackson, rose on the floor of the House of Representatives and spoke for the nation saying: "Let us pay our debts to the Indian tribes that sold us the land we live on. . . . [L]et us make sure that when the Indians have their day in court they have an opportunity to present all their claims of every kind, shape and variety, so that this problem can truly be solved once and for all. . . ."¹⁰ Congressman Jackson was the author of the bill signed into law by President Truman in August of 1946.

The Indian Claims Commission Act, signed into law on August 13, 1946, was designated Public Law 79-726. The original act provided for a Chief Commissioner and two associate Commissioners. The Act has been amended and the life of the Commission has been extended three times by Congress. In 1967 Congress amended the Act to provide two additional Commissioners so that now there are five Commissioners, one of whom is designated Chairman by the President. The last amendment extended the life of the Commission to April 10, 1972.

The Commission was given broad jurisdiction to hear and determine all claims against the United States on behalf of any "tribe, band, or other identifiable group of American Indians residing within the territorial limits of the United States or Alaska."¹¹ It includes all claims at law or equity arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States, Executive Orders of the President, and all claims which the claimant would have been entitled to sue if the United States were subject to suit. It also includes all claims which arise if treaties,¹² contracts, or agreements between the claimants and the United States were revised on the ground of fraud, duress, unconscionable consideration, mutual or unilateral mistake, or other equitable consideration. It further extends to all claims arising from the United States' taking of land owned by the claimant without the payment of compensation. Finally, the Commission's jurisdiction extends to all claims based "upon fair and honorable dealings which are not recognized by any existing rule of law or equity."¹³ The termination date for filing claims before the Commission was August 13, 1951. Under Section twelve of the Act, any claim not filed within the five year period was to be forever barred by operation

of law. Before the cut off date 370 claims or docket numbers were filed. Many of these claims, however, contained more than one cause of action. Some contained as many as fifteen or more. Consequently, many of the claims were broken down into separate docket numbers for each cause of action, making a total of 605 docketed claims.

By December 31, 1968, the Commission had dismissed 149 docket numbers and had completed the hearing and determination and entered final judgment in 134 docket numbers.¹⁴

Final judgments entered by the Commission by that date amounted to \$284,223,-012.16.¹⁵

Before creating the Indian Claims Commission, Congress specifically rejected the proposal to create an Indian Claims Court. Dissatisfaction with both the jurisdictional acts and the timeless procedures utilized to present claims under the Act before the United States Court of Claims had been expressed in a pledge by both major political parties to settle once and forever the Indians' claims against the United States. Congressman Karl Mundt expressed the frustration of Congress that the life tenure of an Indian claim could last twenty to forty years.

"That process is enormously costly and unsatisfactory to everyone. It means that Government clerks and attorneys in the Interior Department, the Department of Justice and the General Accounting Office spend years and years examining and re-examining Indian claims in an effort to determine whether the Indians should have a day in court. . . . [A]nd of course, when a special jurisdictional bill is enacted, the process of investigation starts all over again. Then, only too often, the Court of Claims or the Supreme Court finds some fault with the language of the jurisdictional act, and the Indians come back for an amended jurisdictional act, and the merry-go-round starts up again. In the last 20 years the General Accounting Office alone spent over a million dollars (\$1,000,000.) in reporting on Indian claims bills. And not one cent of that went to any Indian to settle any claim. Justice and Interior and the committees of Congress have probably spent comparable sums. That, in the judgment of your committee, threatens to be an endless waste of the taxpayers' money. This dilly-dallying with the claims problem, according to our Investigating Committee's findings, promises to 'continue to be a real roadblock on the path to Indian independence 100 years from now'. For that reason your special investigating committee recommended that legislation be adopted to fix the final date after which no more Indian claims would be considered by any agency or instrumentality of the Government and to provide for a claims commission that would find the facts and make final determinations on all pending Indian claims cases within a period not exceeding ten years. We ought to have a definite time table; we ought to know that, once having given the Indians a fair opportunity to present their cases, this chapter in our history and this expense to our taxpayers will be concluded once and for all. That is my chief concern in the bill that is before us."¹⁶

Congress was confident the Commission could do the job in the time allowed. It passed Congressman Jackson's bill when he assured them:

"When we set up a Court of Private Land Claims in California in 1851 we set a limit of 2 years on the presentation of the Spanish and Mexican claims. We cleared up the situation in that period of time and so far as I know we have not reopened the question since. From time to time we have set up other special temporary commissions on Indian claims such as the Dawes Commission and the Pueblo Lands Board, which were able to clear up within a few years problems that had been troublesome for many decades. The decisions

of the Dawes Commission and the Pueblo Lands Board have not been overthrown either by the courts or by later Congresses. I think that we can expect as much finality in the work of this Indian Claims Commission provided we give it a jurisdiction broad enough to deal with the entire problem as it now exists and provided we require all Indian tribes to present their claims within 5 years or forever hold their peace."¹⁷

In rejecting the idea of an Indian Claims Court, Congress carefully gave to the Indian Claims Commission all the necessary tools to control at every stage the hearing and determining of the claims before the Commission.

Secretary Ickes had preferred the 1935 House Bill (H.R. 6655) creating an Indian Claims Commission to the Senate Bill creating an Indian Claims Court. Section seven of the House Bill creating a Commission provided that:

"[T]he Commission shall make a complete and thorough search for all evidence affecting such claims, utilizing all documents and records in the possession of the Court of Claims and the several government bureaus and offices. The Commission or any of its members or authorized agents may hold hearings, examine witnesses, take depositions in any place in the United States and any of the Commissioners may sign and issue subpoenas for the appearance of witnesses and the production of documents from any place in the United States, at any designated place of hearing."¹⁸

Section eight provided:

"The Commission shall give notice and an opportunity for hearing to the interested parties before making any final determination on the claim. A full written record shall be kept of all hearings and proceedings of the Commission and shall be open to inspection by the attorneys concerned. Whenever a final determination is reached by the Commission upon any claim, notice thereof shall be given to the tribe, band, or group concerned. Within twenty days thereafter written objection thereto may be filed with the Commission by any interested party."¹⁹

Section nine provided for the adoption of rules and "of such experts, field investigators and clerical assistants as may be necessary to fulfill duties which cannot be properly performed by persons already engaged in the government service."²⁰

From 1935 until the enactment of the Indian Claims Commission in 1946 the word *court* was never mentioned again in any proposed bill.

The provisions of sections seven, eight and nine of the 1935 bill were included in the 1946 Act in: section four, which provides for the appointment of a clerk and such other employees "as shall be requisite to conduct the business of the Commission;"²¹ in section nine, which provides that "the Commission shall have power to establish its own rules of procedure;"²² in section thirteen, paragraph (b), providing for the establishment of an Investigation Division and requiring the Division to "make a complete and thorough search for all evidence affecting each claim, utilizing all documents and records in the possession of the Court of Claims and several government departments . . .";²³ in section fourteen, which gave "The Commission" the power to call upon any of the departments of the government for any information it may deem necessary," specifically authorizing ". . . the use of all records, hearings, and reports made by the committees of each House of Congress, when deemed necessary in the prosecution of its business;"²⁴ and, section seventeen provides that: "The Commission shall give reasonable notice to the interested parties and an opportunity for them to be heard and to present evidence before making any final determination upon any claim."²⁵

There was only one major difference in the 1935 bill and the 1946 bill which later be-

⁸Footnotes at end of article.

came law. The 1935 bill provided that "all determinations of fact by the Commission shall be final and conclusive and shall not be open to reexamination in the Court of Claims or in any judicial or other proceedings."²⁶ The bill signed into law in 1946 provided for review by the Court of Claims and a further appeal to the Supreme Court. Also, in section twenty, paragraph (a), the bill authorized the Commission to "certify to the Court of Claims any definite and distinct questions of law concerning which instructions are desired for the proper disposition of the claim; and thereupon the Court of Claims may give appropriate instructions on the question certified and transmit the same to the Commission for its guidance and the further consideration of the claim."²⁷ It seems that Congress intended to give the Commission a tool by which it could avoid protracted appeals by soliciting guidance from the Court of Claims, an appellate arbiter.

COURT VERSUS COMMISSION

Congress had rejected the idea of an Indian Claims Court. Instead it had created an Indian Claims Commission and, as suggested by Congressman Jackson, has given it broad jurisdiction. It empowered the Commission to investigate the claims; to call on other agencies of the government for assistance; to call on the Court of Claims for assistance; to approve compromise claims; to hear and determine the claims; to give reasonable notice to interested parties; and, to provide interested parties an opportunity to be heard before making any final determination upon any claim.

The Congress required the Attorney General to represent the United States and authorized, but did not require, the Indian claimants to be represented by counsel.

Congress further gave the broadest possible appeal jurisdiction to the Court of Claims, allowing the Court, upon appeal, to determine whether the findings of fact of the Commission are supported by substantial evidence and authorizing the Court to go into "the whole record or such portions thereof as may be cited by any party."²⁸

Congress directed the Commission to:

"[E]stablish an Investigation Division to investigate all claims referred to it by the Commission for the purpose of discovering the facts relating thereto. The Division shall make a complete and thorough search for all evidence affecting claims, utilizing all documents and records in the possession of the Court of Claims and the several Government departments, and shall submit such evidence to the Commission. The Division shall make available to the Indians concerned and to any interested Federal agency any data in its possession relating to the rights and claims of any Indian."²⁹

In an apparent attempt to facilitate the work of the Investigation Division, Congress specified that "any member of the Commission or any employee of the Commission, designated in writing for the purpose by the Chief Commissioner, may administer oaths and examine witnesses."³⁰ The Act stated further that "[t]he Commission shall have the power to call upon any of the departments of the Government for any information it may deem necessary."³¹

How did the Commission utilize these sections? The Commission established the Investigation Division on paper, and for budget purposes, listed one of the members of the professional staff as Director of the Division. It assigned no staff to the Division and a search of the files and records of the Commission indicate that at no time did the Director do more than send out inquiries by mail to the various tribes. Conforming to existing procedures the Commission sat entirely as a judicial body performing no independent investigation of the claims filed before it but instead waiting for the claim-

ants' attorneys and the lawyers for the Department of Justice to present the issues and the evidence to the Commission. Although nothing in the Act required the claimants to have a lawyer, no claim made any progress unless the claimants were represented by a lawyer. In section fifteen of the Act, Congress has said that a "group of Indians may retain to represent its interest in the presentation of claims before the Commission an attorney . . ." and then added in the same section the statement that "the Attorney General or his assistants shall represent the United States in all claims presented to the Commission."³²

The matter was further complicated by the position taken by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Interior. Section fifteen of the Act stated that Indians organized under the Wheeler-Howard Act of June 18, 1934, could hire a lawyer as provided in their constitution and by-laws. The next sentence said that "the employment of attorneys for all other claimants shall be subject to the provisions of Sections 2103-2106, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes."³³ This is the provision in the United States Code which states that no attorney shall be hired by an Indian tribe without the written approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Although the language clearly differentiates between tribes organized under the Wheeler-Howard Act and "all other claimants,"³⁴ the Commission, the Secretary of Interior, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and by acquiescence, the Congress insisted that all attorneys for the tribes go through the complicated procedure of having their contracts approved by the Secretary and the Commissioner.³⁵

Although Congress authorized the Attorney General or his assistants "with the approval of the Commission, to compromise any claim presented to the Commission . . .,"³⁶ it is the policy of the Department of Justice not to make settlement offers.³⁷

Although Congress has provided that the Commission need only "give reasonable notice to the interested parties and an opportunity for them to be heard and to present evidence before making any final determination upon any claim . . .,"³⁸ the Commission, submissive to the requests of the lawyers who practice before it, has provided for a bewildering series of hearings on title, value, offset, attorneys fees and all the motions that any party chooses to present.

The Commission has seldom requested instructions from the Court of Claims on questions of law as provided in section twenty of the Act even though there have been 122 appeals from the Commission's Interlocutory Orders and Judgments.

To summarize, the Indian Claims Commission has failed throughout the time of its existence to exercise the initiative in hearing and determining the claims filed before it. It has not certified questions of law to the Court of Claims, it has given only lip service to the Congressional directive to establish an Investigation Division. In the face of the Justice Department's policy against initiating settlement of claims, it has not actively encouraged the settlement of the claims and, throughout the years of its existence, it has accommodated itself to the narrow interpretation of the law applied by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of Interior with regard to the claimants' lawyers.³⁹ The Commission has chosen to sit as a court and, as a result, the Congressional mandate has been utterly frustrated.

A PROPOSAL

In March 1968 the Indian Claims Commission made a statement to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee that it "will institute any innovations which will

expedite its work." Although the Commission has during the last year instituted pre-trial conferences, reduced the time required for presenting expert testimony, and reduced the time required for hearings at every stage of the cases, it is my opinion that, even at the present rate of production, which is almost double that of preceding years, the task cannot be completed in the time remaining using existing procedures.

In my opinion, no amendment to the act would be required to institute the following innovations to existing procedures which can enable the Commission to accomplish the Congressional mandate by April 10, 1972, the termination date:

1. Refer all claims before the Commission to the Investigations Division as authorized in section thirteen (b) of the Act.

2. Authorize the Director of the Investigations Division to utilize the services of any employee of the Commission in making a complete and thorough search of the evidence affecting the claims. The employee should be authorized to administer oaths and examine witnesses as authorized in section eighteen of the Act.

3. Authorize the employment on an intermittent or regular basis of anthropologists, historians, ecologists, land appraisers, economists, accountants, investigators and such other persons as shall be necessary to complete the investigations.

4. Direct the Investigation Division to submit to the Commission all pertinent evidence and proposed findings of fact upon which a Commission opinion can be based.

5. If the Commission agrees that the proposed findings are proper then a hearing should be called to give interested parties an opportunity to be heard before the Commission makes its final determination as authorized in section seventeen of the Act.

In my opinion the adoption of this procedure would greatly increase the number of compromise settlements, it would remove the Commission from the confining situation wherein its production is controlled to a large extent by the ability of the Justice Department and the petitioners' attorneys to process claims, and it would show the Congress that the Indian Claims Commission is determined to meet the termination date set by Congress.⁴⁰

FOOTNOTES

¹ Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill Creating the Indian Claims Commission, August 3, 1946, Public Papers of the President, Harry S. Truman, 1946, 414 (1962).

² CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 23, p. 30329.

³ T. Moore, Utopia (1516), as found in W. Washburn, Seventeenth-Century America, Essays in Colonial History 24 (1959).

⁴ 8 Works of Sir Walter Raleigh 291, as found in W. Washburn, Seventeenth-Century America, Essays in Colonial History 24 (1959).

⁵ W. Washburn, The Indian and the White Man, 132, 136, 424 (1964).

⁶ Act of March 3, 1863, 12 Stat. 765. For a comprehensive treatment of the history of the Indian Claims Commission, see N. Lurie, *The Indian Claims Commission Act*, The Annals of the American Academy of Political Science (May, 1957).

⁷ L. Meriam, The Problem of Indian Administration (1928).

⁸ Letter from Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, to Senator Thomas, Chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, March 27, 1935.

⁹ Id.

¹⁰ 93 Cong. Rec. 5312 (1946).

¹¹ The Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049 (1946), 25 U.S.C. § 70(a) (2) (1964).

¹² R. Barney, *Legal Problems Peculiar to Indian Claims Litigation*, 2 Ethnohistory (1955). The article points up the difficulties as seen from the point of view of the author, who is Chief of the Indian Claims Section of

the Land Divisions of the Department of Justice.

¹³ The Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049 (1946), 25 U.S.C. § 70(a) (1964).

¹⁴ *Final Judgments Certified to the Treasury Department by the Indian Claims Commission* 19 (Dec. 31, 1968).

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ 92 Cong. Rec. 5316 (1946).

¹⁷ *Id.* at 5313.

¹⁸ H.R. 6655, 74th Cong., 1st Sess. (1935).

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ The Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049 (1946), 25 U.S.C. § 70(c) (1964).

²² *Id.* at § 70(h).

²³ *Id.* at § 70(i).

²⁴ *Id.* at § 70(m).

²⁵ *Id.* at § 70(p).

²⁶ H.R. 6655, 74th Cong., 1st Sess. (1935).

²⁷ The Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049 (1946), 25 U.S.C. § 70(s) (1964).

²⁸ *Id.* at § 70(a).

²⁹ *Id.* at § 70(i).

³⁰ *Id.* at § 70(q).

³¹ *Id.* at § 70(m).

³² *Id.* at § 70(n). (emphasis added).

³³ The Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049 (1946), 25 U.S.C. § 70(n) (1964).

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ Wheeler Howard Act, 48 Stat. 987 (1934), 25 U.S.C. § 476 (1964).

³⁶ The Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049 (1946), 25 U.S.C. § 70(n) (1964).

³⁷ Hearing on S. 307 Before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 68 (1967). Senator McGovern was questioning Edwin L. Weisl, Assistant Attorney General, Land and Resources Division, regarding settlement of the claims. Mr. Weisl answered, "Well, it is the long-standing policy of the Department of Justice in all cases in which money judgments are involved not to make settlement offers on its own, but to await them from the other side . . ."

³⁸ The Indian Claims Commission Act, 60 Stat. 1049 (1946), 25 U.S.C. § 70(p) (1964).

³⁹ Note, *Contract Approval: Attorneys and Indians*, 15 How. L.J. 149 (1968).

⁴⁰ For other excellent treatments of the subject, see Wilkinson, *Indian Tribal Claims Before the Court of Claims*, 55 Geo. L.J. 511 (1966) and Thomas Leduc, *The Work of the Indian Claims Commission Under the Act of 1946*, Feb. 1957, *Pacific Historical Review* 1.

RAISE THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION TO \$1,000

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill that would raise the personal exemption amount to \$1,000. I am convinced, as are 154 colleagues, that no tax reform bill will be acceptable to the public this year without raising the personal exemption amount from its present level of \$600. That level was established over 20 years ago. It is high time we recognized that it takes more than \$600 per year to maintain oneself.

At the present time, 127 bills have been referred to the House Ways and Means Committee that would raise the personal exemption. Thirty-four of the bills would raise the level to \$1,000; 75 would raise the amount to \$1,200; and 18 would raise the amount to other levels. Sixty Republicans and 95 Democratic

Members have introduced these bills—impressive evidence of bipartisan support for such a reform in this year of the "taxpayer's revolt."

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of Members who have introduced bills to change the amount of the personal exemption are in favor of a substantial increase. I am sure that each Member will be willing to compromise on the exact amount of the increase in order to bring about this reform. The important fact is that there is widespread support for such a reform already in the House; in fact, with the addition of only 63 more supporters, we will attain a sense-of-the-House position which I am sure the members of the Ways and Means Committee will fully consider in their deliberations on the tax reform package.

I have addressed a letter to our colleagues concerning my new bill, asking that those who have not already introduced bills on this subject join in the drive to bring about this needed reform. I confidently expect the number of supporters to reach the 218-Member level in a relatively short time.

Members has been besieged by their middle-income taxpaying constituents about this reform—in my opinion, the public expects the Congress to raise the exemption level this year and will not be satisfied with the work of this session unless we do so. We have talked tax reform, now we must produce tax reform. And tax reform means tax relief to the middle-income taxpayer. We can do no less than substantially raise the personal exemption this year.

TWENTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF BALTIC STATES FREEDOM DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Baltic States Freedom Day, which is observed annually on June 15, marks the 29th anniversary of a tragic event in the history of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Between June 14 and June 16, 1940, the Russians overran these three countries, which had maintained free and independent governments since 1920, and brutally conducted a mass deportation to Siberia causing the death of tens of thousands of innocent Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians. Unfortunately, the Baltic States today still remain under the domination of Soviet Russia.

The United States has never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, and continues to deal with those diplomatic and consular representatives of the Baltic countries who served the last independent governments of these States.

In 1922, our country first extended this diplomatic recognition to the Baltic States, and year after year, we have reaffirmed our strong and lasting friendship for the courageous people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It is our firm conviction that the present Soviet des-

potism cannot indefinitely perpetuate its rule over hundreds of millions of people who want to retain their cultural heritage, their inherent right of self-determination, and their personal dignity.

The tragedy of the Baltic peoples began 29 years ago and has long been a source of deep concern to me. When I was elected to the Congress in 1964 to represent the Seventh District of Illinois, one of the first resolutions I introduced in the 89th Congress was House Concurrent Resolution 416 which urged the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion to the denial of Baltic self-determination in order that these precious rights might be restored to the Baltic peoples. Many of my colleagues cosponsored this resolution which was adopted overwhelmingly by both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States.

As free men, we in the United States cannot fully enjoy the benefits of our own liberty, while those in the Baltic States are still deprived of the most fundamental human rights. It remains our moral obligation to let these captive peoples know that they are not forgotten, that we are not reconciled to their fate, and above all, we are not willing to confirm their captivity by giving official recognition to their Soviet domination.

Our close ties with the people of the Baltic States originate in a common devotion to freedom, as well as in the important contribution made by Americans of Baltic descent to the enrichment of the cultural, economic, and political life of the United States.

On this solemn occasion, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gallant Baltic peoples, in honoring the memory of the victims of Soviet brutality who died in the 1940 Russian invasion, and in rededicating our Nation to the still unresolved cause of the Baltic countries. It is my fervent hope that one day soon Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia can again enjoy national independence.

REMINDER OF THE SACRIFICES BEING MADE BY OUR SERVICEMEN

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution which would authorize the President to issue a proclamation directing that the flag of the United States be flown at half staff on the first day of every month in honor of the brave men and women who have lost their lives in Vietnam.

We must never forget the war going on in Southeast Asia. We must never forget that American men and women are daily losing their lives in our commitment to defense of South Vietnam.

This resolution would provide a visible reminder of the sacrifices being made by our servicemen.

The suggestion for this legislation comes from a Cincinnati, Mr. George H. Dickman. I thank him for the idea. I am hopeful that this joint resolution will receive favorable consideration.

TRIBUTE TO VICTOR S.
DAVENPORT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Victor S. Davenport, retiring director of the southern district, Los Angeles chapter of the American National Red Cross, for his 38 years of outstanding service to his fellow man.

Mr. Davenport joined the staff of the American National Red Cross on November 16, 1941. His first assignment was as an assistant field director in service at military installations at Moffett Field near Palo Alto. During the height of World War II he established a service at military installations field office for southern California with headquarters in the old Warner Brothers Studio on Sunset Boulevard in Los Angeles. He served on various military installations in the western area until 1951.

After 6 months temporary assignment with the Richmond chapter in northern California, he joined the Los Angeles chapter on May 1, 1952, at which time he was assigned as director of the Harbor district. The Harbor district in 1952 consisted of San Pedro and Wilmington, whereas the southern district, of which he is now manager, consists of San Pedro, Wilmington, Carson, Harbor City, Lomita Torrance, Gardena, and the entire Palos Verdes Peninsula.

Victor S. Davenport was born on June 20, 1904, in Norfolk, Nebr. His family moved to California in 1918, where he graduated from Long Beach Polytechnic High School in 1924.

In 1925 he entered the University of California at Los Angeles and graduated with a bachelor of arts degree in liberal arts. Then followed graduate school at the University of Southern California for a year in the school of social work.

Victor Davenport then commenced his remarkable career in public service. Joining the Department of Social Welfare, State of California, he served in every county of the State of California except one up until 1941.

There was a time when the headquarters for the harbor district was on Seventh Street in San Pedro. Now the District Service Center serving the 12 communities of the district is in a beautiful new building on First Street and Western Avenue in San Pedro.

Mr. Davenport's service to the community has not been limited to his Red Cross activities. Closely paralleled with his professional duties has been his service in the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity, the Rotary Club of San Pedro, and the Harbor Area Welfare Planning Council of which he was president of the board 1962 to 1964.

On June 20, 1969, Victor Davenport will be honored by a testimonial dinner for his unselfish devotion and dedication to his fellow citizens. It is my privilege to join in saluting Victor S. Davenport for the outstanding job he has done

throughout his long record of service to the community.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I sent to the people of the 15th District of Illinois—composed of

the counties of De Kalb, Grundy, Kane, Kendall, and La Salle—my fifth annual legislative questionnaire. An enthusiastic response—which included many additional comments and accompanying letters—has come from more than 23,000 households. I have been very pleased to see this increasing interest on the part of citizens, and their keen awareness of national problems and world affairs as reflected in their replies has been most impressive.

Believing my colleagues will be interested in the results, I am including the following tabulation:

RESULTS OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLOTTE T. REID'S 1969 PUBLIC OPINION POLL

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you believe the Paris peace negotiations will result in a conclusive settlement of the Vietnam war?	13	79	8
If "No," which would you favor?			
(a) Intensification of the total war effort	44		
(b) Unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops	35		
2. Do you favor deployment of a modified Sentinel antiballistic missile system as part of our national defense?	60	30	10
3. Would you favor changing the electoral college system in order to place greater emphasis on the popular vote in electing the President and Vice President?	83	15	2
4. Should Federal scholarship assistance be denied students convicted of disrupting the administration of our colleges?	92	6	2
5. Do you favor extending the National Labor Relations Act to permit farm employees to organize for collective bargaining purposes if they so desire?	61	33	6
6. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18?	38	60	2
7. Do you favor the proposal to convert the Post Office Department into a Government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis?	70	23	7
8. Should the Congress enact laws to curtail strikes by public employees?	60	36	4
9. Do you feel there should be greater regulation of crime and violence in radio and television programs?	74	23	3
10. Do you feel that a volunteer Army should be established to replace the draft system?	54	40	6
11. Should the surtax be extended beyond its June 30 expiration date in view of the budget and the economic situation?	37	60	3
12. Do you favor a tax-sharing plan which would return a percentage of Federal tax revenues to the States to enable them to solve more of their own problems?	79	17	4
13. Do you favor tax incentives to private business to encourage industry programs of job training and retraining to help meet our social and economic problems?	65	29	6
14. Should the income from investments of private foundations, religious organizations, and social clubs be taxed?	74	23	3
15. Do you favor my bill to provide tax credits for tuition costs and other expenses of higher education?	82	14	4

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM A. BARRETT, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, an important and perceptive statement was made today by our colleague, WILLIAM A. BARRETT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That subcommittee has been holding hearings to review our progress toward meeting the national housing goal set forth in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. His summary of the testimony in those hearings and recent administrative actions in the field of housing should be carefully read and considered by every Member of this body. The fact is, as our former colleague, Andrew Biemiller, of the AFL-CIO, stated in those hearing this morning, we simply are not producing housing within the reach of modest-income families, particularly in view of current high interest rates. Instead of redoubled efforts to meet the goal of a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family, recent months have seen us fall further behind. Here is the text of Chairman BARRETT's statement:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM A. BARRETT, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

I have been deeply disturbed by some of the testimony we have been hearing in the two weeks of our review of National Housing Goals. There is general agreement that the 1968 act which set forth the goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated units in the coming decade, was the largest and most important single housing act in our history. These goals were part of a legislative package which provided ample authorization for the government's role in housing and a well-rounded array of housing and urban development programs to meet our needs. The effort to meet the housing goal for the next decade began with high hopes and all of the testimony we have received has shown that the nation has more than adequate resources.

What disturbs me is the evidence that there has been an actual decline in the production of housing for low and moderate income families over the past five months. In that time, the Administration has announced the end of the highly successful below-market interest rate program for rental and cooperative housing; it has killed the highly successful section 202 housing for the elderly program; and it has stopped the highly successful 221(h) program dead in its tracks. At a time of rising expectations, and a demonstrated need to accelerate our programs in the field, the Administration has cut the budget requests for model cities, urban renewal, section 312 rehabilitation loans, and the administrative funds needed to carry out the Department's fair housing responsibilities.

Some time ago, the Administration announced that it was taking the highly desirable step of allocating \$200 million in immediate assistance to the burned out areas

in our cities, but earlier in our hearings, and to the best of my knowledge not one nickel has yet moved under this proposal despite all of its initial publicity. I remember earlier this spring when President Nixon and Secretary Romney toured a burned out area just a few blocks from the Capitol and expressed shock, but I have seen nothing happen since then. In fact, the Department has so far refused to use the authority granted in last year's act to make 3% rehabilitation loans and home rehabilitation grants available in areas planned for future urban renewal and code enforcement action.

In the midst of all these cut-backs, the only increase we have seen has been in interest rates. Despite the jump to 7½% under FHA, discounts have continued to the harm not only of homebuilders, home sellers, and homebuyers, but have done serious damage to our many programs designed to enlist the aid of private enterprise in the effort to provide housing for low and moderate income groups. Now with the recent hike in the prime rate to 8½%, we will apparently see shortly a further increase in the cost of financing housing.

The principal new proposal in the field of housing in these five months has been the much-heralded Operation Breakthrough. We are all hopeful that this approach will help us to meet our housing goals in the long run but under the Department's own schedule not a single house will be produced under this program for 22 months. Just yesterday, we heard testimony that there is a feeling that other programs are being neglected while we wait for Operation Breakthrough and this is just the point that concerns me. We cannot afford to wait for the hoped-for benefits of Operation Breakthrough while telling the poor and the underprivileged and those who live in both our urban and rural slums that they should wait two years before we can step up our attack on substandard housing. We should be accelerating activity under all of our present programs right now.

I know that every member of this subcommittee is greatly impressed with Secretary Romney's sincerity and his dedication to his job, but I think we would be remiss if we did not offer him the chance to answer these points for the record before it closes. It is my intention to ask Secretary Romney today to give us his comments as soon as possible. If there are any problems with this approach, we may have to schedule an additional day of hearings to have the Secretary come back to discuss these points with us.

OBSCENITY FIGHT IS PUSHED

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 4, 1969, I joined with two of my colleagues from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE and Mr. DEVINE) in requesting Congress to take immediate action to curb the dissemination of obscene materials into the homes of American citizens.

The Columbus Dispatch printed a timely editorial commending Mr. WYLIE and Mr. DEVINE for their courageous leadership in introducing legislation to curtail the flow of obscene material.

I believe this editorial is worthy of note by all the Members of this body and include it as part of my remarks:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, June 8, 1969]

OBSCENITY FIGHT IS PUSHED

There are 165 measures in the United States House of Representatives hopper deal-

ing with dissemination of obscene matter and Columbus can be proud that its two congressmen are in the vanguard seeking action on this vital problem.

Both Congressman Samuel Devine and his colleague, Chalmers Wylie, are either sponsors or co-sponsors of bills which seek to curtail distribution of pornographic materials.

But being able to say they are authors of such measures is not enough for Messrs. Devine and Wylie—they are pushing on various fronts for congressional committees to hold necessary hearings so that the bills can go to the floor of the House where a vote of approval will be a major step toward becoming the law of the land.

With the support of such congressmen as Mr. Devine behind him, Representative Wylie has formally urged the House to avoid any delay in taking action on the proposed legislation.

Mr. Wylie was correct in his contention that "the connection can be demonstrated between increase in pornography and the increase in crime."

Pointing out that "flooding of the market with obscene material undermines organizations which contribute to the stability of our country," Mr. Wylie also made the pertinent point that history proves that where there is moral decay there is political decay. And he added that "one thread is common to the fall of all great nations—moral decay."

Our Congress has a multitude of measures designed to prevent such decay. It should act on the matter promptly.

UMWA CHIEF ASKS MEMBERS KEEP UP FIGHT FOR HEALTH, SAFETY LAWS

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, when the 91st Congress convened this year, one of the first things I did was to join other coal area Congressmen in introducing legislation on mine safety and health because having lived in the great coal mining region of southern Illinois all my life, I am more than familiar with such terms as "black lung," "explosive gas," "respirable dust," and other health hazards faced by those men who dig in the bowels of the earth for coal. We need to have our compensation laws liberalized in order to take care of the black lung problem.

I am happy that the House Committee on Education and Labor is now holding hearings on this subject and I intend to testify before that committee some time in July.

Mr. Speaker, the dynamic international president of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle held a meeting in my hometown of West Frankfort, Ill., on Sunday, June 8, to a large group of Illinois miners. My hometown newspaper, the West Frankfort Daily American, carried a very concise and forthright article written by my longtime friend, Mrs. Edith Dinn. In order that my colleagues can better understand why we need Federal legislation, and under previous order granted me, I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mrs. Dinn's article concerning President Boyle.

[From the West Frankfort (Ill.) Daily American, June 9, 1969]

UMWA CHIEF ASKS MEMBERS KEEP UP FIGHT FOR HEALTH, SAFETY LAWS

(By Edith Dinn)

United Mine Workers of America International President W. A. (Tony) Boyle, Washington, D.C., in a fiery challenge to Union members Sunday in West Frankfort, urged them to accept nothing less than the measures sought in pending legislation for coal miners' health and greater safety.

He also warned them against forces which threaten to split their ranks and politicians who "speak out of the sides of their mouths to newspapers."

Boyle told the nearly 600 coal miners in the high school auditorium, "I know what they (the legislators) will do . . . you know, too."

He said that every day calls come in from law-makers asking why a bill can't be changed or rewritten.

"They'll come up with a law," Boyle said concerning the Union's efforts for legislation to improve mine health and safety conditions, adding that notice had already been served on him that it will not be all the Union had asked for.

Boyle said there is little he can do "with people in Congress, I have only one vote; but you can do it."

He urged that each UMWA member write to his legislators, also adding, "Write to the President of the United States, tell him you support the position of your Union. Tell him you can't accept anything less than the three milligram standard."

Boyle was referring to the Union's health bill which would require that all coal mines reduce respirable dust content of the atmosphere to three milligrams per cubic meter of air.

Union officials and members are making an all-out effort to combat pneumoconiosis ("black lung") and to obtain compensation for the thousands of coal miners already suffering from the disease.

Mentioning the medical experts, black lung sufferers and others who testified recently in Springfield in support of the bill, Boyle told Union members "But it was the over 90 coal miners from this state who went to Springfield to support the bill who are responsible for its progress so far."

Many miners from West Frankfort and the surrounding area were in Springfield in late April to support the Union's effort to get House Bill 1512 passed.

The bill last week was taken out of committee by 110 to 6 votes and will be debated before the House where reportedly it will need 89 of the 110 votes to pass and go to the Senate.

The UMWA-sponsored safety bill would include, in part underground safety chambers where men could flee for protection in a mine explosion; placing a mine inspector permanently at any mine which liberates excessive quantities of explosive gas;

Classify all coal mines as gassy; extend the government's control over roof support plans over the entire mine instead of only partial control as now and increase ventilation requirements in the face areas of underground coal mines.

Boyle, in coal mine work all his life, said he had a "selfish interest" in seeing the mine health and safety laws. Both of his grandfathers, his uncles, his brother and his father died either in coal mines or as a result of working in them, he said.

"I held my father in my arms and saw him gasp his last breath from black lung," he said. He also related how he was a member of a rescue team in which his last remaining uncle was one of 17 men killed in a mine disaster in the east.

The underground safety chamber feature (Boyle's own idea) came about "because I've been through such disasters where men died because they had no place to go . . . no doors to close against poisonous fumes."

He felt it was especially appropriate, he said, to "hold our health and safety rally in West Frankfort, the scene of a major mine disaster which claimed the lives of 119 men."

The 1951 New Orient Mine disaster, the UMWA chief said, and an earlier one in Centralia, were responsible in large part for the Coal Mine Safety Act.

"So these men did not die in vain," he added.

Urging a united front in the Union, the UMWA chief defined such unity as "willingness to join in common causes, to bury minor differences and stand together against the onslaught of our enemy or those who would become our enemies."

Pledging his dedication to the Union and urging members' support, Boyle said "United as never before we'll go forward until coal miners can work without the constant threat of death or injury."

"Do I have that support?" he asked.

A second's silence and then the coal miners rose as one and with long and resounding applause gave their leader the sign he wanted. His first mention at the beginning of his talk on black lung legislation had brought thunderous applause.

UMWA Illinois President Kenneth F. Wells, Springfield, in West Frankfort all week preparing for the miners' health and safety rally said in introducing Boyle, "He is not only our president, he is our leader . . . a great leader."

Gene Mitchell, UMWA District 7 Board Member with offices in West Frankfort, said in welcoming the crowd of fellow members "Ours is the best Union, the best contract and the best membership in the world."

Mayor Mike McClatchey, a coal miner for 27 years before entering politics, presented Boyle a picture of "Mother Jones," of whom he said "she fought so hard for coal miners and is someone you here all know about."

The UMWA president assured the mayor that he would treasure the picture and place it in a revered spot in his office "so that all can see it."

"Mother Jones," from the northern part of this state, led the drive for organizing coal miners before the UMWA was formed.

In addition to the many UMWA district officials and local presidents from as far north as Peoria at the meeting was International Board Member Joseph Shannon. Also here for the event were Miss Ruth Jesberg, Springfield, Mr. Wells' secretary, and Mrs. Shannon.

"Organized Labor's own troubadour," Joe Glazer, folk singer and guitarist, came from Washington to provide special music.

One of his songs which brought many chuckles from miners in the audience was "Coal Miners' Strawberries."

Rev. Glenn Odum, coal miner and pastor of the New Hope Baptist Church at Galatia, gave the invocation and benediction.

Many of the miners' wives accompanied them to the meeting.

As the crowd left the building, Leon Jarvis, Bell & Zoller Mine No. 4 worker who lives at Zeigler, told this reporter he thought Boyle "brought out some real good points in his talk."

His companion, John Galik, also a Bell & Zoller Mine No. 4 worker who lives at Zeigler, said of the UMWA president: "I thought he made a good talk and hope he can get those bills passed. Sure would be a big help to the coal miner."

PATRIOTISM

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, Neville Chamberlain with his 1939 umbrella had

30 years, but nothing more, on his present-day counterparts in Paris who are spending most of their time trying to figure out what they can give away, that the Communists want.

They have said often enough for us now to understand, that they want to bury us, and I do not know how much plainer they can get so that the message gets through to our leaders. The only answer that they will ever understand is that we will not let them.

There is far too much dream world philosophy permeating our diplomats and I say the time has come to stop talking away the lives of our boys over a roundly squared table.

We have got to stop deluding ourselves that we are not in a war, and start letting our generals finish up the mistake that the diplomats made in the first place. No nation in history has ever established such a complex web of misguided control over military planning, tactics, and operation, which reaches to the very forward edge of the battle area and reduces the prerogatives and alternatives of our trained officers to the point where they are practically handcuffed and blindfolded.

I do not protest Hamburger Hill but I say that our allies would be growing rice at the foot of Hamburger Hill in 1969, if the men who are trained to prosecute a war that we handed to them were allowed to utilize the options our commanders had at Valley Forge and San Juan and the Marne and Guadalcanal.

The Communists keep asking us to withdraw our troops, but they have not said a word yet about the army of government and quasi-government civilians who wander around checking defoliation, counting civilian casualties, and measuring air and water pollution and a thousand and one other department-conscious jobs—most of which seem designed to limit, control, counsel, or actually impede the military combat effort.

Leadership has no other meaning in any dictionary, than to lead. We cannot forever flash a green light for a military action—and then sit around a radio or television set to see what the public reaction is going to be. No hostile action will ever win any popularity contest and Lincoln and Wilson and Roosevelt were publicly mauled, but each took those positive steps which though unpopular, finally achieved peace.

Has not anyone ever really wondered why our pilots, the best in the world, with equipment that will permit them to drop a bomb in a smokestack, never succeeded in knocking out more than a small portion of electric power in Hanoi and Haiphong. They know, and I do, that a hit on this highly sensitive generating equipment, which takes years to replace, would have shut down war-producing factories for the duration; and we selectively bombed around the enemy capital 2 years ago, but with so many restrictions that our pilots spent most of their time on the way to the target reading their clipboards.

Our Students for a Democratic Society will label me a "hawk," but I remember too much of my time as a young man in World War II to buy this label. I do not

want to see our boys hurt, but a war is not a croquet match and while we spend eons of time arguing about the rules around the wickets, our boys are being surprised and hit from places that were supposed to be off limits by virtue of agreements reached by negotiators 5,000 miles away in air-conditioned splendor. Crawl out as I have done to some stinking rice paddy, where your boy sits with water up to his waist and ask him if he thinks he is being fully supported, or look in his eyes to witness the abject frustration, and then think to yourself that he would not even be there at age 19 if the military had prosecuted our war to an obvious conclusion a year ago and the Communists had asked us to discuss terms. The terms would have been the same then; stay out of South Vietnam.

A BILL TO PROVIDE CHIROPRACTIC BENEFITS IN MEDICARE

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would provide for coverage of chiropractic benefits in medicare, title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

This proposal is intended to achieve parity with existing provisions of medicare in title XIX, under which chiropractic services are authorized for the medically indigent. My bill is designed to equalize an odd situation which results from the inconsistency between these two titles. At present, the States are authorized to provide chiropractic services to the medically indigent under medicare—title XIX—but the medically self-sufficient who personally pay a premium for their medicare—under title XVIII—are denied the freedom of choice of chiropractic services. It is this irrational discrimination against those who pay for their medicare benefits which my bill will rectify.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that Congress has established two overriding policies for medicare, as follows:

First. Prohibition against any Federal interference, section 1801.

Second. Free choice by patient guaranteed, section 1802.

The current medicare law violates both of these principles by its failure to provide chiropractic coverage.

First, States rights are abridged by Federal law through interference with States freedom effectively to make available to their elderly citizens the health services of doctors of chiropractic.

Forty-eight States—including my State of Alaska—as well as Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, have licensing laws which recognize the practice of chiropractic. Thus the Federal medicare law penalizes the citizens of these States and interferes with the operation of such State laws within their respective State boundaries.

Second, freedom of choice is denied to patients to obtain the beneficial health services of State-licensed doctors of

chiropractic. A continuing thread during the entire congressional debate on medicare was freedom of choice by the patient to obtain health services from any qualified institution, agency, or person.

When such freedom of choice is denied, medicare denies older people the health services they want and need, as well as the independence and dignity which medicare is designed to assure. This circumstance involves not only fundamental theories of the relation between the Federal and State governments and the relation of the American citizen to his government, but also the individual health, comfort, and well-being of each and every senior American.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose this legislation.

FEDERAL SALARIES

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill designed among other things to implement the Federal employee's pay comparability system and to establish a Federal management-labor salary survey board.

In drafting this bill I have taken into account the experiences we have had with the 1967 Federal Salary Act which served as a highly instructive experiment as to the feasibility of establishing a Federal compensation system which could work without annual legislative review by Congress.

During September 1968, the Compensation Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be the chairman, held 4 days of intensive hearings to review the entire problem of Federal compensation. The subcommittee received testimony from the chairman of the Civil Service Commission and from the unions representing Federal employees as well as from professional associations of Federal employees.

Since that time I have been in consultation with representatives of the executive branch and of employee unions and professional associations. On June 16 and 17, the Compensation Subcommittee will resume hearings on legislation to determine how Federal compensation shall be determined for classified and postal employees and for those other Federal employees whose salary schedules are linked to the rates of pay of classified employees. The first three witnesses will be Winton M. Blount, the Postmaster General, Robert E. Hampton, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and Phillip S. Hughes and Roger W. Jones of the Bureau of the Budget.

In order to focus attention on the most critical issues which I believe must be resolved in one way or another, I have decided to introduce today a bill which addresses itself directly to them. For this reason, the bill uses very explicit and detailed language. Moreover, because the bill is intended to serve as the basis for many years of setting Federal salaries administratively, I have expressly resorted to detailed guidelines so that the

Members will be fully aware of the problems involved and the solutions proposed. Consequently, in their deliberations, the Members will have the opportunity to accept, substitute or reject detailed, precise and explicit language.

For the reasons I have already indicated, the bill is detailed. I wish to emphasize that I am not wedded or committed to any one of these details or solutions. However, I do believe that explicit language should be included in any new legislation which emerges.

In summarizing the bill, I should like to emphasize that this bill is intended to establish a well-defined administrative mechanism conforming to the wishes of Congress which the executive branch can employ for an indefinite time in establishing Federal compensation rates.

The two major innovations of my bill involve the creation of a Federal Management-Labor Salary Survey Board and a regrouping of the 18 grades of the classified service into six classes. Both these provisions are the result of the experiences we have had with the 1967 Federal Salary Act and the very clear conclusion that the pay rates about to be placed into effect on July 1, 1969, fall very seriously short of comparability in GS grades 4, 5, 6, and in the postal field service grades which are linked to GS-5. Whereas the classified grades GS-9 and above conform fairly closely to comparability with private enterprise rates, the grades below GS-9 seriously deviate from these rates, being as much as 12 percent below comparability in GS-5.

The first major innovation, the creation of the Federal Management-Labor Salary Survey Board, is designed to prevent the recurrence of the serious breakdown in consultation between Federal management and Federal employee representatives regarding the conduct of the comparability salary surveys by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

To assure a fair system of consultation and deliberation, my bill establishes a seven-member Board in the office of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

This board would have the responsibility for defining the specific criteria, within the terms and limitations set by Congress, which shall govern the determination of the salaries and salary adjustments for Federal employees in the classified and postal systems as well as for all other related pay systems whose rates of pay are linked to the classified system schedules.

The Board would be composed of seven voting members and its Chairman would be the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. The remaining voting six memberships would be divided equally between representatives of Federal management and labor union representatives of Federal employees.

The three management representatives would be designated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the Postmaster General. Of the three labor union representatives, one would be designated by the labor union having the largest number of classified service employees as established in exclusive recognition contracts; one would be chosen from among

the three largest unions of postal field service employees in a manner agreed upon by themselves; and one would be designated each year by an independent labor union selected by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission annually on a rotating basis.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission would furnish the necessary administrative and clerical personnel to carry out the business by the Board. Moreover, the Board would be authorized to employ consultants or to enter into contracts for professional advice and for independent studies, surveys and inspections.

My bill also provides explicitly that in the first and second years of its activity, the board would study the problem of the linkage of postal and other pay systems to the classified system and of possible alternative methods of identifying occupations in private enterprise comparable to postal field service functions.

The second major innovation of my bill relates to the grouping or clustering of the 18 grades in the classified service into six classes and the setting of ranges of percent pay differentials between the three grades within each class and between the classes.

I decided to include such a provision in my bill after hearing a great deal of testimony on the reasons for the breakdown of the comparability system in GS-4, GS-5, and GS-6, and after discovering the extremely wide range of percent differences between grades which have characterized the pay schedules since October 1965. These percent differences have ranged from 8.7 percent between GS-1 and GS-2 up to 19.5 percent between GS-11 and GS-12.

The testimony and evidence I received showed that the causes for both the breakdown at the lower level and for the wide range between grades lay in the so-called conflict, as defined by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission, between the two requirements of the 1962 and the 1967 Salary Acts; namely, the first requirement of comparability with private enterprise and the second requirement of pay distinctions in keeping with work and performance distinctions between grades.

A factor in this so-called conflict, resulted from the concept that the entire classified pay schedule represented really only one master career plan, with everyone supposedly beginning at GS-1 and everyone supposedly aspiring to progress through all these intermediate grades up to GS-18.

Now the fact is that there are many typical career life histories in the classified system and almost not a single employee runs through every grade during his Federal career. Some people begin at GS-1 and end in a grade between GS-1 and GS-6. Some start at GS-7 and end in a grade between that and GS-12. Others begin as high as GS-13. And some even begin at GS-18 at the top. Consequently, it is unrealistic to try to draw up a pay schedule in such a way that a single rigid line fits everybody absolutely into one rigid structure system. This attempt creates a kind of procrustean bed. As the actual experience under the 1967 Salary Act now reveals, the lower

members get dreadfully pinched lying in this kind of bed with the top members.

To reconcile the two requirements, pay comparability and distinctions in keeping with work and performance distinctions, my bill divides the 18 grades into six classes as follows:

- First. Class A: GS-1, GS-2, GS-3.
- Second. Class B: GS-4, GS-5, GS-6.
- Third. Class C: GS-7, GS-8, GS-9.
- Fourth. Class D: GS-10, GS-11, GS-12.
- Fifth. Class E: GS-13, GS-14, GS-15.
- Sixth. Class F: GS-16, GS-17, GS-18.

The bill provides that the pay line, as heretofore, would be drawn on the basis of the fourth step of each grade.

Within classes A and B, the pay line would be drawn in such a fashion that any shortfall in any grade from the official figures of comparable private enterprise rates as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics would not exceed \$50 annually. This would be a great improvement over the current situation where the shortfall in GS-5 and PFS-5 is \$824 annually or more than 12 percent below the private industry rates. In all other classes, the shortfall in any grade could not exceed \$100.

These provisions of my bill take into account fully the requirement of comparability.

To take into account the other requirement of having "distinctions in keeping with work and performance distinctions" between grades, my bill stipulates that the salary percentage difference between the three grades in any one class should be as nearly identical as possible. Moreover, to assure that the ranges between grades in any one class do not reflect the extremely wide ranges of the past, my bill prescribes that within any one class the actual percentage between grades must not be less than 7.5 percent and must not be more than 15 percent.

Taking into account both "comparability" and the requirements of a coordinated and integrated salary compensation system, I concluded that the range of pay between the highest grade in any class and the lowest grade in the next higher class should not exceed 25 percent. Because it would be hazardous to try to set the lowest limit of this range, my bill does not state any statutory minimal percentage difference but leaves it to be determined by the board on the basis of the actual figures merging out of the comparability surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Up to now, I have dealt with the kinds of concepts which I believe should be before the Members when they are legislating for the comprehensive administrative pay system of the future. However, there is a very serious problem that confronts us as an inheritance from the past. This is the inequity and the problem arising from the fact that the executive branch has been defining the so-called conflict between "pay comparability" and "pay distinctions in keeping with work and performance distinctions" in such a way as to deprive employees in GS-5 and PFS-5 of \$824 in pay annually. A second, related problem from the past derives from the fact that the executive branch has not made any effort to eliminate the timelag in the reporting of the private enterprise rates. Thus

the BLS comparability rates are a year late. It is generally estimated that since June 1968, the rates in private industry have increased from 8 to 12 percent, or an approximate average of 10 percent. Yet the executive branch has ignored this development.

If the Congress were to correct fully these inequities inherited from the past, it might have to consider enacting legislation between now and July 1 adjusting Federal salaries in grades GS-4, GS-5, GS-6, GS-7, and PFS-5 up to "true comparability" with the June 1968 BLS figures. In addition, it might have to consider granting a further increase from 8 to 12 percent throughout the entire adjusted pay schedule.

In my bill, I have sought to provide a middle-of-the-road answer. Instead of adjusting the salaries on July 1, 1969, I have included a provision that we adjust them as of January 1, 1970, thus finally giving comparability with June 1968 private enterprise rates to the classified and postal employees in the lower grades.

My bill also provides catching up part of the timelag for all grades, a lag which by January 1970 may be as high as 15 percent, by granting a flat 5-percent increase to all grades in the adjusted pay schedules. Title II of my bill lists the actual pay tables which would apply on January 1, 1970, to classified employees and postal field service employees and to the "linked" schedules of employees of the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration and of the employees of the Foreign Service appear in title II of my bill.

I wish to emphasize that these schedules do not represent a "second pay raise" in fiscal year 1970 for Federal employees. These schedules really should have been put into force on July 1, 1969, by Executive order. Thus, they are only a delayed compromise solution between what the Federal employees should be receiving on July 1 and what they will be receiving in fact.

INCREASES ARE NEEDED IN GI BILL PAYMENTS

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 11906, to increase payments to veterans of our Armed Forces who are attending school under the provisions of the GI bill.

The increases provided in this bill correct a basic problem: We simply are not providing these veterans as much money as education costs today. Or, to put it more simply, we are promising our military veterans an education, then failing to provide it.

The story is told very clearly in the fact that the average cost per year for college level education in public institutions in the United States today is \$1,092, and we are paying our veterans an average of \$1,040. This difference may

seem slight, but when the cost of education in private institutions—an average of \$2,336—is considered, the fact of underpayment becomes readily obvious.

The bill I have introduced would increase payments to unmarried veterans attending college full time from \$130 per month to \$190 per month. The increase for veterans with one dependent would be from \$155 to \$215. Veterans with two dependents would receive \$235, up from \$175. An additional \$10 per month would be paid for each dependent over two.

Mr. Speaker, anyone familiar with the rising costs of higher education would readily agree that these increased amounts are reasonable. Even the higher payments in the case of a veteran with dependents would not be adequate to cover the full cost of education.

Today, when some of our young men are serving their country in the military service, while many others are not, one of the real benefits we have to offer is a college education under the GI bill. Let us make sure that what we offer really is a college education.

SHOE IMPORT PROBLEM THREATENS JOBS IN DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the increasing volume of imported footwear is posing a serious threat to the workers holding jobs in our domestic footwear industry in Tennessee and throughout the Nation.

I am advised that since 1955 shoe imports have increased from 7,810,000 pairs valued at \$13,571,000 to 175,438,000 pairs valued at \$328,543,000 in 1968.

This is an alarming rate of increase and the projection is that by 1975 the imports will total 468 million pairs unless steps are taken to establish quotas or in some way curtail this influx of foreign goods.

The loss of jobs in many areas of our American footwear industry is being translated into adverse effects on the economies of many of our smaller communities in the Nation. The penetration of the American shoe market by foreign products necessitates layoffs of employees in many places.

The foreign competition is unfair because these foreign shoes are produced by workers who earn as low as 56 cents an hour while our American workers are well paid in keeping with our standard of living and our American way of life.

The economic facts of life are that if our domestic footwear industry is to survive some import equalizer must be instituted.

In this connection I have joined with other interested members of the Tennessee congressional delegation in urging the President to take steps to negotiate voluntary import limitations on footwear with other nations that are principal suppliers of the American market from abroad.

These quotas and limitations are necessary to assure that the domestic shoe industry will continue as a healthy and viable segment of our economy.

Action is needed to assure our workers in the footwear industry of their jobs—and Congress and the President must be alert to their responsibilities in the matter.

PORNOGRAPHIC MAIL

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, I addressed the House concerning the need for legislation to protect the public against the offensive intrusion into their homes of pornographic material sent through the mails. At that time I introduced a measure that would prohibit the interstate dissemination of smut materials of all kinds to juveniles under age 18. A good number of our colleagues have introduced similar legislation, which demonstrates Congress' growing concern over this problem.

I am also pleased that President Nixon has addressed himself to this serious problem. Mr. Nixon has submitted to Congress a realistic proposal for protecting the public from the smut peddler whose filth has been thrust into our homes with no legal recourse available to the receiver. Under current law, if a person receives a piece of pornographic mail, he can return it to the postmaster with instructions to have his name removed from the smut peddler's mailing list for future mailings. There are two weaknesses in this procedure. First, the individual has to receive at least one pornographic mailing before he can initiate the procedure for having his name removed from the sender's mailing list. Second, the Government's directive to have a smut peddler remove an individual's name from his mailing list does not always work. This is because some smut peddlers put out successive mailings under a different company name, usually with different company officers listed. The Government's directive applies to the old company, but not to the new one which more often than not is operated by the same people.

I am today introducing a measure which embraces President Nixon's proposal and would urge the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to hold prompt hearings on this legislation. This bill would permit an individual to advise his postmaster that he desires to receive no sexually oriented advertisements through the mails. The Postmaster General would maintain a current list of those persons who have made such requests, and the smut peddlers would be required by law not to address any such material to those persons. The lists maintained by the Post Office Department would be made available to the smutsmiths for a fee covering the Government's cost of compiling and maintaining the lists. This procedure would hit the senders of pornographic material where it hurts the most—in their pocketbooks.

I am also introducing another measure aimed at filling a gap in the existing law dealing with the mailing of pornographic materials. The present procedure for directing the smut senders to remove individual names from their mailing lists is not only ineffective, but costly to our Government. In my district of San Diego, it has been estimated that it cost the post office 50 cents to handle each patron request to have his name purged from the offensive mailing list. The San Diego Post Office handled more than 3,000 of these requests, thus costing the Government \$1,500. My bill would require the smut senders involved to pay our Government the cost of administering this law. Here again, the attack is directed at the smutsmith's pocketbook. It is only fair that he pay the Government's administrative costs which result from handling of requests from millions of persons who have refused to accept his pornographic advertisements. Certainly, the taxpayers are under no obligation to pay this cost for him.

DISRUPTIONS SCORED AS DISLOYALTY

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the disorders at home and on college campuses have been widely condemned. On Memorial Day it was appropriate to emphasize a point not frequently mentioned—the terrible disloyalty shown to those who have made past sacrifices for their country.

I am, therefore, including as part of my remarks the Memorial Day address of our former colleague, Laurence Curtis—Republican of Massachusetts, Member of Congress, 1953–62—of Newton, Mass., delivered before the members of six American Legion posts at Mount Hope Cemetery in Boston. Curtis, a war amputee, is a past State commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

The address follows:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY FORMER CONGRESSMAN LAURENCE CURTIS, IN PART

One of the most sordid aspects of the current disorders is the disloyalty shown to those who have fought and suffered for their country.

They did not serve and sacrifice in order to return to a land torn by disunity, racked by violence and where even the flag is often held in disrespect.

The immortal Lincoln proclaimed: "Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father . . . There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

We veterans know that the disorders at home and on college campuses encourage the enemy who is counting on a collapse of American will on the home front. They encourage him to persevere with resulting increase of American casualties.

We demand an end to the inept and indulgent responses to campus disorders. We demand that effective measures be taken to restrain force, violence and storm-trooper tactics.

We join in the tribute to our departed

comrades so beautifully expressed by the poet Henry Wadsworth Longfellow:

"Your silent tents of green,
We deck with fragrant flowers.
Yours has the suffering been,
The memory shall be ours."

OUR NATION AND THE SEA

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, Dr. Julius A. Stratton delivered a timely message on oceanography at the offshore technology conference in Houston. Dr. Stratton served as Chairman of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources and is a formidable figure in the field of oceanography. As you know the report of the Commission was submitted to the President and the Congress in January. This outstanding work on "Our Nation and the Sea," sometimes called the Stratton report, contains many recommendations for action, including the establishment of a centralized Government agency to carry out a national program.

Although Dr. Stratton has completed his work on the Commission, he continues to act as a forceful spokesman for ocean exploration and development. In his Houston speech he reminds us that:

There has been no marine Sputnik to galvanize public interest in the oceans. One can point to no spectacular mission to the very bottom of the sea to stir national pride such as a single journey to the moon. Nonetheless, I am convinced that this heightened concern for marine affairs is of transcendent importance for the future. For it reflects the confluence of the most diverse activities, of a multitude of needs, and of great opportunities.

In conclusion he states that:

We are at the threshold of decision. We must look to bold, decisive action on the part of the Administration and the Congress or be resigned to another decade of studies and debate. If the choice is to be action and progress, it is important that all of us who have an interest in the ocean and a concern for its vast resources now make ourselves heard.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of the concept that the United States needs a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency as was proposed by the Commission if we are to effectively explore and use the seas. I am pleased to insert Dr. Stratton's speech into the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House:

OUR NATION AND THE SEA

(Address by J. A. Stratton, Offshore Technology Conference, Houston, Tex., May 19, 1969)

As you will surely surmise from the title of my remarks, I have been asked to tell you this morning something of the work of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources—of the findings of that Commission—and of our nation's stake in the sea.

I must say that I stand here feeling somewhat akin to the gentleman of an earlier day who had survived the Johnstown flood, who spoke about it unceasingly, and who delighted in telling everyone—singly and in

groups—about his terrifying experience. The years wore on. Eventually he was duly admitted to heaven, where he asked if he might have an opportunity to address the assembled souls. Permission was granted. But as he stepped to the podium, St. Peter quietly said: "Before you begin, I think you should know that Noah is in the audience."

Whatever slight qualifications I may have gained to justify my appearance on this platform in the company of you whose professional lives have been directed towards the science, the economics, or the technology of the oceans, has come from my own special version of the Johnstown flood—you might say, from a process of total immersion. Not that in any literal sense I have gone down and into the sea. But throughout my two years as Chairman of the Marine Commission, I have been constrained to read, to listen, to think, and to speak about the oceans. The members of that Commission have been my teachers, and never have I enjoyed the privilege of association with men more dedicated to their task or more concerned for the effective use of the sea. There is neither time, nor is this the occasion, to review in detail the multitude of conclusions and recommendations that have been the product of their work. But I should like in these few minutes to convey to you as best I can something of the character of our report and of the spirit in which it was conceived.

Looking back over the past thirty years, one can readily discern a movement of national interest towards the sea—a movement that only lately has begun to gather momentum. Very likely we could trace its origin to submarine operations in the Second World War and to the extraordinarily effective and far-sighted programs of the Office of Naval Research. Indeed, it was the Navy which in 1956 stimulated the National Academy of Sciences to prepare a report, which proved to be historic, on the needs and opportunities for oceanography in the decade of the sixties. This was but the first of a number of such studies. Their total impact was to capture the widening attention of the scientific community, of industry, and notably of the Congress. In the period from 1959 to 1966 some one hundred actions were proposed in the House and the Senate relating to marine resources and to the organization of marine affairs.

Yet for all this stirring, there was still the need for effective Federal action. Finally, in June of 1966, Congress took a definitive step with the passage of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act.

First, in a declaration of policy and objectives, the Act defined as national goals the expansion of knowledge with respect to the marine environment, the more rapid development of resources, and the encouragement of private investment.

Second, it created for an interim period a National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development under the chairmanship of the Vice President—a body at Cabinet level charged with coordinating the activities of the staggering array within the Federal government of agencies with missions that relate to the sea.

Third, the Act of 1966 established an independent Commission, wholly free of operating responsibilities, and with a membership to reflect the broad range of marine interests, both public and private.

Our mandate called for a completely detached assessment of the current national effort directed towards problems not alone of the oceans, but of the total marine environment as well, viewed from the standpoints of science, technology, economics, security, and the quality of our national life.

Upon this basic evaluation of needs and resources, we were asked to formulate a national—as distinguished from a Federal—plan for the future.

And, finally—and explicitly—we were

charged with the task of recommending a plan of governmental organization to support our program.

This past January, as you know, the Commission completed its task and delivered its report to the President and to the Congress. That report, with its many recommendations for action, comes to the public at a time when our country is distraught by some of the gravest crises of this century—by the frustrations of a war in Asia, by the rise of crime at home, by disruption on the campus, by the mounting congestion of our cities, and by our growing impatience with conditions that perpetuate hunger and poverty. What claim dare we make, then, for the priority of a national program on the oceans in the face of such an awesome agenda?

To this one can only answer that such a program is itself directed towards the needs of people—towards the vast resources which await exploitation in the sea—towards developments which threaten the quality of our total environment—and towards the consequences of a national failure to take action now.

There has been no marine Sputnik to galvanize public interest in the oceans. One can point to no spectacular mission to the very bottom of the sea to stir national pride such as a single journey to the moon. Nonetheless, I am convinced that this heightened concern for marine affairs is of transcendent importance for the future. For it reflects the confluence of the most diverse activities, of a multitude of needs, and of great opportunities.

The world is changing before our eyes, and for all our plans, the time scale is shrinking.

Before the end of this century, the population of the United States may exceed 300 million, and over the globe will probably double.

According to the most reliable projections, world food production must increase by fifty per cent over the next twenty years.

We face the prospect of dwindling reserves of many of our natural resources—not this year or the next, but nonetheless in the foreseeable future. Estimates have indicated that the consumption of metals in the next thirty-five years may equal that of the last 2000, and that the world demand for key minerals will double by 1985—and triple by the end of the century. The potential availability of such resources in the ocean bottom is, of course, a subject of major interest to this conference.

Our concern for a more effective use of the sea derives also from the need for an ever-expanding economy, for new jobs, and new avenues of productivity.

It relates to the growth of our coastal cities, to the need for new areas of recreation, to the pollution of our lakes and our estuaries, and to the erosion of our shores.

And it relates profoundly to our national security. For the increasing ability to move freely along the bottom of the sea—an ability shared by other nations as well as ourselves—is even now presenting us with a whole new order of international issues.

This then, very briefly, is our national stake in the uses of the sea—a stake of such magnitude and of such import for the future that we shall neglect it at our peril. The Commission makes no proposal for a crash program, nor does it offer glowing promises of immediate returns. But we do urge most strongly a systematic plan of action and an increasing national investment.

Now the prospect of achieving these objectives lies first with science and technology and then with management.

The primary need to expand our capabilities in the oceans is a dominant theme running throughout the whole of the report of the Commission—the capability to move under the surface at any depth—to gain access to the furthest reaches of the ocean floor—to do productive work at any level—in short, to establish a technical freedom of the seas.

To arouse the nation and to accelerate the movement into the seas, the Commission has suggested the establishment of certain specific goals, and proposes that programs be designed to meet them. These goals derive quite naturally from the geography and bathymetry of the sea. We recommend that the United States achieve the capability to occupy the bed and subsoil of our territorial sea and that we learn to utilize fully the continental shelf and slope to a depth of 2,000 feet. Looking farther ahead, the Commission urges that we develop the capability to explore the ocean depths to 20,000 feet within a decade, and to utilize these depths before the end of the century.

But the prelude to the attainment of any such goals is a solid base of fundamental technology—a reservoir of fundamental engineering skill which—like basic science—provides a foundation for many applications and serves many users. It opens the path to new developments, to the reduction of costs, to an increase in reliability, and to the solution of new problems.

The improvement of materials, for example, as this audience well knows, is basic to all marine activities, whether on or under the surface.

Undersea operations, whether fixed or mobile, depend on power supplies. Underwater habitats must become self-sustaining, and deep submersible design is handicapped by a present lack of efficient, economical, long-duration power sources.

There is a need for the development of basic tools and equipment with an adequate degree of reliability and simplicity of operation.

We must grapple with the problems of visibility and communications.

And since much of the national investment in ocean programs for the foreseeable future will be devoted to measuring, mapping, defining, and monitoring the marine environment, the development of good instruments—dependable, accurate, and not too costly, is a most urgent necessity.

I have spoken earlier of the manifold diversity which characterizes the entire domain of marine affairs. It is as though one were confronted with the problem of defining and developing the potential of an entirely new continent—the plants, the animals, the minerals, the economics, even the politics. Understandably, this same diversity is reflected in the whole of marine technology. To meet the need for a focus of effort, the Commission has proposed a plan for a series of endeavors to be known as National Projects. These have been devised to establish a sense of priority, to test and evaluate the economic as well as the technical feasibility of new marine systems, and to provide new technology essential for scientific research and exploration.

Foremost among these is a recommendation to increase the number and capability of facilities for research, and for the development, testing, and evaluation of undersea systems. Such a project should include high-pressure facilities on shore for testing equipment, bio-medical pressure chambers for observing and evaluating man in undersea work, and ocean test ranges, all reminiscent of the kind of contribution made by the NACA to the early years of aviation.

Other National Projects recommended by the Commission and of special interest to this present conference relate to an exploration of techniques for the restoration of the Great Lakes;

to the establishment of both fixed and mobile laboratories on the continental shelf; to the development of underwater nuclear power generation;

to the development and construction of submersibles for exploration with a transit capability to depths of 20,000 feet; and

to a pilot buoy network for the development of technology that might ultimately lead to a global monitoring system.

The Commission believes that basic technology—like basic research in science—must be funded largely by the Federal government. Accordingly, the management of and primary support for the proposed National Projects becomes a Federal responsibility. Nonetheless, industry and the academic community must participate in the planning and conduct of these projects, for their essential purpose is to advance our technical power on a national scale.

I should say at this point that, whether by chance or design—but in my own judgment, very fortunately—this Commission was strongly oriented towards the needs of industry and the private sector. Individually or through panel meetings, the members of the Commission took part in literally hundreds of interviews and conferences with representatives of marine activities in every part of the country. Out of this experience it emerged rather clearly that industry in general neither needs nor desires direct subsidies. What seems essential for the encouragement of private investment enterprise, particularly in new areas of resource development, is a government effort directed toward providing the research, exploration, fundamental technology, and services necessary to expand operations at sea, as well as a set of laws and regulatory policies that will permit more accurate business planning and investment activity.

Earlier I have noted that the prospect of achieving our objectives lies with management as well as with science and technology. And this brings me now to the most difficult part of our assignment, to perhaps the most controversial of our recommendations—a proposal for action which we are convinced is essential for the national interest.

It is the view of the Commission that the goals we have set forth, the building of a strong, truly national program, will be achieved only through a major reorganization of the Federal government in the domain of marine affairs.

We are by no means the first to arrive at such a conclusion.

The need was stressed by the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences in 1966.

It was urged by the President's Science Advisory Committee in its report, *The Effective Use of the Sea*.

A variety of proposals in the House and Senate have been directed towards this end.

In Miami last October, Mr. Nixon spoke most eloquently of the unknown frontier—the sea with its inexhaustible riches—as the scene of the next great adventure of the American people. And he went on to say:

"Nevertheless, we still lack a unified effort in the field of marine sciences and engineering."

"Our national oceanography effort is fragmented and confused, overlapping, and lacking in direction. An astonishing number of Federal agencies, departments, and bureaus are involved, and many Congressional committees and subcommittees must consider problems and programs."

On various other occasions—and I am well aware that some among you in this audience have heard me before on this subject—I have ventured the comment that the ocean as a new frontier poses problems differing profoundly from those that marked the initiation of the nuclear and space programs. Each of these grew out of well-defined scientific and technological breakthroughs. Each started fresh. There was no governmental history, and at the outset very little, if any, industrial constituency.

But the seas have always been with us, and over the past two centuries marine activities in the Federal government have grown largely without plan—scattered now among the twenty to thirty departments, bureaus,

and agencies of which the President spoke. Many of these activities relate only marginally to the central mission of the parent department. And this fragmentation and dispersal is indeed reflected in the relevant committees of the Congress.

The Commission began its task without prejudging the issue, without bias or preconceived views, agreeing that a plan of organization should rightly emerge out of the ultimate needs and concept of the program itself. We should determine first what ought to be done, and only then decide how to do it.

At an early stage we rejected the idea of consolidating every single marine and atmospheric function into one massive agency.

We have endeavored in the clearest terms to support the needs of a strong, effective Navy, and we recognize that programs in marine science, and engineering carried out by the Navy itself are essential to that objective.

The Department of the Interior, though primarily a land agency, has activities that border on the marine—the geological survey, fresh water management, and national park and wildlife conservation.

The National Science Foundation supports marine and atmospheric science as part of its basic mission to advance education and research.

But apart from these—step by step—the argument for the establishment of a strong locus of effort, with adequate authority and adequate resources, with a capacity to take major initiatives and follow through, became overwhelmingly persuasive.

As one proceeds through the report of the Commission, the logic of that argument appears to develop of itself.

It rests upon our need to create through science and engineering an expanding arsenal of capabilities, which I have only briefly touched upon this morning.

It relates to the sponsoring of the plan of National Projects of which I have just spoken.

It reflects the urgency of establishing, before it is too late, a program for the systematic management of our coastal zones and to forestall the continuing erosion of our shores and the pollution of our estuaries.

It meets the need for mapping and exploration and research that are essential to the productive use of the seabed and to the rehabilitation of our fisheries.

It recognizes the environmental unity of land and sea and atmosphere and the future of monitoring, prediction, and control.

At the outset we propose the transfer of certain existing agencies to form the nucleus of the new entity, which has been called NOAA—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency. But the spirit of our intent is one of building, rather than merely reshuffling. The design of this new organization has been governed by the dimensions of the task that lies before us. We have proposed only such transfers as will contribute to the national goal. And we are convinced that whether it be the Coast Guard, or ESSA, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, or the Sea Grant Program, each will gain in strength and effectiveness. Each will find its mission broadening and deepening. Out of unity will come a new coherence of effort, a sharing of services and resources, and a sense of common interest and purpose.

More than half a century ago, as the United States entered the aeronautical age, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics proved invaluable in uniting the interests of government, of industry, and of the academic community—thus assuring a free interflow of ideas and information. The need for the oceans today is of a similar character. Accordingly, the Commission has recommended also the establishment of a committee, which might be called the National Advisory Committee for the Oceans—NACO. Such a body, whose members would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, should be broadly representative of the marine and atmospheric interests of the

nation. Its primary responsibilities would be those of advising the head of the new agency, NOAA, and of reporting periodically to the President and the Congress on the progress of government and private programs towards the achievement of our national goals.

Let me assure you that we did not arrive at our conclusions lightly, and we recognize full well that such a bold redesign of the existing Federal structure will not come easily. Already we are hearing some agonized cries of protest. I can readily understand the desire of anyone charged with the responsibility of a department or bureau to serve as a protagonist for the interests of his own domain. But the real issue here is the national interest.

The very existence of the Commission expresses the intent of the Congress to develop an ocean program worthy of a great sea nation. And clearly it was for that reason that the President and the Congress turned to an independent body for an outside view of this immensely complex problem—to a commission the majority of whose members were completely detached from the inescapable loyalties and commitments that must prevail within the government.

This is a time for vision and statesmanship. None of us will claim that the particular pattern of organization that we have put forward is perfect in every detail—that there is no room for molding or adjustment. And we are also aware that, with the new Administration, the entire Federal structure is now coming under review.

Nothing in our proposal for an oceanic agency should preclude an accommodation to revisions on a larger scale that are long overdue. Moreover, in this year of budgetary stress, I think it particularly important to emphasize that the incremental cost of prompt action for consolidation—through NOAA—will in itself be relatively small. But a failure to recognize the overriding need for such consolidation of effort and the building of strength will, I fear, be disastrous to the best interests of our country.

None of us who have labored over this task throughout the past two years harbors any illusion that we have said all that needs to be said or have offered the final word. In a field of such diversity of interests and of history, a failure to stir debate and controversy could only mark an absence of strength and content.

We have endeavored to clarify and to formulate the issues, and in every instance to give our best judgment on what action should be taken.

But the crucial test of whether this Commission has served well the interests of our country is simply this—

Will the ensuing discussion, the debate—indeed, the controversy—stir this nation to take a mighty step forward in its use of the seas—to develop our marine capabilities, to stimulate investment, to protect and use our shores.

We are at the threshold of decision. We must look to bold, decisive action on the part of the Administration and the Congress, or be resigned to another decade of studies and debate. If the choice is to be action and progress, it is important that all of us who have an interest in the ocean and a concern for its vast resources now make ourselves heard.

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. On June 4, 1969, a young man from my congressional district, Gary H. Thorstens of

Rockford, Ill., graduated from the U.S. Military Academy. The day before his graduation, he wrote me expressing his feelings on this important occasion in his life.

I was so impressed and encouraged by his comments that I felt compelled to call them to the attention of my colleagues here in the Congress. During this period of mounting unrest and discontent among so many of our Nation's young adults, it is refreshing to have this indication of the acceptance and understanding of the responsibilities of citizenship by this young man. Mr. Thorsten's letter follows:

U.S. CORPS OF CADETS,
West Point, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter on the eve of my graduation to express my gratitude for the appointment which you gave me four years ago. I find it hard to express in words my appreciation for this chance you have given me to serve my country.

I am proud to join the long grey line which has served this nation since its birth. I promise you I will uphold that tradition of honor and devotion to duty. In this way I will repay the debt I owe my country and you, Sir, for my four years here at the Academy. Thank you again.

Sincerely,

GARY H. THORSTEN,
Rockford, Ill.

TWO MARYLAND SOLDIERS DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Spec. Harry R. Italiano and Sgt. William J. Sewell, two fine young men from Maryland, were recently killed in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO SOLDIERS DIE IN VIETNAM—SPECIALIST ITALIANO, SERGEANT SEWELL KILLED IN ACTION

An Army enlisted man from Prince Georges county and a sergeant from Baltimore have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were identified as:

Spec. 4 Harry R. Italiano, 21, the son of Mrs. Margaret E. Italiano, of Suitland, Md. He was killed in action last Tuesday.

Sgt. William J. Sewell, 21, the son of Mrs. Katherine C. Smith, of the 1600 block Homestead street. Reported missing May 31, Sergeant Sewell was declared killed in action upon identification of his body last Tuesday.

Specialist Italiano had attended Suitland High School. He had worked for three years at Drug Fair stores in Marlow Heights and Suitland before he was drafted last June. He served with the 46th Infantry in Vietnam.

Specialist Italiano was engaged to be married to Nonnie Sady, of Washington. Their wedding was planned for next spring.

Besides his mother, Specialist Italiano is survived by a brother, Charles J. Italiano, Jr., of Lanham, Md.; his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Mary Shearer, of Suitland, and two nephews.

BORN IN CALVERT COUNTY

Sergeant Sewell was born in Calvert county. He moved to Baltimore at the age

of 14, and attended Clifton Park Junior High School.

He later returned to Prince Frederick, in Calvert county, where he was graduated from Brooks High School in 1966.

He worked briefly for the Westinghouse Electric Corporation at Friendship Airport before enlisting in the Army in March, 1967.

SERVED WITH 112TH

Sergeant Sewell was serving with the 112th Infantry and specialized in heavy duty electronics.

Besides his mother, Sergeant Sewell is survived by his stepfather, Melvin Smith, of Baltimore; two brothers, Sgt. Thomas C. Sewell, USAF, stationed at Kessler Air Force Base, Miss., and Elijah Sewell, of Prince Frederick; five step-brothers, Larry, Verdell, Maurice, Clayton and Tony Smith, all of Baltimore; a step-sister, Debra Smith, of Baltimore, and his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Marion Sewell, of Prince Frederick.

AT UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, IT IS THE FORWARD LOOK

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is commencement time and an appropriate time to reflect upon what has been going on in our colleges and universities, particularly in the past year.

There have been demonstrations, sit-ins and whatnot in institutions all across the Nation. Some have been spectacular; most have involved only a small minority of the students and faculties. In fact, many of the participants in case after case are individuals who have no connection whatsoever with the institution involved.

State University at Buffalo has had its incidents and the complexity of the issues involved have been very well spelled out in an excellent article which was featured recently in the Buffalo Evening News.

The writer, Elwood M. Wardlow, assistant managing editor, has a job that usually ties him to the desk perusing and editing the copy of his staff. But he has done a real writing chore in the following interpretive article:

AT UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, IT'S THE FORWARD LOOK

(By Elwood M. Wardlow)

The State University of Buffalo is winding up its school year with commencement tomorrow.

And to the surprise of just about everybody, UB is alive and well out there on Main St.

In fact, it may have turned the corner on the worst of its problems, and be headed into its golden age.

OK, we know we can get a lot of arguments about that.

A lot of people are confused about what's been going on at UB.

And a lot of others doubt anyone is learning anything any more, what with all the pot smoking and demonstrating and raising Cain.

What is emerging on our campus—new ways of working and learning together—may solve our own problems in due course and set patterns that will be copied across the nation.

The last chapter hasn't been written yet, of course. The zealous revolutionaries—there aren't that many, but they usually try harder—might still huff and puff and blow the whole thing apart.

But what has happened is this:

1. Most of the students have shown themselves to be genuinely concerned about the well-being of the school. They want changes—in fact they insist on them. But they aren't about to let a small doctrinaire band of radicals lead them into an orgy of disruption and destruction.

2. The faculty by and large is joining in the spirit of the quest for better ways of educating.

3. The administration has done an intelligent job of responding to provocations and pressures. If better things are on the way, it wants to sign its name to them.

A NEW STYLE OF LIFE

The only group that seems to be moving in the other direction at this moment is the community at large.

For one thing, Amherst still shows signs of nervousness and coolness about the university locating there.

And there is also much adverse feeling about some of the things that have been happening on campus.

Most of these things have nothing to do with education. They are part of a new style of life.

Like long hair, for instance. Most male students have longer locks than the office types downtown. And comb them less often.

And scruffy clothes. You'd think sometimes that there isn't a haberdashery or a laundry within 5 miles of campus.

And dirty words. They're in general use. From four letters to 12, and everything in between. By both boys and girls. In some very public places, including the campus newspaper.

And drugs. Probably a majority of the students have never tried pot and never will. But there is enough of the stuff on campus, and there are enough users, to be a severe worry. A spring drug symposium, which drew most of the big-named "heads" in the country, broke up in a really big pot party.

And political, unorthodoxy. There are hordes of liberals. And lots of New Leftists and SDS disruptions. And a hard core of activists who love Uncle Mao a lot better than they love Uncle Sam.

NAMES AND ABUSES

And impertinence. Any administrator on campus who hasn't been called a "fascist" or "pig" or some other choice name just isn't important enough to bother with.

And abuse of property. Beyond a doubt, some of the students treat their surroundings with less than tender loving care.

And lastly, there are the weirdos. Like the guy—not even a student—who peeled down to the buff before he gave an impromptu speech at the drug symposium. Or the girls who look like something left over from a Paris vice raid.

Got the picture, friend?

Well if you think you do, you probably don't.

For that litany of woe, long and sad as it is, doesn't tell nearly the whole story of the university today.

Let's take a look at the school and try to grab the whole picture. It's too important to us to understand only a part.

UB is already one of the major schools in the country. It has 10,894 full-time undergraduate students and 6,490 graduate and professional-degree students. There are another 6,183 part-time undergraduate and non-credit students in the evening division.

The faculty totals 1,344 full-time and 1,184 part-time, paid and unpaid.

UB was founded in 1846 by a group of public-spirited citizens which included Millard Fillmore.

For its first four decades, it was only a medical college. But then, in 1877, it added a law school. And in 1913 it added an arts and sciences curriculum and became a general college, non-sectarian and private.

MANY ALUMNI IN PROFESSIONS

A high percentage of Western New York's doctors, dentists, lawyers and teachers were educated at UB.

Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, in his tenure from 1922 to 1950, brought the school to prominence in upstate academic matters.

He also had a lasting impact in other areas. He was a strong believer of academic freedom and went to bat for his faculty on numerous occasions to defend it.

He emphasized independent study and close faculty-student relationships—two of the things the university is attempting to reaffirm now, despite problems of size.

Dr. Capen was followed by T. Raymond McConnell as chancellor. McConnell, a nationally known leader in higher education and UB chancellor from 1950 to 1954, started building dorms.

He was succeeded by the late Clifford C. Furnas, under whom the university experienced considerable change. During his tenure (from 1955 to 1966), the curriculum was broadened again, most of the schools were strengthened, additional buildings were constructed and finally, in 1962, the school became part of the State University system.

That system today has many parts. There are four university centers: Buffalo, Stony Brook (Long Island), Albany and Binghamton. There are 10 colleges—including Buffalo State, Fredonia State and Geneseo State. And there are 22 community (two-year) colleges, including Niagara.

UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO IS JEWEL OF STATE SYSTEM

The jewel of the entire State University system today is the UB. It is by far the biggest—and by most accounts also the best.

It has more candidates for graduate degrees than the remainder of schools in the State University system put together. It has the only public pharmacy school in the state, and one of the only two public engineering schools in New York.

It has special programs for some of the poverty area students, who can enter with less than outstanding high school records, and can receive special academic help.

But for most of the students being accepted at UB today, academic excellence is a way of life. You're not likely to be accepted if your high school average is less than 83 to 90 per cent.

The faculty has been strengthened greatly. The school has brought some of the top teachers in the country to Buffalo from Harvard, Yale, Northwestern, Chicago, Berkeley and other great American universities. More are constantly being recruited.

UB has grown mightily since World War II. As of tomorrow's commencement, it will have almost as many State University alumni as privately graduated alumni (about 29,000 before it became state-operated; about 26,000 since).

In fact, UB has grown so much that Albany realized something had to be done to provide growing room.

The result is one of the breathtaking academic ventures of our time—a whole new campus will rise in the Town of Amherst, four miles to the northeast of the present campus. Close to a billion dollars will be spent over the next five or six years to build a totally new plant for up to 40,000 students. It could be among the dozen largest universities in the country.

UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO CONCERNED WITH COMMUNITY

As part of its recent growth, UB has paid more attention to the community itself. Un-

der Dr. Furnas, it reached out increasingly into the economic fabric of the community, lending its pool of intellect and talent to help solve community problems.

Under President Martin Meyerson, who is a specialist in urban affairs, this reach-out has been accelerated still further.

As the nature of UB has changed, some of the old relationships have changed with it. And sometimes this has been disconcerting.

Parents who hoped their C-average sons could enroll at UB have been disappointed.

And it isn't a commuter college any more, where most of the students are within an NPT ride of home. Since it became part of the State University, more and more (about 60 per cent of last year's freshman class) have come from other parts of the state—and beyond.

And for some, there's the rub—who wants all those out-of-town boys coming here and teaching our children their wicked ways? And who wants them filling the places that Erie County-bred children might have at UB?

There's a sensible answer, UB must, because it is a state university, take a certain percentage of out-of-town students. But it is easier, academically, for a local student to be admitted.

Even the competition for "underprivileged" students attempting to get into UB's special programs is fierce. It's fiercer, in fact, than the competition for students trying to get into the regular programs.

UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO HAS GREAT LEADERSHIP

That, in capsule, is UB today and yesterday—and President Meyerson, perhaps, has put it all in perspective as well as anyone:

"Here at the State University of Buffalo, I believe we have the best leadership in depth of any university in this country," he has said.

"Our students have been our conscience. It was they who first complained of our often-neglected classrooms; they insisted on the values to which the academic society has always paid homage if not service.

"Reform is absolutely necessary . . . It is our students who are saving our universities from the fate of the dinosaurs."

But that's all prologue. What, you might ask, has been going on at UB lately that sounded so awful but might turn out all to the good?

For the answer we might drop back two years to the start of the tense period on the campus.

In the spring of 1967, a number of things happened at the same time. And all of them, to the community, sounded pretty bad.

For one thing, the Spectrum, the campus newspaper, developed a liking for dirty words and/or pornographic poetry. Things got so bad that the printer threatened to cancel his contract.

And there was the Leslie Fiedler case. The police charged that the professor's home was being used as a marijuana den for youngsters.

And the radicals and student-power people were beginning to raise raucous voices.

COMMUNITY REALLY DISTURBED

The community at large didn't understand this type of behavior. And it didn't like it. Anti-student and anti-UB mail to The News during that period ran very heavy—second only to the great controversy some years before concerning the "Spirit of Womanhood" statue.

Last year, the mail tapered off somewhat, but there was a great deal of resentment over such things as the harassment of Dow and other recruiters.

This year, some of the dirty words crept back into the Spectrum. There has been some tension over the matter of programs for blacks. City Councilman Raymond Lewandowski was splattered with eggs when he showed up, by invitation, to take part in a campus program.

There were more drug arrests (even though a recent survey revealed that UB is lower than most other universities in the nation in drug usage).

And there was a controversy over Project Themis research for the government.

And a one-night take-over of Hayes Hall.

And finally, controversy over black participation in the work force building the new campus.

Active throughout this period were a hard core of students—sometimes as few as a dozen, sometimes as many as 200—who consistently displayed a totalitarian frame of mind. They were the radicals and revolutionaries. And they were trouble.

Things reached a potential flash point in February when Bruce Beyer, never a UB student, went on trial in Federal Court on charges of assaulting a federal officer trying to arrest him in the Buffalo Unitarian Universalist Church. Beyer and a friend had taken "symbolic sanctuary" in the church to defy their call for Army induction.

BEYER CASE IS FOCAL POINT

Day after day during the course of the trial, dozens of young friends—some from UB, plus a number of others—picketed the federal courthouse in shouting protest. And when the guilty verdict was delivered, they called for action on the campus.

The protesters and their sympathizers convened and drew up a list of nine "demands" upon the administration of the university.

Some of these demands didn't exactly fall into President Meyerson's realm. The protesters demanded, for example, the firing of Buffalo Police Commissioner Frank Felcetta. And "justice" for Martin Sostre, convicted in a 1968 narcotics case. And, of course, the clearing of Bruce Beyer.

Others of the nine demands, however, related to campus matters. And there was something of an air of expectancy over the campus as the UB administration drew up its response. This was the type of situation that, on so many campuses across the country, had led to violence and disruption.

The "reply" came in two stages. First, from a Meyerson aide, came a written "working paper" that explored some of the student demands but did not pretend to answer to them.

And then came the real reply. President Meyerson went before the assembled student body in person and read off a list of nine "demands" of his own. They boiled down, really, to this: A plea to reason together to find ways to make the university more relevant to its time and function.

DEMANDS IGNITE CAMPUS

The two sets of "demands" ignited the campus. It no longer was a dispute between a band of radicals and the administration. Most of the student body began to sense that a major event was in the making, and they had better get involved.

They did, in what amounted to a long and disputatious week-end. When it was over late on a Monday night, a sweeping decision had been made—and it had been made by moderate and liberal students over the bitter protests of the radicals.

What the decision amounted to was this:

The whole matter of education had become too important to be left to the whims of campus politics or violence. It deserved to be discussed in a broad and methodical way by the entire UB community—students, faculty and administration.

So the idea of a week-long "teach-in" came to pass.

All professors were urged to focus on the issues at hand during their day periods, and give the week over to discussions.

Many of the faculty did just exactly that. Some cancelled classes and others held their class as usual, but had general discussions rather than lessons. In most departments of

the university, few if any regular classes were held.

During the course of four days, there was an average of 30 to 40 teach-ins a day. Some were led by students; others had faculty or administration speakers; and a few featured speakers from the community.

TEACH-INS AID COOLOFF

The radicals were not pleased with the results, but most everyone else was. With few exceptions, the discussions were good sessions—positive in tone, democratic in manner.

By the end of the week, a great deal of information had been shared and a great deal of insight had been gained.

The whole matter is now in the hands of committees, set up within the existing structure of university government.

Many of the concerns that have been causing tension on the campus over the past couple of years may soon be answered by reforms and restructurings.

The most dramatic event of the spring was still to come. It occurred on March 19, the date of Bruce Beyer's sentencing.

His friends, protesting the prison term, caused a ruckus downtown and several were arrested. The remainder trickled back to the campus, and soon things were popping there.

A mob went to the site of Project Themis—a research job for the Pentagon on undersea environment. Two construction sheds were damaged.

Then, in mid-afternoon, several hundred students advanced on Hayes Hall, where President Meyerson and most of the other administrators have their offices.

The students took over most of the building and held it through the night, roaming through the offices at will.

President Meyerson returned from an out-of-town trip during the evening and immediately plunged into the task of restoring order.

SITUATION IS TENSE

He did so in an atmosphere of high tension, for scores of police had lined up along Main St. and were ready to move onto the campus and clear the hall.

Meyerson spent two hours in direct confrontation with about 200 of the occupiers—and failed to budge them.

By morning he had asked for—and been granted—a court order for the students to leave the building. In the face of imminent police enforcement, the students withdrew.

Feelings remained high for some days, but eventually abated.

The Student Polity—a town-meeting type of student government that speaks for the undergraduate student body—met and voted for an endorsement of the radicals' undergraduate actions.

But the losers in that vote claimed it was not a true indication of student opinion. They petitioned for and received a campus-wide referendum. And in that referendum the students decisively voted against the radicals on nearly every issue.

Except one: The matter of black participation in the work force that will build the new university.

The students made it very clear that they want their school built by an integrated work force.

The faculty and administration took vigorous stands along the same lines.

And for a time, all work on the Amherst site was stopped.

ORGANIZED LABOR COOPERATES

Later, after organized labor indicated its wish to co-operate, work was resumed. And a formal agreement has been worked out to carry out integration under the auspices of the State University Construction Fund.

President Meyerson has been receiving increasing attention for his leadership. A May 6 editorial in the Modesto (Calif.) Bee is an example:

"Of all the adroit handling of student protests and rebellion, the State University of Buffalo has been, perhaps, the most astute and successful . . .

"President Meyerson for three years has withstood all efforts to intrude politics or rash police action onto the campus. At the same time he pacified disruptive elements within.

"Above all, he displayed creative approaches, which brought reform without capitulating to violence or to punitive pressures from outside . . .

"To relieve the provocation of giantism, he has created seven faculties, each with a provost, gathering related departments into separate and manageable units. He has insisted upon every member of the faculty teaching, including himself."

William Austin—the new Student Association president who formerly headed UB's Black Student Association—has said "Black students don't have to get their heads bashed in at UB . . . They're not in the mood for taking buildings . . . Right now the campus is pretty good for black people . . . Now, if you can just keep that aura of goodness . . ."

FACULTY SENATE REVAMPED

Dr. Mac Hammond, secretary of the Faculty senate, points out:

"This past year, the Faculty Senate, restructured so that every full-time faculty member is a senator, has made inroads in long-overdue educational reforms, a fact, I'm sure, that has helped spare the university from the tormented experiences at other universities across the country.

"When students have the feeling that their new visions of what education should be are in some ways being accommodated, they are less likely to adopt patters of disruption and destruction. For six years, the university has been preparing for the future campus at Amherst; but only in the past year has realistic planning begun to take place—and this has been partly under the supervision of the Faculty Senate."

So

If the integration agreement holds . . . And the state can come up with the money. And Martin Meyerson keeps his masterful touch

And the faculty keeps its head . . . And the students follow their own aspirations, rather than emotional calls to rule or ruin

Things are really looking up. If things come off at their hopeful best, Buffalo can have one of the great schools in the land, in the finest new plant in the world. The value to our students will be immense. And the potential value to the community will be profound.

There will still be beards. And long hair. And scraggly clothes. And dirty words. And lefties. And sheer meanness. And pot.

And greatness. Just keep your cool, friend.

THREAT TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a little over 2 years ago, the so-called 6-day war between the State of Israel and the Arabs, which the Egyptians and their Arab allies started, ended with a crushing defeat of the Arab aggressors.

According to press reports Russia and the Communists have for the past 2 years

supplied all the Arab countries with huge quantities of Communist-made arms and weapons of war with the result that in all Arab capitals from Algiers to Adu Dhabi, hatred against the State of Israel and the free world has deepened.

Notwithstanding the efforts of the Soviets to rearm the Egyptians and the other Arab countries, the latter nations are still outclassed by Israel's defense and therefore, the likelihood of another general war breaking out in the Middle East has been reduced. All this underscores the fact that the interest of the United States and of the free world must coincide with that of the State of Israel and her desire to live in peace with her neighbors.

Because of the importance of recent events in that part of the world, the Evening Sun of Baltimore printed an excerpt from an address by Moshe Dayan, the Israel Defense Minister concerning the Arab actions along the Suez Canal. I know that my colleagues as well as my constituents share my concern about the present threat to peace in the Middle East and I insert this article at this point in the RECORD for their consideration:

ISRAELI VIEW—ARAB PRETENSE AT SUEZ

I should like to comment upon the situation along the front lines, and particularly along the Suez Canal, the line facing Egypt. Lately this line has been "heated up." The question to be asked is what is happening there, what do they want, what are they driving at?

The Egyptians do not have the power to beat Israel, not in the autumn, not in the summer and not during this spring. And they know it.

At the moment we are witnessing a diplomatic offensive. This is the maximum that the Arabs could aspire to since the war, and finally they have succeeded in getting the Four Power meeting, with France as the initiator. The basic premises of these Four Powers, although they may not be acceptable to the Arabs, certainly accord them some sort of hope of achieving their aims—much more than they could by the use of force.

Accordingly, I do not think that the Arabs would like to disrupt this Four-Power meeting, to foil its purpose, especially when they have no chance of achieving their aims by use of their armies. Thus the United States, the Soviet Union, France and England—whether they decide to impose or not to impose any kind of solution—talk on the basis of premises that are in themselves an achievement for the Arabs.

So if the Arabs realize that they cannot defeat us by force, and if they are dependent—and they should be—on the Four Powers insofar as their requirements are concerned, why then should they "heat up" the border? Why do they open up fire along the canal?

I assume that what is now happening along the lines, and it may well get worse as the summer progresses, is the desire to provide evidence for President Nixon's assumption that the Middle East is powder keg, that the situation may deteriorate even further and this keg full of powder may explode. He assumes that it must be solved, the matter must be settled and that war may spread otherwise.

The Middle East is not on fire and the Arabs lack the power to set it ablaze. There exists no danger of American-Soviet confrontation, because there is no danger of renewal of the war, because the Arabs are unable to start one. It is true that they say they can land on the east bank of the canal

but they cannot win a war. It is agreed that they cannot win. At this stage no one seriously evaluating the political-military situation can say truthfully that the Arabs have any chance of launching a war with prospects of victory.

The eastern front, that of Iraq, Syria and Jordan, is no longer an operative front. On the western, the Egyptian front, we have seen in the latest shooting incidents that they do not have the strength to push us back from the canal.

What is happening on the western front shows that it is not the Middle East that is burning, but that Suez is burning. That's quite a difference. If we say that the Middle East is afire, it means the possibility of total war between us and the Arabs that might deteriorate into a confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. If we say Suez is burning, it means that Egyptian oil tanks are aflame, because of a local incident.

Their reason for shooting without regard for their losses and the great damage caused to them is to create evidence for saying that the Middle East is blazing, that a deterioration is possible. We do not have to extend them a helping hand in this scheme—neither in information nor in our conduct on the military and the political levels. We have an interest in localizing things. We have no interest in creating a distorted picture, in forming the impression that indeed we are on the verge of renewed war.

MAYBE TEDDY SHOULD RETURN TO ALASKA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the entourage of the senior Senator from Massachusetts is extremely public relations conscious, I feel that an editorial in the Wednesday, June 11, Chicago Tribune merits their review:

MAYBE TEDDY SHOULD RETURN TO ALASKA

In April Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts led a Senate subcommittee on a safari to Alaska to discover evidence of poverty and oppression. He was equipped with a script from his staff members which note that he could dramatize "colonialism" and "economic exploitation" of native minorities of Eskimos and Indians before the TV cameras.

The memorandum advised the senator to contrast the affluence of government compounds and installations with native village life.

Now the current U.S. News & World Report publishes a compilation on where the 50 states rank in per capita income—and guess what? Alaska, with a per capita income of \$4,124 in 1968, is no worse than fourth on the list, two places ahead of Illinois and six ahead of Sen. Kennedy's home state of Massachusetts.

Alaska, where the federal hand scatters much largess, does not come off as well, it is true, as the District of Columbia, home grounds of the federal establishment, which is No. 1 in the nation, with a per capita income of \$4,516. The bureaucrats in residence, with their regular advances in payroll and allowances, may account for most of the affluence, but the level of general poverty cannot be considered high.

Perhaps Sen. Kennedy should look around him in the national capital, and perhaps a return trip to Alaska would be advisable.

THE MEEK MAJORITY

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I would urge every Member of Congress, and every other concerned American, to take the opportunity to read Eric Hoffer's article, "The Meek Majority," in the Washington Daily News today, June 12. For their convenience, I include Mr. Hoffer's article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Hoffer has expressed far better than could I the thinking of many in Congress and throughout America as to the attitudes that should be taken regarding the techniques of violence disrupting so many institutions in America this year.

In this column, Eric Hoffer draws very relevant historical parallels between present-day tolerance of violence and startlingly similar toleration of the violent tactics of the Nazis, Fascists, and Communists in the 1920's and 1930's. This toleration without effective control and punishment of those who sought their objectives by any means—no matter how illegal or violent—encouraged the perpetrators of tactics of violence as they escalated vandalism to increasingly destructive activities—bringing the horrors of tyranny, murder of millions, genocide, and finally world war.

Undoubtedly there were those also in the 1920's and 1930's among the German intelligentsia and elsewhere, including well-meaning and intellectually superior liberals, who said of the growing violence of the Nazis in their early militant efforts "Let us tolerate or ignore this Nazi nonsense and it will come to nothing—if we attempt to repress it, the movement may become worse."

Today, a generation and millions of lives too late, Russian intellectuals and leaders decry the excesses of the Stalin regime. But these same intellectuals and leaders a generation or so ago through their tolerance, if not actual advocacy, of the Stalin group allowed it to come to power and engage in these bloody practices.

Despite allegations to the contrary, the American people have traditionally rejected violence in the American political scene. They have never long tolerated violent causes or permitted violent men to assume national power. The United States is now the world's oldest republic operating under a written constitution. Our institutions and society are founded upon respect, perhaps even reverence, for the law, and the law has eventually triumphed in America despite adverse circumstances.

Why then are so many of our leaders, especially in the academic world, seemingly paralyzed in the face of violent tactics by student militants on our campuses? It would seem that liberal intellectual leaders disregard the lessons of history and attempt to apologize for, excuse, or even justify—if not actually encourage—acts of violence committed

by black militants because of their sympathy for victims of past racism, and that many of these members of faculties or administrators of institutions of higher education similarly refuse or fail to act to control and punish destructive and disruptive acts by militant radicals of the new left because of a liberal sympathy for radical thought.

It is questionable—indeed, improbable that these same liberals would be similarly tolerant were students who belonged to more conservative organizations to use similar means to obtain their objectives—I can well imagine the speed with which the same college administrators would call in the police and act to expel any white conservative student who used any violence or infringed on any university rules, or who even reacted against those New Left or black militants who prevented him from attending classes or obtaining full value for his tuition. Application of the double standard and of Orwellian "double-think" would immediately become the practice, I am afraid, with far too many of these administrators and faculty members, and with far too many in other American leadership circles.

Many Americans, including myself—probably the vast majority of Americans—are tired of this nonsense. The double standard should be dropped. All who participate in illegal or violent acts, disrupting institutions of higher education, should be equally punished in accordance with the rules of the institution and the applicable laws—including immediate expulsion where appropriate. If an act is illegal when committed by a white student or a conservative, it is just as illegal when committed by a black militant or a member of the New Left or SDS, and justice requires equal treatment under the law including equal punishment. I can be sympathetic to the need for reform and improvement of American institutions, but I can have absolutely no sympathy for any person no matter what his color, creed, philosophy, or age, who in the name of reform engages in illegal acts including acts of violence aimed at destroying rather than reforming those institutions.

Unless current trends of increasing disregard for law and order are reversed and those who engage in illegal activities including acts of violence are apprehended and punished, on campus and off, there is considerable danger in store for America.

I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans in both major parties, and of those termed independents or even old-fashioned Socialists, would agree with Mr. Hoffer's remarks and conclusions. We may indeed have been the meek majority, but no longer. Most Americans would agree that students and faculty members who disrupt campuses with illegal or violent acts should be expelled from the institutions and punished for their acts. The meek majority does not wish tax funds to be used to finance students and faculty members who engage in such activities, and they do not want any Federal assistance to flow to institutions whose administrators fail to comply with the law. They want Con-

gress to enact legislation which would stop Federal aid to such students, faculty members, and institutions.

To this end, my colleagues and I have introduced appropriate legislation. To those who would term this legislation "punitive," and would on that ground oppose or substantially weaken it, I would answer that these same individuals wholeheartedly support withholding of assistance to institutions of higher education or to school systems which fail to conform to Federal guidelines on desegregation under the Civil Rights Act. Logic would appear to require them to give equal support to our legislative proposal to withhold Federal assistance to individuals or institutions which fail to or refuse to comply with other equally valid provisions of Federal law.

Eric Hoffer warns the meek majority of Americans will not remain weak, and he predicts a reaction by the meek majority against the excesses of mindless radicalism and its intellectual defenders. Unless the American public is soon satisfied that action is being taken, in its inevitable reaction to continued tolerance of unlawful and violent acts it may demand extreme measures. My colleagues and I in sponsoring H.R. 11941, the Higher Education Protection and Freedom of Expression Act of 1969, and similar legislation, are hopeful that by this moderate legislative approach any reaction will be kept within reasonable and appropriate bounds.

The article referred to follows:

THE MECK MAJORITY
(By Eric Hoffer)

It is a paradox that the most fateful characteristic of our violent age is the non-violence, the incredible submissiveness, of the victims. Hitler and Stalin liquidated millions of men, women and children without meeting serious resistance.

In this country at present, millions of peaceful folk in city streets and ghettos, in suburbs and on campuses are submitting meekly to robbers and muggers, to black and white ideological thugs, and to foul-mouthed insults and threats. No one hits back, and hardly anyone speaks out loud in outrage.

Well-meaning people are warning us not to "over-react" against those who have turned our cities and schools into savage jungles. We are warned that action by the majority would be vigilantism, that it is the duty of the police to endure taunts and provocations without hitting back, and that we shall not have peace until we have cleansed our souls of racial arrogance and callous smugness.

The other day, at Berkeley, a class of 250 students was assaulted by an intruding Negro student with obscenities and warned not to come to class next day or have their throats slit. The punk was not thrown out. The professor, a famous teacher, begged the intruder to leave the class.

Would it have been over-reaction or vigilantism had the class rushed the foul-mouthed, bushy-faced punk and thrown him out? Was it sheer humaneness that kept the famous professor meek in the face of insults and threats?

The students and the professors were plainly afraid. They would probably maintain that they practiced forbearance. When cowardice becomes a fashion its adherents are without number, and it masquerades as forbearance, reasonableness, conscience and whatnot.

It is amazing how nobly philosophical we become when we have to rationalize our cowardice. We love our enemies, extol altruism, and see self-assertion as the root of evil.

The unavoidable impression is that it is the meekness of the majority that incites and fuels the violence around us. The muggers in the streets, the rioters and looters in the ghettos, the black and white hoodlums on the campuses are all on the lookout for tame enemies and tame battle-grounds.

We do not know what's ahead of us. It is hardly likely that the violent minorities will abruptly change their way. There is a vague feeling that a day of wrath is waiting around the corner, when the saturated resentment of the long-suffering majority crystallizes in retaliation. It is impossible to say where and how the reaction will start.

COMMENCEMENT AT WEST POINT

HON. MARTIN B. MCKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. MCKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am privileged to insert an outstanding and inspiring address delivered by Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at the graduation exercises held at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., on Wednesday, June 4, 1969. I commend General Westmoreland's remarks to every Member of this body for careful consideration. His remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND

I am privileged to return to this great institution to recognize and address the Class of 1969. As I stand here and observe once more young men who are about to begin a career of service to our Nation, my thoughts turn to the sorrowful Friday afternoon on the 28th of March of this year. On that day we paused to pay homage to a great American. We joined millions of other people the world over who mourned his passing—General Dwight D. Eisenhower—a man of humble background, a man of noble character, a man of eminent prestige—a man whose life had influenced the lives of millions throughout the world.

He had dedicated his life to the service of his country. His service had been long, diversified and productive. Although only a Major at the age of 45, with 20 years of service as an officer, nevertheless, he had prepared himself to meet the challenges of the future. It was Eisenhower, the soldier, who was selected to lead the greatest military force man ever deployed against an aggressor. Following two years as head of a great university, Eisenhower, the soldier/statesman, was recalled to active duty to lead the Supreme Allied Command under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In 1953, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the patriot, became the thirty-fourth President of the United States.

During his eulogy in the rotunda of our Nation's Capitol, President Nixon said that Dwight Eisenhower was "a man who truly loved his country." General Eisenhower also loved West Point—a love that never dimmed as he approached the twilight of his service. I know, personally, of this love for West Point because he talked to me about it many times.

I have several reasons for reminiscing about General Eisenhower's contributions to the Nation he loved so much. His life of

dedication to his country illustrates the qualities of leadership which we must have in today's world of unparalleled challenge; it serves as an example for men of many professions—of leaders at all levels of organization, civilian as well as military—but particularly it can serve as a goal for you, the Class of 1969, to emulate. It demonstrates the need for leaders who can rise to a challenge. Each of you has the capability to meet head-on the profound challenges of today and tomorrow. You too will succeed—you too are destined to serve and to contribute to the welfare of our country.

Worthy of recall are General Eisenhower's last words to the people of the United States as their President. He said:

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

While proclaiming the need for strength, General Eisenhower's feelings about war were the same as those of every man in uniform who—just as he—"witnessed the horror and lingering sadness of war." No one who has tasted its tragedy and witnessed its cruelties could ever become its advocate. Yet, like General Eisenhower, while working to achieve peace, we must continue to face the harsh realities of life. And, violence between men and nations unfortunately is one of those harsh realities.

Peace is not—as some persons contend—the total absence of violence in a society. Peace is the organization, or control, of violence in a society. And sound leadership to aid in that organization is, as never before, at a premium.

The complexities which General Eisenhower faced as a leader are now being faced by our leaders at all echelons. They will face you as you take your places as officers in the service of our country. Although these complexities may not be the same in magnitude or scope, they will be every bit as perplexing and often even more diversified.

As I stand here in the company of the Class of 1969, my thoughts carry me back thirty-three years ago when I sat where you now sit . . . young, but not immature . . . educated, yet not all-knowing . . . unfamiliar with the Army, yet appreciative of its role . . . and enthusiastic, yet at the same time apprehensive. Conditions in the world then were unstable. Our own country had just begun to emerge from the demoralizing Great Depression. The storm clouds were gathering in both Asia and Europe. Although my class was warned that our role in the future was to be significant, few of us were convinced, and none could conceive the magnitude of the role we were destined to play.

Here in the United States, our orientation was introspective. We were so concerned with our domestic problems and so convinced that our geographical isolation shielded us from the problems of the world that our preparedness had been whittled to a dangerous level. The strength of the Army was only 180,000. Yet, within a few short years, we were to become so engulfed in the turmoil of the world that we were forced to build the greatest military machine in history.

Today you are faced with many similar . . . yet, at the same time, contrasting problems.

In the 1930's, the United States found itself in a position of weakness. Now it deals in world affairs from a position of strength.

Today, in heeding General Eisenhower's challenge to keep our arms mighty, we enjoy success in deterring global war. We find ourselves, however, involved in a complex conflict that defies a quick solution. We find that some of our own countrymen are ever clamoring louder for us to pull in . . . withdraw . . . reduce our international commitments—to focus inwardly to solve pressing

domestic problems. Our national will to honor our foreign commitments is being questioned—perhaps eroded. At least our enemies would have us infer that our resolve has diminished. We find our military establishment, that has helped to forge the shield behind which this country has lived in prosperity, is now under attack. And finally, we find the values that we have traditionally honored are being questioned . . . altered . . . and in some cases discarded.

Wars are no longer fought by military tactics alone, if, indeed, they ever were. Today the maintenance of peace and the waging of war are products of highly involved equations containing many unknowns . . . unknowns that cut across all the instruments of national policy—the political, the socioeconomic, the psychological, and the military.

These complexities become further involved when viewed from the various levels at which the military leader works during his career. These levels vary from the international or strategic level . . . to the national or domestic level . . . through the operational or tactical level . . . to the level of the individual.

Our Nation faces an enormous spectrum of military threats . . . from all-out nuclear war, which we strive to deter, to the threat of externally directed insurgency against nations that want to remain free.

All of our Nation's leaders, both civilian and military, must deal with such complex problems as a normal challenge. Military officers must appreciate considerations, other than purely military, that constitute a coordinated national effort. At the same time, their role is military and their advice should not be compromised by considerations beyond their cognizance. The orchestration of governmental instrumentalities is the role of political authority. Yet, if the Armed Forces are to accomplish their assigned missions, they need the support of the American people.

Furthermore, the military profession—your profession—becomes even more intricate when viewed from the large number of selective capabilities it can employ—if authorized by civil authorities . . . to counter various threats to our country. These range from the use of military assistance and advisors . . . to a show of force . . . through the measured use of conventional military power . . . to the use of nuclear weapons.

At the national level the military leader must be ready not only *tactically* . . . but he must also be ready *tactfully* to use measured force in times of civil disaster or disorder.

And finally, at the national level, we must be ever mindful of the constructive role that our Armed Forces have played . . . and continue to play . . . in our society, a role that cuts across the fields of education, health, transportation, communication, construction, exploration, and sociology—to name a few.

At the operating level, numerous complex skills must be mastered. Our officers must be business managers on a big scale. They must be capable of mastering the machines of peace as well as war. They must be authorities in transportation, logistics, and personnel administration. And they must possess the vision to chart our Nation's needs in research and development.

At the "man-to-man" level, our leaders must be able to handle the personal and often very emotional problems found in every generation—indeed in society itself.

But most important, the individual leader—you members of the Class of 1969—must stand out as the guiding example for your men, and in them you must inspire respect that is undying. The legacy of General Eisenhower is your goal:

You must possess unquestioned personal integrity and the highest of morals.

You must be fair, consistent and dignified. You must be able to face the dangers that every man in uniform has faced since time immemorial.

You must be able to undergo the physical hardship that not every man is willing to endure.

You must readily accept discipline—but what is more difficult, you must frequently be the disciplinarian.

You must accept periodic criticism of the military as inevitable, some of which may be unfair and irresponsible. However, you should not be a slave to this criticism, but take solace in the knowledge that you are defending a civilian society that permits free expression.

You must willingly accept and adjust to family separations whenever national interest demands.

And in a period when material things are becoming more and more the incentive for the individual, you must take pride in a job "well done" rather than material remuneration.

In short, you must display those attributes that you expect—even demand—from those whom you will lead.

These standards prescribe a man of unusual motivation, a man of dedication, . . . of dedication to serve our Nation for the gratification that only service to one's country can give.

The military service and our government, like the free enterprise system, need young men who want to assume responsibility for what happens next . . . because only through shouldering responsibility does leadership develop.

In order for our officers to handle the complexities of modern military life that I have described, they must build through the experience of responsibility from a firm foundation—a foundation that can only come from a liberal education—the kind you have been fortunate to receive.

Our Nation cannot risk having leaders with a stereotyped mind—narrow, unyielding, unimaginative. Instead, it must have leaders who are innovators . . . men with initiative . . . men with imagination . . . men with vision . . . men who want to be men . . . men who are disciplined, yet men who are responsible.

These are the men we need as leaders . . . men of great mental flexibility who can adapt to a changing world . . . men who want to live a purposeful life . . . men who want to contribute—to be honorable . . . men who care . . . and men who are dedicated to the service of our great Nation. Our Nation needs—and the unknown future demands—such men. You are such men.

Gentlemen of the Graduating Class, many of you are probably deeply disturbed at the apparent dissatisfaction and unrest which are manifest throughout our country today. How this questioning, challenging, doubting, even rejecting, will affect your lives and careers is a question for all of us.

As students of history and society, you know only too well the long, difficult struggle within Western civilization to create social and political institutions of a democratic character. The framework of our government with its legal and social systems is based on consent—not only consent expressed in the polling booth, but consent and general agreement on a set of values and beliefs on which all else is based. No social structure so large and intricate, so dynamic, so ever-changing, so confronted with enormous problems could long survive through coercion or direction by a small group. Our way of life must proceed on the basis of a broad and general agreement on goals, an accepted set of values, and concepts of social justice, and general agreement on what is tolerable and what is not. If this underlying consensus disappears, then our complex mechanisms cannot operate. Three thousand years of history have told

us that when the forces of consent have been replaced by the forces of coercion, we will have lost the magic spark which has made our country both great and unique.

As young officers about to embark on a military career in the midst of an unpopular war, you are aware of public attitudes. You will require an unusual sense of balance and rare judgment to avoid discouragement and disillusionment. I believe that the voices of dissension and dissent represent a minority view. Yet, I would hate to see the Army or our society mark time in the name of traditionalism. On the other hand, I continue to believe in certain values, which in Western society are eternal. I know that the United States Army is today, as it was in the beginning, dedicated to the protection of this Nation and the precepts on which it was founded.

You are about to be commissioned in the military service of your country. In accepting your Commission, you are taking an oath to defend and preserve the Constitution of the United States which embodies these values and precepts from which the structure of our government has grown.

You are joining a highly motivated, dedicated Corps of Officers. As members of the Long Gray Line, you join an illustrious assemblage of "sons of an earlier day." As graduates of West Point, however, you join your fellow alumni in a group that represents only a small minority within the Officer Corps.

Like your fellow officers who are commissioned through ROTC, Officer Candidate Schools, or on the battlefield, you must establish your reputation and prove your worth by your motivation . . . your judgment . . . your intelligence . . . your stamina . . . your bravery . . . your loyalty . . . and your dedication to service.

West Point has prepared you well to meet this challenge. Testimony to your four difficult years of preparation is symbolized in two items that you will depart with today. These items that you will treasure—yet never advertise—are your diploma and your Academy ring.

The first—your Military Academy diploma—attests to your excellence in academic achievement. On it is inscribed that you have been "carefully examined on all the branches of the arts, sciences and of literature taught at the United States Military Academy," and have "been judged worthy to receive the Degree of Bachelor of Science."

Your ring is your other token of achievement—but perhaps a more cherished memento because it will be on your person continually.

Let this ring be your ever present stimulus for service to country, let it remind you of your obligation for the future, and lastly, let it be your link to the past—a past of notable accomplishments by those "sons of an earlier day."

Fifty-four years ago, General Eisenhower reversed his ring on graduation—just as you will today—so that the Academy crest was facing his heart . . . symbolizing his acceptance of the full heritage of West Point. He wore it proudly for forty-four years—throughout a lifetime of service to his country. Today, General Eisenhower's ring—worn by time and responsibility—returns to West Point.

This ring—with the legend of the great man who wore it, is a part of the institution that prepared him—as it has prepared you—for a life of service to our country. May the Academy ring ever remind us, as it reminded General Eisenhower, of our heritage and obligations as American citizens and as members of the Long Gray Line. And—

When our work is done,
Our course on earth is run,
May it be said well done.

General Koster, at the request of Mrs. Eisenhower. I have the distinct honor to present to the United States Military Academy the ring of General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower, Class of 1915.

PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPMENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week President Nixon submitted to us the administration's foreign-aid proposals. The President warned against American isolation as a threat to international stability and advised that our assistance efforts are in the best interests of world peace and justice. He has called for a bold redirection of American efforts by enlisting the energies of private enterprise through an overseas private investment corporation; by emphasizing innovative technical assistance through a new technical assistance bureau; by inducing other advanced nations to bear a fair share through multilateral assistance programs; and by furthering world food production and family planning.

I commend the President on his excellent appraisal of third world needs and America's responsibilities in meeting those needs. I think his recommendations are realistic in terms of what we can and cannot do and I am especially pleased with his proposals for reforming those existing aid programs which have too often fallen far short of their intended goals. Many people have long argued that America could get better mileage out of its aid dollars and I am convinced that President Nixon will make every effort to see that this is done.

In connection with this, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article which appeared in the Sunday, June 1, Washington Post. Anthony Astrachan, the Post's Africa correspondent, has written a perceptive and penetrating analysis of the problems and prospects of the developing nations on that continent. Among other things, Astrachan discusses the barriers to greater agricultural production and the problem of "school leavers"—those who have been educated only to find no jobs available to match their education.

Mr. Astrachan also comments on the role of foreign assistance in relation to the complexities of development and concludes:

Intervention cannot help Africa if it comes in unacceptable forms. Africa can make it only by doing its own work and making its own mistakes. He warns against "foreign aid tailored to the donor's needs more than to Africa's or to massive intervention."

I think we would do well to keep in mind the conclusions drawn by this astute journalist as we design our own foreign assistance programs for the seventies:

The article follows:

PESSIMISTIC THINKING MAY MAKE AFRICA
CLICK

(By Anthony Astrachan)

(NOTE.—Astrachan has spent six of the past nine years in Africa, the last 20 months

as The Washington Post correspondent there. He is being reassigned to Moscow.)

In Africa, even more than in most places, you have to think like a pessimist and behave like an optimist.

You have to think like a pessimist because that is the only way to get an accurate estimate of the trajectory Africa is following toward some intersection of natural disaster and social upheaval.

Once you have a realistic projection, it is possible to make sense out of behaving like an optimist. That may be the only way you can muster the energy to try to prevent Africa from arriving at that point between trouble and catastrophe. If the continent reaches target, the explosion could be merely firecracker revolutions—but it could also be blowups killing millions.

Thinking like a pessimist, for example, you recognize that Tanzania is a country with few economic resources, little trained manpower and less likelihood of enough foreign aid to lift it from subsistence agriculture to economic takeoff.

Behaving like an optimist after making an accurate estimate of his country's problems, President Julius Nyerere is trying to organize Tanzania for socialism and self-reliance with a rational manpower training plan and minimum dependence on foreign aid, to climb steadily at a pace that is slow but its own.

Unfortunately, the odds against complete success for Nyerere's attempt at viability through common sense are at least as great as those against more pretentious and less relevant programs in Africa. Even worse, after nearly a decade of formal independence, only a handful of the 35 other independent black Africa states show anything remotely like an optimum combination of pessimism in thought and optimism in action.

Many African leaders have learned to be realistic in the sense that they no longer expect overnight economic development or political stability. Few, however, have learned how to combat, or even measure accurately, the poverty that surrounds their occasional trace of wealth.

Subject to an armload of maybes and qualifications, and the right to add or subtract names at will, you might come up with this tentative list of countries you can afford to be hopeful about: Cameroon (if it can unite north and south as well as Anglophone and Francophone); Ghana (if it chooses civilian rulers with economic guts); Uganda (if it stops talking and starts doing); and Zambia (if it can learn to transform its copper wealth into mass development before tribalism overwhelms it).

If you were inclined to be foolhardy, you might add some of Africa's richer countries, like Congo-Kinshasa (if it is left in peace for 40 years; 1968 was its first year of independence without civil war); Ivory Coast (if it can lessen its dependence on foreigners and the gap that now widens every day between elite and masses); or Nigeria (if it learns how to unite the energies with which federals and Biafrans are now killing each other).

All these "ifs" are larger than Mt. Kilimanjaro. Even the countries on the first list have shown too little of the profound variety of realism.

CRITICISM IS RESENTED

Africans seldom make such pessimistic appraisals of their situation. And like other people, they respond to gloomy analyses with a sense of insult. They feel that outsiders have little right to criticize their performance.

This lends irony to the fact that many of Africa's "accomplishments" are either refutations of racist predictions of quick disaster or corrections of Africa's own mistakes. Africa never degenerated into the chaos and race war that its enemies prophesied. Governments do function, even if many of them only maintain minimal law and order and collect minimal taxes. The corps of qualified

civil servants is not large enough to do all the needed things well, a reflection on how little the colonial powers did to prepare Africans for developing societies, but that only makes the competence of the best African officials the more remarkable.

The continent has skirted the edge of chaos only once, in the 1964 rebellion in the Congo. The Nigerian civil war is a destructive tragedy, but the way administration has continued to function in both Nigeria and Biafra is an effective answer to the too-often repeated question, can Africans govern themselves?

The shadow of war between whites and blacks still looms over Rhodesia, the Portuguese territories and South Africa. But it has nearly vanished from Kenya, Zambia and the Congo despite recurring racial tensions in all three. That may be the kind of good news that newspapers are often accused of neglecting.

THE STABLE CONGO

More important than refutations of ignorant or prejudiced Cassandras is the ability Africa has sometimes shown to correct its mistakes. The stability the Congo has begun to show since the expulsion of white mercenaries in 1967 may not be entirely the result of political genius in President Joseph D. Mobutu, but it is a form of progress.

So is the reduction of subversion of some African states by exiles, noticed since Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown as President of Ghana in 1966. So is the ending of the border warfare between Somalia and its neighbors, Kenya and Ethiopia, which clearly owes more to the sense and courage of Somali Prime Minister Mohammed Ibrahim Egal than to any other single factor. So is the return from military to civilian rule in three of the 12 black African countries that have had military coups, with Ghana scheduled to be the fourth in September.

More affirmative accomplishments may yet fail to meet the goals Africa has set for itself, or through their very achievement create new problems beyond Africa's ability to solve. Take education, for example. In 1960-1, 36 out of every 100 children of primary school age in black Africa were in school. A UNESCO-sponsored conference of African education ministers put the target for 1965-6 at 47 per cent. In fact, only 44 per cent were in primary school when 1965-6 came around.

Kenya and Nigeria are more important examples. Both have expanded schooling beyond the economy's ability to absorb school-leavers (graduates and dropouts). In 1965, only 5 per cent of Kenya's 168,000 school-leavers found wage-paying jobs. In Nigeria, the number was nearly three times as high, the percentage probably less than twice as high.

Even if these countries' hopes for economic growth are fulfilled, which is extremely unlikely, they will be unable to give their educated or half-educated youngsters the kind of jobs they are demanding. Many of them already spout revolutionary rhetoric; by 1980 it may be revolutionary action. At least eight other African countries face a similar future.

A HOST OF INSOLVABLES

School-leavers are one of a host of problems that seem beyond Africa's present ability to solve. These are reasons why many observers, including Africans and foreigners who love Africa and work hard to prevent catastrophe, think that the continent is heading for disaster, natural or social.

The list of insolubles begins with the natural problems—infertile soil, extremes of rainfall, debilitating diseases like malaria and bilharzia—that impoverish all but a handful of African states. Solutions could be found—but only with money and technology that Africa does not have.

Next are the ancient social problems that Africa shares with most of the underdeveloped world and which hinder the effort to overcome the natural problems: low-yield farming methods; patterns of land use and ownership that make departures from sub-

sistence farming often seem unprofitable; the extended family that deprives a successful individual of much of the reward of his enterprise.

Solutions to these problems require patience—in other parts of the world it took centuries—and radical imagination, a combination that is just as hard to find in Africa as anywhere else in the world, or more so. And Africa's efforts to solve both sets of problems are complicated by problems created by European colonial powers, though the Africans have often added their contributions to them.

ARBITRARY BOUNDARIES

These problems began when the colonialists carved up Africa on boundaries that split some tribes and pushed others together into states too heterogeneous for easy development. Today's African states stick to colonial boundaries because changing them would be an appallingly bitter and complex process. They therefore must face only moderately bitter and complex situations like tribal "aggression" across borders, as in the case of the Somali nomads in Ethiopia and Kenya; tribalism within a state, which sours the politics of all but a handful of African countries, and civil wars, like the well-known one in Nigeria and the little-known ones between Ethiopia and its province of Eritrea, and between the Arabized Sudan and its black south.

Another set of problems stemmed from colonial organization of African economies to provide raw materials for the homelands at prices set for the latter's benefit. Most African countries, like most developing countries everywhere, are still at the mercy of outside economic forces.

Their one-crop economies are profitable only with subsidies from the former metropolises. Fluctuating commodity prices sometimes lose producing countries more money than they get in foreign aid. Foreign supplies of capital and technology often mean foreign interference with a country's economy.

Another set of problems began with unfortunate styles that the colonialists saddled on Africa, but the Africans must share the blame for continuing them. One is the corruption. The meeting of traditional customs and modern methods transformed gift-giving into bribes; the idea of money as a key to success in societies that blurred Western distinctions between personal and communal wealth led to large-scale stealing that diverted resources from development in virtually every country in Africa.

AN EDUCATED ELITE

A more serious problem in this set is elitism. Every country in Africa is torn by a rift between the educated and uneducated, the modern and traditional, the rich and poor, the urban and rural, the wage-earner and peasant. A recognizable elite—the educated-modern-rich-urban-wage earners—controls the levers of power in every African state.

Development inevitably reaches a few members of society before the many, and the contrast may pit them against each other. But there was nothing inevitable about the way Africa made elitism a preferred ideology.

In a few states—Somalia, Zambia and Tanzania now; Ghana if it sticks to its program for an elected civilian government—there is a vote in which the masses can remove individuals from power, and do. In a few, there are signs that the elite sometimes listens to the people and keeps its policies within the few limits set by an inarticulate public opinion. Guinea and Cameroon each does this in a different way, though Westerners might have low opinions of their electoral systems.

In many African countries, however, the access of the people to the rulers, the best test of democracy outside the West, is closed off. Economic development and political

power are tools used by the elite for their own benefit; the masses are lucky if they participate.

Even efforts to help the people can turn sour, as in the expansion of schooling that created the school-leaver problem already cited. At best, the governments thought the spread of education was the key to economic growth—but thought too little about what kind of education was needed or about the size of key that would fit their small growth possibilities.

At worst, the governments catered to the desire of the people for a diploma that they thought gave them membership in the elite. The elite did not notice how seldom the students actually acquired the education that the diploma symbolized, or how ready the people were to imitate the elite and snub the practical training that can give increased productivity and real economic growth.

COUP AND CHARISMA

Two special kinds of elitism provide much of the news that Africa has made in the past three years and will make in the next few. One is the military takeover, in which one elite usually shoves another out of power.

The reasons for a coup are often but not always elitist. In Togo in 1963 and 1967, it was primarily to preserve the salaries and troop strength of the army—a military class interest. In the Sudan in 1958, it was to preserve political and economic "stability" that the politicians seemed ready to let go by default while they bickered. But the reasons can be truly revolutionary, as in the military intention to end corruption and abuse of freedom by Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana in 1966.

Military rulers frequently lack talents needed to govern, which may give civil servants the chance to exercise real power in the name of the soldiers, as in Nigeria today. Military rulers also have an even harder time keeping in touch with the people than other elites, which has actually led to their overthrow in Sierra Leone and Sudan.

The second special kind of elitism is rule by an old man who incarnates his country's nationalism and enjoys the charisma that traditionally belonged to king, chief or elders in many African societies. He thinks his and his country's interests are synonymous and opposes almost all change, no matter how much of a revolutionary he once was. He resists change because it might interfere with his power.

Africa's prime examples are Emperor Haile Selassie II of Ethiopia and Presidents William V. S. Tubman of Liberia, Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya and Felix Houphouët-Boigny of the Ivory Coast. They have ruled their countries so long and so thoroughly that it is hard to imagine what will happen once they die—even if the probabilities favor some purely political process of change, as in Liberia and Kenya, rather than civilian upheaval (possible in the Ivory Coast) or military intervention (probable in Ethiopia).

A SKIMPED CONTINENT

Some observers ask what makes Africa's disaster indications different from those of any other part of the underdeveloped world. One possible answer is that the rich nations have collectively done less for Africa than they have for Latin America and Asia in this century.

Another is that the synergism of Africa's problems may be greater than in any other part of the world: that is, their collective impact is greater than the sum of their individual impacts. Saddle a corrupt elite on a country using subsistence agricultural techniques on land that is semidesert except where it is flood plain or rain forest, and the result is worse than you would guess from any one of those problems.

Africa's problems are huge, and it has

much less than it needs in skills and resources to deal with them. This often leads foreigners to prescribe the grandmotherly advice; foreign aid tailored to the donor's needs more than to Africa's or massive intervention.

The last might be the kind that sent white mercenaries to the Congo, first to help secessionist Katanga and then only to see them threaten to undo all they had helped accomplish. Or it might be the kind that now would like to help secessionist Biafra with food, or arms, or diplomatic recognition—often without considering the consequences.

Intervention cannot help Africa if it comes in unacceptable forms. Africa can make it only by doing its own work and making its own mistakes. A friend may be entitled to note his observations of the way Africa is compounding the mistakes that nature and the colonialists committed there. He is not entitled to try to save Africa against its will.

Independent Africa has the right to go to hell in its own way. That is one of the things that independence means. If enough Africans think like pessimists but behave like optimists—or follow some other, better formula of their own devising—they may wind up at some more attractive destination. But you can't make them do it.

FARM REFORM

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as part of my continuing effort to see that the massive support for payments limitations on farm subsidies, shown by this House a few weeks ago, does not go unnoticed by the other body, I include in today's RECORD a copy of an excellent recent article by Gerald B. O'Connor, published in the Berkshire Eagle in my hometown of Pittsfield, Mass., on June 4, 1969.

I want to advise my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that, although I was correctly reported as not being "optimistic about chances in the Senate" for my amendment, I have become increasingly optimistic in recent days.

In my contacts with Members of the other body I have been greatly encouraged by the growing enthusiasm they display toward payment limitations. The Senate response is in keeping with the substantial amount of mail I have received in support of my amendment from citizens all over the Nation.

And so, while I will be continuing my efforts to develop and encourage support for my amendment in the other body, I am happy to report that there seems to be more reason for optimism with each passing day.

The article referred to follows:

CONTE AND FARM REFORM

(By Gerald B. O'Connor)

Congressman Conte's proposal to limit big payments made to a top echelon of agricultural fat cats for not planting so-called basic crops is viewed generally as a maverick action. But, interestingly, it has certain grassroots support from the farms themselves.

The support obviously doesn't come from the likes of Griffin Farms, Inc. of California, which collared \$2.8 million worth of these payments last year. Nor does it come from even the lesser of the Griffin colleagues, such as, perhaps, Sen. James O. Eastland of Mississippi, who collected \$116,000.

But it comes from farmers in the Northeast, including Conte's district, and from the National Farmers Union which draws its membership from the western states.

It also comes from farmers along the northern tier of the country, although numbers and percentages have not been assessed.

There is no mysterious reason for this—it is that the smaller farmers, particularly those who aren't prime growers of cotton, feed grains and wheat, see in these so-called diversion payments a too-blatant symbol of what's wrong with government control of agriculture and marketing. If diversion payments across the nation were of the size of those made in Berkshire County, however, it is doubtful if anyone would have heard a peep.

In Berkshire, direct federal subsidies to agriculture amount to approximately \$40,000 a year. And less than a fifth of that goes into crop-diversion payments.

The rest is for such things as wool incentive payments, cost-sharing for building farm ponds and field drains, forestry assistance, soil improvement and the like. A farmer who receives \$500 in any one year is making it big here.

The theory of crop diversion seems reasonable on its face. When Commodity Credit Corp. stocks of wheat and other grains became alarmingly high by 1960, the diversion program was instituted in an attempt to keep the pile from mounting.

Growers were urged to grow less grain and to divert—hence the program name—acreage to so-called conserving uses, like grass. As former Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman explained it, the farmers who participated were given incentive payments, "which helped compensate the grower for loss of cash income. For the government, it was cheaper than acquiring and storing unneeded grain."

On July 1, 1961, the wheat "carryover" was a record 1.4 billion bushels. Five years later, the pile was "down" to 725 million bushels.

Continuation of the old price-support program, which had resulted in the record buildup in the first place, would have doubled the storage pile, said Freeman, and would have cost the country more than paying farmers not to grow.

But as Conte says, the time when 25 per cent of the population was living on the farm has gone.

Corporate and even "family" farms that control thousands of acres of cropland, have leaped into prominence, particularly in the South and Far West. When the diversion program came along, it was the work of a moment for them to shift from the price-support to the diversion train. And they could feel pleased because the new handout was costing the government less than the old.

And now Conte is trying to put a lance in that balloon and the dairy farmers and apple and vegetable growers in areas like New England are silently applauding the effort.

The first formal expression of support from the farm quarter originated in Berkshire County where the county Farm Bureau adopted a resolution in 1967 favoring Conte's effort that year. The resolution was adopted again at the annual meeting last fall and was also adopted by the state Farm Bureau Federation. But when it was brought to the floor of the America Farm Bureau convention in Kansas City, it was defeated by votes from the big grain and cotton areas whence arises much of the opposition in Congress.

What Conte is trying to do is put a limit of \$20,000 on payments to any one grower, whether corporate or not. He has won his round in the House of Representatives but he's not optimistic about chances in the Senate.

He said Monday that he will talk this week with Sen. John Williams of Delaware and "some of the younger men in the Senate" to obtain their support to broaden and

perfect the proposal. Because he was dealing with a House appropriations bill, rules prevented Conte from writing new legislation, limiting him to asking for a ceiling on specific payments.

"But the Senate rules are broader," he said. "They can write new legislation."

New legislation is apparently what's needed. If a ceiling is placed on diversion payments, the big growers are going to be tempted to plant larger acreages and return to the old price-support program. Many agricultural economists say price supports will cost more than diversion payments, and the Agriculture Department is in agreement.

But this is a red herring, suggests Conte. "Right now, big corporate landowners are picking up small farms" and are simply using them in the most profitable ways. If diversion payments are profitable one year, selling the land for building purposes may be profitable the next.

The principle of government control and support of agriculture in order to assure a steady and adequate supply of food and fiber to the nation is a reasonable one. Present policies were basically shaped in the 1930s by Henry A. Wallace, who called for an "ever-normal granary." But when the system becomes a gravy train for a few, it is time for alterations.

Still and small as they may be, voices from hinterlands like the Berkshires that support those alterations haven't been lost.

FLAG FLOWN 24 HOURS DAILY DURING VIETNAM CONFLICT

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years it has often seemed as if patriotism has become an unfashionable emotion. The voices of our critics drown out those who maintain a quiet pride in the Nation. Therefore, when someone initiates a campaign to express continuing faith in our country, it is worthy of notice. It is for this reason that it seems especially fitting on Flag Day to bring the efforts of Mr. Joseph Theodore of New Bedford, Mass., to my colleagues' attention. By enlisting the support of veterans groups, American Legion posts, and legislators, Mr. Theodore has been successful in flying the American flag, illuminated at night, 24 hours daily until the end of the Vietnam conflict. Many Massachusetts towns have adopted his resolution, and the idea is catching on in other States.

An article telling of Mr. Theodore's efforts appeared in the New Bedford Standard Times of April 20, 1969, as follows:

PROOF THROUGH THE NIGHT

Standing on the deck of a British warship, while on a mission to secure the release of a friend who was being held captive, Francis Scott Key anxiously watched the shelling of Ft. McHenry during the War of 1812. As he wrote in "The Star-Spangled Banner," inspired by that experience, "The rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air, gave proof through the night that our flag was still there."

Today, in many communities throughout the United States, the flag flies, spotlighted through the night, at public and private buildings alike. And it started in New Bedford more than a year ago.

On Feb. 15, 1968, to be exact, floodlights atop City Hall were turned on during a special "Loyalty Commemoration Day" to enable the city to fly the flag 24 hours a day until the war in Vietnam has ended.

The idea came from city wire inspector Joseph Theodore of the Master Electricians Association. Fifteen members of the association donated time to erect the floodlights.

Nearby towns quickly adopted the idea. Illuminated flags now fly all night at, among other places, the Acushnet, Dartmouth, Marion and Wareham Town Halls; the Thomas Tuttle Post, VFW, Acushnet; Fairhaven High School, Ft. Phoenix, Post 1, American Legion; the National Guard Armory, and Knights of Columbus Hall in Buzzards Bay.

After a resolution adopted by the Legislature last July, the flag at the State House has also been illuminated, and the idea has spread beyond Massachusetts.

Many communities between here and Florida are now flying flags 24 hours a day; veterans' organizations, on state and national levels, have approved a resolution drawn up by Theodore urging their local chapters to try to get communities to adopt the idea, and Theodore has received inquiries about his flag idea from as far away as Nebraska.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 14, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, a vice president of the AFL-CIO and organizer of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters in 1925, will be honored at an 80th birthday testimonial dinner at the Hotel Bradford in Boston.

I am happy to add my congratulations and best wishes to our esteemed friend and great labor and civil rights leader of this Nation, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, for more than 60 years a recognized leader of his people who has labored long and hard in their cause.

He is a leader of conviction, idealism, wisdom, and dedication, who committed himself long ago to the ideals of equality of treatment, the rights of the individual to be free and unfettered in his personal aspirations and endeavors and the struggle for social justice, which are so meaningful for those who need a fair chance and a just opportunity to share the fruits of our American society.

Philip Randolph is a man of many gifts, a vigorous leader who has never spared himself in the battle to elevate the status of his people and all other people who need and are entitled to the new opportunities and the higher standards of wages and living conditions that are possible in this enlightened day and age.

His leadership has been imaginative, inspiring, and forceful. He has worked tirelessly to lift up the poor, the helpless, the oppressed and the exploited to give them a chance for a better life, through jobs, housing, and freedom from discrimination and bias.

The years have not quenched his enthusiasm nor dimmed his wisdom or abated his courage. His clarion voice still speaks out against inhumanity and injustice demanding redress of wrongs and affirmation of rights.

I am very happy to join in the many tributes that are being paid to this great American, A. Philip Randolph, in celebration of his 80th birthday and wish for him continued good health, success, prosperity, and the continuation for many years to come of his loyal, forward-looking vision to his own people and all other people in our great Nation and the cause of freedom, justice, and democracy.

**SMALL BUSINESS CRIME
INSURANCE ACT**

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, as a cosponsor, the bill entitled Small Business Crime Insurance Act of 1969, a measure which is vitally needed if we are to keep our free enterprise system functioning as it should in these troubled times.

It is an index of the unbalanced state of our society, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is necessary. I wish that it were not. But crime and disorder are realities—and the insurance industry has not responded in responsible fashion to our changing needs. So I lend my support to this plan, which will enable the small businessman to continue playing his important role in our economy.

This bill will empower the Small Business Administration to set up a program to insure small businesses which are otherwise unable to buy insurance at reasonable rates for losses from crime and civil disorder. It authorizes the Treasury to advance \$50 million to get the program underway, but this money would be reimbursed as premiums build up in excess of losses. The measure will be an important national asset in two ways: First, it will insure the survival of small businesses which might otherwise have to liquidate, for reasons beyond its control and second, it will keep taxes flowing to the Treasury which might otherwise be lost. Over time, then, this bill will, I believe, actually be a money-maker for the Government.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow our society to be disrupted by a breakdown of law and order. We are going through troublesome times. It may take years before the illness from which we, as a society, suffer is cured—but I am sure it will be cured. In the meantime, we must take every feasible step to keep the bonds of our society from breaking. This measure will contribute to that end.

It would indeed be a misfortune if the chief victim of the current wave of lawlessness is the small businessman. Big business can survive. It has resource on which to fall back. But the small businessman frequently functions on a very small margin—and either a property loss from crime or an unreasonable insurance premium could wipe him out. The small businessman is the backbone of our society, and we must not allow this to happen.

The bill I have proposed will, I believe, attract the support of whoever believes in the free enterprise system. Sometimes Government must step in to save that system, and this is one of those instances.

**TO AMERICA'S BANKERS—FIRST IN
THE POCKETS OF THEIR COUNTRYMEN**

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the friendly, neighborly banker on the corner all over our Nation has just shown what he thinks of the people he serves by raising the prime interest rate to an astronomical 8½ percent. This is the first raise of a full percentage point since 1945, showing how poor these struggling neighbors of ours really are. It is the fourth increase in the prime interest rate since last December—a rise of 25 percent in 6 months. All just goes to show what last year's Rolls Royce and a shortened Riviera vacation can do to people.

Our all-seeing-eye Secretary of the Treasury, a former banker of the highest amperage, assures the Republic this is a proper anti-inflationary step. Oh, wondrous revelation. How much of an anti-inflationary effect did previous hikes in recent months have? Can a flea rape an elephant? Then so did these hikes halt inflation.

Are we all to stand by and bleat like lambs as the door to the financial slaughterhouse yawns before us? Who really benefits from such hikes? Certainly not our ordinary taxpayer, who is already crushed between millstones marked taxes and inflation. Small business people gain nothing. In fact, they lose, for their loans now come at a much dearer rate of interest. Only the poverty stricken bankers of our Nation make a profit, because they now make even more money by lending money.

Even announcement of the interest rate hike by so many of the top names and banking institutions is most revealing. Simultaneously, all stepped forward, dabbing away tears of sorrow, to inform us they were about to give the knife of interest they have buried to the hilt in our financial intestines another full turn.

Meanwhile, on a nationwide basis their advertisements flood the media, enticing millions of Americans to come in for loans. How convenient for their profit margins from interest on loans as so many are being coaxed into their lairs to be "helped." Dinner guests at the Borgias came out further ahead.

What will happen to the small householder seeking a mortgage? Or the family purchasing an automobile? Or to those seeking small personal loans? And the head of a household borrowing capital to educate children? Only such hapless citizens by the millions will pay the banker's usurious price in the form of exorbitant interest. It is well worth noting that only a few major privileged

corporate borrowers will pay the prime rate of 8½ percent. By the time this hike reaches the average American borrower, he will be paying significantly more in interest for money he borrows. Is this legitimate? At least Jesse James used a gun and wore a mask when he made people stand and deliver. These gentlemen of the banking community perpetrate this act in the name of sacred patriotism—heaven save us all. Well, if this is pure, shining altruism, then prevent me from confrontation with true venality.

Mr. Speaker, the people who have pulled off this financial feat accomplish true inheritors of the tradition of the robber barons and J. P. Morgan. Never have so few stolen so much so successfully from so many. They will require wheelbarrows and dumptrucks to cart away their ill-gotten loot. Yet it is a fact that these rhinestones in the rough below like so many gored oxen if their sacred profits are touched or their lofty motives impugned.

Hats off to the bankers of America. First in war, first in peace, and first in the pockets of their countrymen. Star-spangled men, all of them. For such devoted service to their country in time of peril to the dollar, we should reward them all. By popular national subscription a statue should be created and mounted upon some prominent headland. Let it take the shape of a bulbous, drooling glutton clutching massive moneybags. Let this caricature be rolled in malleable fool's gold from topknot to toenail and revolve majestically upon a pedestal, so incoming ships may be guided safely to port by its blinding light. Under the pedestal should be chiseled the following message for the ages, reflecting the feelings of the donors:

Sacred to the memory of the bankers of America and their love of country in time of need.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Federal Government to roll back this interest rate hike, and take a close look at the Federal Reserve System.

RISE IN PRIME INTEREST RATE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent raising of the prime interest rate to 8.5 percent will have a dangerous if not disastrous effect on the economy.

In my district, now faced by a critical housing shortage, the interest hike means virtually no middle- or low-income person can purchase a new home. It means that those who live in rented homes or apartments face further increases in rents. It means the homebuilders are crippled when the need for new homes is most urgent. It means desperately needed jobs will be left unfilled as the homebuilding industry shuts down.

Runaway inflation is a serious threat but it will not be cured by a raise in the rediscout rate, an extension of the surtax or other halfway measures. The inflation has been ignited by runaway military spending in Vietnam and in the military budget. Military spending has more than doubled since the Eisenhower years. The economy simply cannot stand this strain without it resulting in severe inflation. I would hope that President Nixon would realize finally this fact and proceed to deescalate the war and the resulting big Federal spending. So far he shows no inclination of catching on to the economic facts of life.

I urgently request the administration to take action to the end the current crisis.

GUY CORDON

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 9, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, Oregon has lost one of its most eminent citizens, Guy Cordon, who served for 10 years in the U.S. Senate. Elected in 1944, Senator Cordon was a strong voice for conservation and proper utilization of the Nation's water and land resources. As chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, he had both the respect and admiration of his colleagues who recognized his integrity, his knowledge, and his great ability.

It was Guy Cordon who, during his time of concentration on the problem, best understood the Oregon and California timberlands and who counseled his colleagues on the wise management of these and other Federal forest lands. The fine way in which the Oregon and California forests have been managed and are managed today is in large due to the creative work of this man. Those of us from Oregon who know these forests—their high yield of timber for building materials and other vital national needs and their financial return to the State—realize that Guy Cordon made a unique and significant contribution both to the Nation and to the State in which he made his home. After he left the Senate he continued to work for Oregon, serving as the Washington counsel to the Oregon and California counties.

Just as he was a friend to all Oregonians, he was a special friend to those of us who represent the State in Congress. When I first came to Washington he offered me the benefit of his many years in the Nation's Capital. Senator Cordon was a kindly, generous, and dedicated man who was of great help to those who were new to Washington. He offered me good advice on the ways of the Congress and I always found him a wise counselor.

It was my privilege to know this fine man and I join my colleagues in expressing my sympathy to Mrs. Cordon and the other members of his family. Oregon has lost a distinguished citizen and a true friend. We shall miss Guy Cordon,

but his good work for his adopted State endures.

OUR FINE FRIENDS THE FINNS

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Finland is a market economy country where private enterprise forms the basis for economic growth. As this growth increases it is possible to strengthen the cultural interchange between Finland and other countries.

On May 5 in a ceremony in New York, Finland's Ambassador to the United States, Olavi Munkki, donated \$25,000 from his government to start a half-million dollar Finnish fund in the American-Scandinavian Foundation (ASF). The new Finnish fund is an expression of international friendship and will increase the exchange of students, teachers, and lecturers between the United States and Finland.

In an editorial the Miami Herald reminded us of the longstanding friendship between the United States and Finland and I make it a part of the Record:

OUR FINE FRIENDS THE FINNS

The reservoir of good will for the United States in Europe is old and deep. It antedates by many years the 1949 founding of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which seeks to pool the economic, military, political and social strength on both shores of the North Atlantic Ocean.

We are reminded of the links forged long ago by plans for a little ceremony in New York today. Finland's ambassador to the U.S. will donate \$25,000 from his government to start a half-million-dollar Finnish Fund in the American-Scandinavian Foundation (ASF).

The rest of the money will be sought in Finland and the U.S. to finance a perpetual student exchange between the two nations.

Note, please, that the ASF was established in 1910 "to maintain an interchange of students, teachers and lecturers, publications, art, music and science between the U.S. and Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden." The new Finnish Fund will do more of the same "as an expression of international friendship and respect."

Our land was peopled originally by Europeans. Migrants from the Old World, including Scandinavia, have strengthened the ties between this country and their kinsmen overseas.

Florida alone, for example, has about 3,000 Finns, counting immigrants and their U.S.-born children. They are concentrated around Lake Worth and elsewhere in Palm Beach County, plus New Port Richey and Key West. Minnesota and Massachusetts contain large colonies of Finnish-Americans.

Cultural exchange isn't spectacular but can work wonders in international understanding. It has been going on since before the U.S. attained nationhood.

Cultural exchange can work wonders in international understanding. But so does the goodwill built by immigrants. For instance, in my own State of Florida there are about 3,000 Finns, including immigrants and their U.S.-born children, who have strengthened the ties between this country and their kinsmen overseas.

I am happy to be able to speak of this goodwill from firsthand experience. For the past month Mrs. Sole Mustakallio Cook from Turku, Finland, has worked for me in my office here in Washington. She is the daughter of Dr. Eero Mustakallio, professor and head of the department of microbiology at the University of Turku Medical School. Dr. and Mrs. Mustakallio visited Washington, D.C., and are now touring the United States.

Sole has been a very great help to me, and has also increased my knowledge and understanding of the Finnish people. I wish Sole and Finland the very best in the future, and thank them both.

A SITUATION THAT APPEARS IMPROPER

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record a copy of a wire service news report which came over the Dow Jones news wire on June 6, 1969. If this report or any part of it is true, I am deeply disturbed.

The public deserves to be able to place its trust and confidence in the officials of all departments of our Government and especially in those of the Department of Justice. There has been much discussion in recent months about propriety in our judiciary. I would like to suggest that actions by an official of the Department of Justice must also be free of any question as to conflict of interest or even the appearance of impropriety.

I would be the last to want to discourage the entrance into public life of the many fine men who come from professions or businesses which are intimately involved with the Government. We need these men and we need their experience. However, in associations and in Government business after entering public service, these men must maintain a constant vigil to assure that the public's confidence in the integrity of its officials is not called into question.

If this wire report is true, we are certainly faced with a situation which appears to be improper. Remedial action ought to be taken immediately by the President and the Attorney General to assure the public that it will not have to be faced with a repetition of this action.

The report follows:

McLAREN'S MOVES IN NORTHWEST-GOODRICH FIGHT, SAID TO HAVE AIDED HIS FORMER LAW FIRM

GARDEN CITY, N.Y.—Richard W. McLaren, the Nixon administration's antitrust chief, intervened in the Northwest Industries-B. F. Goodrich merger fight in a way that benefited Goodrich, which was being represented by his former law firm, Newsday reported.

The Long Island Newspaper said McLaren, Assistant Attorney General in charge of all antitrust operations, conferred with his former law partner on the case in his justice department office.

Newsday said McLaren also sent copies of his correspondence with one side in the case

to his former law firm, which was fighting the merger on behalf of the other side.

On May 21, McLaren, representing the Justice Department, obtained an order temporarily blocking the takeover on antitrust grounds.

SALUTE TO DR. PETER ZENKL

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 85th birthday of a great defender of the democratic tradition. I would like to take this opportunity to salute this man who, while he is not an American, has spent his life fighting against tyranny in all forms and for the freedom and individual integrity of man. Dr. Peter Zenkl was born June 13, 1884, in Tabor, Czechoslovakia, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. He became a believer in the supreme value of the individual and spent his early career teaching his philosophy of humanism and helping develop a national movement of adult education that was to eventually bring his country to the forefront as one of Europe's most broadly educated nations.

His belief in democratic traditions has often brought him to the brink of death by totalitarian regimes. During World War I, his open attacks on the Empire resulted in an accusation of treason, and his life was spared only because of the sudden breakup of the monarchy in 1918. With the freedom then gained by Czechoslovakia, Zenkl became a national leader in one of the major miracles of postwar reorganization in Europe. The burst of enthusiasm and national pride that promoted this miracle is in itself a tribute to what free men can do for themselves when released from totalitarian rule.

As Minister of Social Welfare and later lord mayor of Prague, Peter Zenkl instituted a series of social programs and public works projects, including social security programs, medical aid, slum clearances, hospitals, schools, parks, transportation systems and so on that was unsurpassed in its day. During the period between the wars, Zenkl became the No. 1 enemy of the Communists, but was begrudgingly called by them the "Fireman of Prague" for his ability to put out the fires the Communists tried to build to produce a social explosion.

His love of independence resulted in his immediate resignation from his Cabinet post the day the Munich decision with Hitler was made. The day Poland was invaded, Zenkl was arrested and spent the next 6 years in Buchenwald. He escaped a death sentence by hiding in the sewers of the prison for several days before the allies liberated the camp April 12, 1945. He went back to Prague and became first Vice Minister of the Republic. This was by free election in 1946 when the Communists were soundly defeated. Other than suffer another defeat at the polls, the Communists seized the country 1 month before the March

1948 elections. Peter Zenkl escaped the fate suffered by other anti-Communists in the Government by fleeing to the United States.

He now lives in Washington, D.C., and continues to write and speak against the Communists who still control his native land. The motto of the free Czechoslovak Republic was "Truth Conquers." Zenkl's motto today is "Truth Will Still Conquer." As long as the world produces men like Zenkl, it will.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should all join with Americans of Czechoslovak descent who are tomorrow honoring the birthday of Peter Zenkl.

CONGRESSMAN BIAGGI URGES INDEPENDENT MARITIME AGENCY

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the fact that both the House and Senate overwhelmingly approved legislation in the last session to restore the Maritime Administration to its former status as an independent agency should be ample proof of the advisability of this action. Unfortunately, it was pocket-vetoed by the President.

Efforts are being made again in this session to accomplish this change. Our colleague, the gentleman from New York, MARIO BIAGGI, speaking at the maritime trades department luncheon in Washington yesterday, made an excellent case for an independent agency. Knowing that all of you will be interested in reading his remarks, I am inserting them in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD:

REMARKS BY MR. BIAGGI

I feel privileged to be able to come here today—to the E. L. Bartlett Memorial Auditorium—to speak on a subject that was particularly close to the heart of the man whose memory this room honors.

I refer to the campaign which Senator Bartlett led in the Senate prior to his death—the campaign to restore the Maritime Administration to its former status as an independent federal agency.

This is not a new fight—it's an old one.

It's a fight which we won last year in Congress—but which we lost in the White House when the President pocket-vetoed the independent agency bill.

It's a fight which we're going to win this year!

Frankly, I think we're kidding ourselves if we think we're ever going to get a meaningful maritime program—out of any Administration—until we have an agency of government capable of drawing up such a program.

I realize that there have been some signals from the present Administration about its intentions with respect to a maritime program.

I hope the signals are accurate—and that the Administration does move quickly to repair some of the damage that our commercial fleet has sustained during two decades of neglect.

But we have been wrong before.

In January 1965, President Johnson sent some pretty strong signals to the Congress

and the public with respect to his maritime intentions.

In his State of the Union address that year, the President promised to come forward with a "new maritime program."

Four years later—in January 1969—President Johnson left the White House, and we still had not received that promised new maritime program.

So you'll forgive me if I approach the promises of the new Administration with a little misgiving.

I am not suggesting any attempt to mislead the Congress or the American people—I am willing to concede that President Nixon truly hopes to do something in the maritime field, just as President Johnson hoped before him.

I am also suggesting that there are other problems weighing on any American President—and all of his Cabinet officers who must advise him on the operation of the Executive Branch.

This is as true for the Secretary of Commerce as it is for the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense—all of the Cabinet officers, in fact, have primarily responsibilities that are enormous, and that require urgent attention.

And that is precisely my point.

With the best of intentions in the world, the Secretary of Commerce—in whose Department the Maritime Administration is now lodged—cannot give to our merchant marine the time, attention and expert guidance that this industry deserves.

The Secretary of Commerce is responsible for maintaining the total business health of the nation—and not only does he not have the time for maritime, but it actually would be wrong for him to devote the major share of his energies to this single phase of our business life.

It's true that the Maritime Administration has its own full-time staff and its own full-time Administrator—but superimposed on this setup is the entire structure of the Department of Commerce.

No program that the Maritime Administrator might design—no plan that he might prepare to implement it—can be acted upon until it has first been channeled through the bureaucracy of the Department of Commerce.

What's more, the way things stand now, the Secretary of Commerce can veto any action of the Maritime Administrator—or any decision of the Maritime Subsidy Board—without giving a reason and without his decision being subject to any appeal.

This is not the way to run our merchant marine—and history bears this out.

When the Maritime Administration was an independent agency—with a direct line to the President and the Congress—we made progress in the development of our shipping interests.

Under an independent agency we built ships—we developed plans for new and improved vessels—and we increased the share of cargo being carried to and from our shores aboard ships flying the American flag.

Once the Maritime Administration lost its independence, we went into a decline.

The number of ships being built decreased—shipyards were forced to close down—and shipbuilding craftsmen were laid off.

The percentage of cargo carried by American-flag ships declined—vessels were laid up—and seafarers were put on the beach.

What better proof do we have as to the necessity for returning the Maritime Administration to its original status as an independent agency?

As you know, I don't stand alone on this issue—there are nearly 170 members of the House and Senate who have joined in co-sponsoring maritime independence legislation this year.

We are determined to do something to revitalize the American-flag merchant marine—and we are agreed that the place to start is with an independent agency—one charged with the responsibility to develop a new program—and one armed with the authority that matches this responsibility.

I realize that there are some of my colleagues in the House—including some of the cosponsors of the maritime independence bill—who have introduced legislation calling for the creation of a Cabinet-level Department to deal with the entire subject of our merchant marine, our fisheries and oceanography.

This is a worthwhile goal.

I think that the day is fast approaching when we're going to need precisely that kind of an operation—because it's difficult, indeed, to separate our shipping needs from the related problems of developing the sea's total potential.

But while the goal is worthwhile, I think the present attempts to reach it may be premature.

All of us in Congress know the length of time that usually is involved in the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department.

In the past sixteen years, we have been able to create only three such Departments—HEW under President Eisenhower, HUD which was proposed by President Kennedy and which finally came into being after his death, and Transportation, which was created in 1966.

Congress moves slowly on so major an undertaking as establishing a Cabinet-rank Department—much more slowly than our needs with respect to maritime require.

In view of the fact that time is of the essence, I would recommend this procedure to my colleagues:

First—that we move with all possible speed to give maritime back its independence, because this will satisfy our need for prompt action to alleviate the problems besetting our merchant marine.

Second—that we follow this up with orderly, thoughtful consideration of the desirability of taking all of our ocean programs—which are now spread out among a score of federal agencies—and putting them into a single Department whose sole responsibility would be the full development of the potential of the seas around us—and of our inland lakes and waterways, too.

I do not believe that creation of an independent federal Maritime Administration is the end of the line for the proper administration of our merchant marine affairs.

But I do believe, most strongly, that this is where we must begin.

To delay for the time that would be required to set up a full-fledged Cabinet Department could very well prove fatal.

You have a saying in the labor movement which I admire—that "justice delayed is justice denied."

I'd like to paraphrase that saying, with respect to maritime, and say that "action delayed is action denied."

What we need most urgently is to get on the long-overdue job of putting our maritime house back into order.

The place to begin is with an independent Maritime Administration.

The time to begin is now.

Thank you very much.

THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for inclusion in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD my current Washington Report,

which will be sent out to my constituents this week. The newsletter follows:

THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

I chose this title from an outstanding literary book, as it does apply to President Richard M. Nixon. The President was born in Yorba Linda, Orange County, California, in the year 1913 only a few miles from my own birthplace, which was the City of Tustin, where I still reside.

The President has traveled far and wide, has had a brilliant political career, and finally attained the highest position in the United States, or in the world, so far as that is concerned. It is an outstanding example of dedication, industry, ambition, faith, and hope, and certainly proves the adage that in this country you can go as far and as high as you desire, provided you are dedicated, able and diligent.

It may appear that I am a little delinquent in delaying my welcome to the President as he returns to our home county, but I wanted to make sure that the move was certain. He has purchased the Spanish-style home built in the 1920's by Mr. Hamilton Cotton in the City of San Clemente, on Interstate 5, with a beautiful view of the Pacific Ocean. This property was originally part of a large Mexican grant to Pio Pico, who was the last Mexican Governor of California, just prior to the Mexican War. This property was transferred by Pico to the Juan Forster family of San Juan Capistrano, and was later acquired by the O'Neill and Flood interests of San Francisco. At the beginning of World War II, Camp Pendleton was carved out of this grant, and is one of the largest Marine bases in the country.

The Coast Guard has a small base adjacent to the President's home, with a helicopter pad, which makes a natural and easy access for the President when he lands in "Air Force 1" at the El Toro Marine Corps Air Station, not more than twenty miles distant.

The President has told me that he and Mrs. Nixon expect to register for voting in California, in Orange County. This makes the San Clemente residence his legal home, and I wish to welcome him back to the county of his birth. This can truly be called "the return of the native."

No one could be more pleased that I over the appointment of Judge Warren E. Burger as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Judge Burger is an outstanding jurist with a firm belief in our Constitution. He may be liberal in some concepts and conservative in others, but any decision which bears his name will be found to be fully within the purview of the Constitution. He has said on many occasions that it is the province of the Supreme Court to rule on constitutional issues and not to invade the precincts of the Legislative Branch.

The Warren Court was always engaged in writing legislation, which was a preemption of the responsibility of the equal and coordinate branch of the government, the Congress of the United States. Those days are over. President Nixon made the remark at a press conference that he hoped that what had been the minority views of the Supreme Court would now become the majority views of the Court. That would really be something!

I want to give an example of a most recent charade by the Warren Court.

Coming before the Court was the "one man, one vote" proposition, on appeal from courts in Missouri and New York. The fiction involved is that the legal determination of population is based on the 1960 Census, now nine years old. The Court said, "Equal representation for equal numbers of people is a principle designed to prevent debasement of voting power and diminution of access to elected representatives. Toleration of even small deviations detracts from these purposes. Therefore, the command of Art. I, Section 2, that States create congressional

districts which provide equal representation for equal numbers of people permits only the limited population variances which are unavoidable despite a good-faith effort to achieve absolute equality, or for which justification is shown."

I invite you to examine Article I, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution and see if you can find the word "command." I will save you the trouble. Here is the exact wording:

"ARTICLE I, SECTION 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature."

The Court has repeated this nonexistent "command" of Article I, Section 2 so many times that they have begun to believe it themselves, and to base all their decisions on this illusory concept. As a result, the Supreme Court says, in fact, that "Congressman Utt, there are approximately 425,000 people in your District." I know, and you know, that there are more than 800,000 people in my District, but the Court is satisfied by equating my District to a 1960 Census. The only time that there could possibly be one man, one vote in any changing population area would be during the month of the Census. Thirty days later, it would be distorted and that distortion would get progressively larger as each month goes by.

By way of dissent, Justice Harlan and Justice Stewart wrote:

"Marching to the nonexistent 'command' of Art. I, Section 2' of the Constitution, the Court now transforms a political slogan into a constitutional absolute. Strait indeed is the path of the righteous legislator. Slide rule in hand, he must avoid all thoughts of county lines, local traditions, politics, history, and economics, so as to achieve the magic formula: one man, one vote."

The amazing thing is that the only newspaper, to my knowledge, which pointed out this misquotation of the Constitution was a little weekly called the Vista News and Views, published by C. W. Stevenson and William Stevenson of Vista, California. If I had made such a misquotation the Los Angeles Times would have written a full-page editorial on the irresponsible quotation of Congressman Utt.

TRIBUTE TO THE JEWISH LEDGER

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 the Connecticut Jewish Ledger will mark its 40th anniversary by publishing a special edition. The Connecticut Jewish Ledger is the only English-language Jewish weekly newspaper in my State.

Throughout the past 40 years of turbulence, tragedy, and triumph in world and Jewish history, the Ledger has faithfully reported and interpreted these events as they occurred. The Jewish community in Connecticut has acknowledged the Ledger's leadership role through its editorial and news columns for the community and world Jewry.

Its editorial viewpoint has been brilliantly enunciated during its entire history by its cofounder and only editor, Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman. Moreover, the Jewish Ledger's traditions, set forth by cofounder Samuel Neusner and carried out over the past four decades, are being continued today by its present owners and copublishers, Berthold Gaster

and Mrs. Shirley W. Bunis. They have served the paper as managing editor and advertising manager, respectively, for over a decade.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to pay tribute to the Connecticut Jewish Ledger and to take note of the role it has played in the continuing progress of the entire Connecticut community.

THE WELFARE STATE, NIXON STYLE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Sar A. Levitan, of the center for manpower policy studies, has written an interesting article regarding the Nixon administration's action in the welfare and poverty area.

I believe that the comments of Doctor Levitan are worth reviewing and include them at this point for the information of my colleagues:

THE WELFARE STATE, NIXON STYLE

(By Sar A. Levitan, Center for Manpower Policy Studies, the George Washington University)

A recent column by humorist Art Buchwald needed pundits who draw conclusions from meager information. "Richard Nixon," he stated, "has now been President of the United States 5½ days and so it is not too early for historians to judge what kind of President he has been." His point is not lost on those making judgments after only four months of the new administration. However, activities during this time yield some clues, though inconclusive, as to what can be expected in the years to come.

The Nixon administration has not developed a definitive position on the anti-poverty and manpower programs it inherited from the Great Society, nor have its spokesmen advocated new comprehensive programs on the order of Medicare, the War on Poverty, or the JOBS program. Instead, the new administration has emphasized several thrusts in the welfare and manpower fields, and has taken only halting steps toward implementing the programs it favors.

NEW THRUSTS

President Nixon has focused on three approaches to helping the poor and the unskilled. The first is a greater use of tax incentives to promote manpower and economic development. The Johnson administration favored direct subsidies to employers who hired and retained disadvantaged workers while shunning modification of the tax system to help the poor. The leaders of the Great Society opposed Republican proposals for extending tax carrots to employers to cover training costs, either as an alternative or in addition to direct government subsidies. In their conflict with the Johnson administration, Republicans made tax incentives an article of faith.

Most Republicans in the 90th Congress endorsed the Human Investment Act, which was an extension of the 1962 law giving a 7 percent tax credit toward the cost of investment in machinery and equipment. Reasoning that investment in human skills deserves the same consideration, the Human Investment bill proposed a 10 percent tax credit to reimburse employers for training non-managerial or non-professional employees. The higher tax exemption for human investment is justified on the grounds that it involves a greater risk to the employer than investment in machinery. Machines become the

property of the employer, but trained workers can opt for a better job with another employer.

The Nixon administration has yet to take a formal stand on the Human Investment bill, and it is not known whether this bill will attract the same widespread sponsorship as it did in the 90th Congress. Presidential support of tax incentives not only for hiring and training poorly prepared workers but for slum rehabilitation is indicated by Nixon's endorsement of the Community Self-Determination bill, and from statements by Arthur Burns, the Presidential Counselor. In the words of the bill, the measure would help ghetto residents in "securing gainful employment, achieving the ownership and control of the resources of their community, expanding opportunity, stability and self-determination."

The major appeal of the tax incentives lies in the belief that the inducements will eliminate bureaucratic meddling in private business while encouraging business to pursue socially desirable goals. However, it is not clear whether the sought-after goals can be achieved without government intervention. In the absence of governmental monitoring, entrepreneurs would do what comes naturally and locate in the most advantageous places and hire the best workers. It is also misleading to think that tax incentives are costless. The National Manpower Policy Task Force and other observers have sought to clarify misconceptions about the true costs of tax incentives. In reducing the liabilities of individuals or groups singled out for special privilege, tax incentive schemes force others to pay higher taxes to cover the cost of government, or to forego tax reductions that might otherwise be possible. In addition, tax incentives may prove to be not only costly but also a windfall to those who least need the help. Tax incentives may become another subsidy for helping the affluent under the guise of helping the disadvantaged.

Another major plank in the Nixon welfare program is reliance on voluntarism. "We are approaching the limits of what government can do," President Nixon said in his inaugural address. "Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government, to enlist the legions of the concerned and the committed."

Voluntarism has always played a major role in American life; over a century ago, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that America is a nation of volunteers. Millions of people are now performing good works, but most of this work is done in churches, P.T.A.'s, and other local organizations. It does not follow that large numbers will volunteer to work on a sustained basis in ghettos or that the type of volunteers the President is seeking will be available. It is doubtful that another government effort could mobilize a significant number of new volunteers. VISTA, the antipoverty volunteer organization, has never realized its goal of 100,000 part-time volunteers. While the Office of Economic Opportunity has argued that requests by some 2,000 public and private agencies for volunteers attest to the success of VISTA, it may be more correct to state that the excess of requests proves only that "demand" for free labor exceeds supply. American citizens will continue to perform good works, but there is little reason to believe that new exhortations from Washington will appreciably increase these efforts.

It is also not clear that volunteers are an adequate substitute for trained help in supplying basic education or related manpower services to the poor and the unskilled. It is a romantic notion that inspired volunteers will serve poverty areas better than trained professionals or that ghettos can be rehabilitated by volatile, short-term, part-time volunteers.

A third thrust of Nixon's welfare program is the promotion of business ownership among minorities. It is argued that only

when blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Indians have a "piece of the action" in terms of ownership can they enter the mainstream of our economic system and escape the cycle of dependency.

The "ownership gap" is undeniable. Of the 5 million businesses in our country, only 100,000 to 150,000 (less than 3 percent) are owned by Negroes, who comprise almost 11 percent of the population. In the largest central cities this problem is most obvious, with white outsiders owning the vast majority of ghetto businesses. It is often claimed that the outflow of profits from the ghetto bleeds its economy and is a major cause of its anemia. Increased ownership would give minorities more economic bargaining power in a system where power is closely correlated with wealth.

Recognition of the ownership gap and attempts to promote minority entrepreneurship began during the Johnson administration. The SBA had for several years administered the Economic Opportunity Loan program which provided financial and technical assistance largely to minority groups. In August 1968, it initiated Project Own to concentrate efforts under the various SBA loan programs and increase the number of loans to minority businessmen. (Washington Notes, March-April, 1969, pp. 15-22)

President Nixon's commitment to expand Negro entrepreneurial activity was manifested in the appointment of a special White House aide with responsibility for encouraging minority entrepreneurship, and in the creation of an Office of Minority Business Enterprise in the Department of Commerce. The function of this agency is to coordinate existing programs in the SBA, OEO, and other agencies. In spite of these steps, there is little evidence that the impetus given to Negro businesses by the Great Society's SBA program is being continued by the present administration. President Nixon has not indicated thus far whether he will seek new authority and additional funds to implement his campaign promise aimed at encouraging Negro entrepreneurship.

DELIBERATION WITHOUT COMMITMENT

The policy thrusts of the Nixon administration toward the wider use of tax incentives, an increased role for volunteers, and the promotion of minority businesses have a limited potential and are not, in fact or intent, substitutes for Great Society programs. There also appears to exist wide divergence among the top Nixon advisors about the appropriate means to pursue the programs favored by the President. It would appear that the Nixon administration has opted, either by design or default, for reform rather than replacement of current welfare and manpower programs. It is proceeding pragmatically, seeking to cut waste and ineffective programs while initiating efforts only when problems become critical.

This approach is clearly manifested in the administration's handling of the Economic Opportunity Act and OEO programs. With the legislation expiring less than six months after President Nixon was sworn in, the time was opportune for sweeping changes if they were contemplated. Instead, the new administration requested a one-year extension of the Act (later changed to two years) in order to "more carefully consider alternatives." This rationale for the short term extension was at best spurious. The new hands such as Robert H. Finch, Daniel P. Moynihan, and George P. Shultz were intimately acquainted with the programs in their respective jurisdictions. And if the vast expertise of the new administration was not adequate, the General Accounting Office's review of the EOA programs, and other independent appraisals of these efforts, were available. It is difficult to accept lack of information as a major stumbling block in the administration's failure to take a position on extending the Economic Opportunity Act. More

plausibly, the administration did not contemplate any dramatic changes in the future course of the antipoverty efforts. And rather than endorse a Great Society measure, it resorted to the subterfuge of further study. While President Nixon may not have an abiding commitment to expand the welfare state, he apparently does not plan any wholesale reductions. Program decisions seem to be generally based on pressures generated in connection with specific issues or problems rather than on the basis of a carefully conceived plan.

The Job Corps offers an example. Having singled out this program during the campaign as expensive and badly administered, it was not surprising that the Nixon administration would seek to change it. First came the announcement of the transfer of the program to the Labor Department, whose superior ability to administer residential facilities remains to be proven. It was not the best-kept secret that Secretary Shultz and OEO recommended modest cuts in the program and indicated a desire to experiment with training and residential facilities for Job Corps clients near home rather than hundreds of miles away. The Shultz ideas were endorsed by Moynihan, who praised the proposed restructuring of the Job Corps as imaginative and constructive. Someone in the White House, however, decided that more drastic cuts were in order and the Labor Department was told to cut fiscal 1970 outlays for the Job Corps by \$100 million, or more than one-third of the budget proposed by the preceding administration. The actual impact was even deeper than the cut in funds indicates since part of the remaining funds was to be used to close centers. The sharp cut made it difficult to single out for closing only inefficient and poorly operated centers, and little money was left to experiment with new types of programs.

While the administration was attempting to "save" \$100 million, its spokesmen were expressing grave concern about mass unemployment among Negro youth. It is no wonder, therefore, that some saw a contradiction between pronouncements of the administration and its deeds. Disclaimers by the administration that alternative opportunities would be offered to Job Corps clients were unconvincing, since reduced appropriations for centers accounted for most of the administration-proposed cut in Economic Opportunity programs.

Opponents of the Nixon administration and defenders of the welfare state were quick to generalize from the Job Corps cutbacks that the administration was out to reduce welfare expenditures and would resist any expansions. One indication was that in its first four months the administration failed to take a position on possibly the most important welfare reform—revamping cash support to the poor. The Nixon welfare task force recommended establishment of federal welfare standards and minimum monthly support of \$30 to \$40 per welfare recipient. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert H. Finch apparently went beyond the task force recommendations favoring a federally-financed and administered welfare system. It was also reported that the Urban Affairs Council supported the proposal as did Richard Nathan, chairman of the Nixon welfare task force, who had since assumed a top position in the Bureau of the Budget. The support of the Bureau of the Budget was considered crucial in advancing the proposal. Nonetheless, other potent voices within the administration opposed federal take-over of public assistance payments and it is anybody's guess as to the measures that the administration is going to adopt in this field. In May 1969 the President promised a statement on the subject before the end of the year.

This foot-dragging may not be indicative of rejection. The President's Urban Affairs Council proposed a \$1 billion increase in

spending for federal food programs in March at a time when the President was obviously reluctant to increase expenditures. Based on inside information, pundits indicated that economists gained the upper hand in the White House and predicted that President Nixon would refuse to allocate adequate funds to combat hunger in the United States. No sooner did the proverbial ink dry on these predictions than President Nixon declared that "There can be no doubt that hunger and malnutrition exist in America, and that some millions are affected." The remedy was an announced major expansion in food programs with an additional \$270 million for fiscal 1970. Compared with the \$100 million retrenchment on the Job Corps, an optimistic scorekeeper might suggest that the Nixon administration batted 2.7 to 1 in favor of expanding the welfare state.

FORTY-FOUR MONTHS TO GO

Based on four months' experience, it is becoming clear that concern about the demise of the Great Society's manpower and welfare programs were exaggerated and premature. The worriers can relax—indications are that the domestic programs inaugurated during the sixties will continue into the foreseeable future. It would seem that just as the Eisenhower administration gave respectability to New Deal and Fair Deal legislation, the Nixon administration is putting its stamp of grudging endorsement to New Frontier and Great Society domestic programs. Though the administration has promised innovation, the new directions it has outlined are limited in their potential and intent.

Improving the efficiency of existing programs is a laudable goal, as is careful and pragmatic consideration of changes. Deliberation is a healthy contrast to the haste and waste of the early War on Poverty days. However, there are serious drawbacks to this approach. Social programs cannot be solved by stuttering reactions to crises. Solutions require a continuous and large-scale commitment of resources. Thus the temporary extension of OEO for one year without any commitment about the future of the programs is bound to involve waste and inefficiency. OEO's experience with annual congressional authorizations is ample proof of the problems created in communities by the allocation of vast resources without the ability to plan long-range projects. Commenting on this problem, Paul Ylvisaker, a veteran antipoverty warrior and one of the most sophisticated men in the business, said:

"Even more important than the amounts of money to be made available, is the more secure commitment of funds over a longer period of time. . . . No industry I know of would venture the development of a new product on a sudden-death basis and with uncertain financing. Yet this is what the poverty program has had to do—attempting fundamental reforms and incredibly complex innovations on short-term budgets subject to change without notice."

It is also clear that our large and growing social needs cannot be met by cutting the fat from present programs. The War on Poverty, despite its rhetoric, was an experimental program with limited funds in relation to its declared objectives. Clearly, programs that have not been successful should be reduced, as in the case of Job Corps (although the reduction should not have been so arbitrary). Not only should the savings from these programs be used in the more successful programs, but the total commitment of resources must be expanded. In an increasingly affluent society, efficient operation of the welfare system must go hand in hand with its expansion. Thus far the Nixon administration has shown a propensity for exhortation about improving the quality of welfare and manpower programs, but it has not indicated a willingness to pay the price.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY CALLS FOR CRITICAL LOOK AT THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN OUR COURTS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion of the problems being faced today by our courts and our law-enforcement agencies in dealing with crimes against society.

Rulings of the courts have installed restrictions that have caused many of our conscientious law-enforcement officials to literally throw up their hands in their efforts to protect society by enforcing the law.

Michael F. Dillon, district attorney of Erie County in which my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., is located, has had some pointed comment on the present impediments to enforcement of our criminal laws.

His words speak for themselves—and I agree wholeheartedly with him—as contained in the following stories in our Buffalo newspapers:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, June 6, 1969]

DILLON SCORES CAT-MOUSE TRIALS AFTER ACQUITTAL IN GIRL'S ASSAULT

Trials of criminal cases are no longer a search for the truth, Dist. Atty. Michael F. Dillon said today in commenting on a County Court jury's acquittal of a Grand Island man in a rape case Wednesday night.

Trials are now a game of "cat and mouse," he said, to see how much of the truth can be kept from a trial jury.

He said he had no right to quarrel with the jury's verdict, reached 29 hours after the end of a five-day trial.

But there are other aspects of the case showing "that we have reached an outrageous state in the administration of criminal justice," Mr. Dillon said.

He called for "the restoration of rules of reason and common sense guiding the trial of criminal matters" and suggested that other prosecutors throughout the country join him in attempting to bring new cases before the U.S. Supreme Court in "an attempt to restore sanity to the judicial process."

DEFENDS JUDGE'S RULING

In the Grand Island case, a 10-year-old girl was taken from her home and raped in a nearby field.

The man charged with the crime made a statement to sheriff's deputies the same day. The written statement was ordered suppressed after a pretrial hearing before Judge Joseph S. Mattina.

"It is my judgment that Judge Mattina was correct in every aspect of his decision," Mr. Dillon said. "For him to have ruled otherwise in light of Supreme Court decisions which bind lower court judges would have been improper and probably would have resulted in a later reversal of any conviction which might have been had."

TECHNICALITIES AROUND

But the district attorney said also it was clear that the deputy sheriffs who conducted the investigation did not engage in any force or coercion.

"Today's law is clear, regrettably, that truthfulness of a confession has no bearing whatsoever on whether the confession should be admitted into evidence against the defendant," Mr. Dillon said.

"The old test of voluntariness has become so cluttered with a myriad of technicalities that more often than not the trial of a criminal case has become a farce.

"Such trials no longer are a search for the truth but rather have become a game of 'cat and mouse' to see how much of the truth can be kept from the trial jury."

SOME JURORS WEPT

The district attorney said Judge Mattina told him that Asst. DA Franklin Stachowiak did an excellent job in presenting the case.

After the jury reported its verdict, Mr. Stachowiak spoke with several jurors and when he told them of the defendant's statement—the one which had been suppressed and could not be offered as evidence—some of the jurors actually wept, Mr. Dillon said.

In calling for a return to reason, he noted that he has in the past agreed with the principles enunciated in Supreme Court cases.

However, he said now he feels there is a need to give greater opportunity to jurors to use their good sense in evaluating whether a confession or admission was made voluntarily and whether it is truthful.

SEEKS "HAPPY BALANCE"

"To provide for technical roadblocks which deprive jurors of the opportunity to even know of the existence of such confessions or admissions is, in my judgment, violative of basic rules of reason," Mr. Dillon commented.

Mr. Dillon said he was hopeful that a newly constituted Supreme Court might correct some of the injustices which have resulted from the unnecessary, excessive and technical over-protection of the alleged rights of criminal defendants.

"This is not to say that I seek a return to the law and practices of 20 years ago but it is to affirm that I seek the establishment of rules which will afford a happy balance between individual rights and society's rights."

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, June 8, 1969]

TECHNICALITIES AID CRIMINAL, DA SAYS (By Greg Faherty)

More and more frequently, prosecutors, judges and even grand juries are speaking out against legal technicalities that are permitting the guilty to go free.

In the words of Dist. Atty. Michael F. Dillon:

"Too many murderers, muggers, robbers and rapists are walking the streets and infesting our communities with too little fear of punishment."

CONFESSION SUPPRESSED

Item. A child molester signs a written statement confessing the crime. He is brought to trial, but the confession is suppressed from use in evidence. A jury acquits him.

Item. A rapist wanders through the suburbs preying on women. A grand jury is powerless to indict him because of a penal law provision requiring corroboration of the women's testimony.

So unrealistic was this to the grand jury that its members felt compelled to hand up a presentment recommending that the state legislature abolish that section of the law.

EXTENSIVE TESTIMONY

The grand jury stated that it heard "extensive testimony" from female complainants in cases involving sexual attack.

Testimony given by the women was entirely credible, said the panel, but it was thwarted from taking appropriate action because of the requirement of corroboration in serious sex cases.

The grand jury said that the requirement makes "neither sense nor logic."

LEGAL SAFEGUARD

"If anything this rule of law works to increase the frequency of this type of crime and provides the sex violator with a legally imposed safeguard against successful prosecution," said the grand jury.

"In our opinion it allows the habitual sex offender to continue his activity with little fear he will be brought to justice," said the panel in its report.

The rule of evidence requiring corroboration in sex crimes can be changed by legislative action. Rules governing admissibility of confessions are subject to rulings by the high courts.

PLEDGES EFFORTS

Dillon has pledged his efforts to alter both "in an attempt to restore sanity to the judicial process."

There is also growing concern among court administrators over the time required to try individual cases in light of Appellate Court rulings that increasingly broaden the rights of defendants.

The Erie County judges, in their latest annual report, commented: "A few years ago, criminal motion practice took comparatively little of the court's time."

MUCH TIME

"Today, however, motions in the areas of identification of defendants, searches and seizures, confessions and admissions, sanity and insanity, and many others, occupy a great percentage of each judge's time and effort."

Pretrial and post conviction remedies now afforded defendants not only greatly increase the work of the courts but also appear to have decreased significantly the number of guilty pleas.

During 1966, there were 403 defendants who pleaded guilty in County Court; 343 in 1967 and 255 in 1968.

Fewer guilty pleas naturally mean more trials. The judges see a need for an increased number of trials even to maintain the present backlog of untried indictments, let alone reduce it.

One hearing in County Court concerning the admissibility of statements began in January and continued, with lengthy recesses, over a period of several months. Total court time required: 35 days.

The defendants, indicted more than a year ago, are still awaiting trial.

"I'm not in favor of a return to the days

of the bright lights and the rubber hose," said one veteran court observer, "but when confessions voluntarily given are thrown out by the courts, I say it's time for a change."

"And when grand juries are powerless to indict sex offenders then it's about time more attention is paid to the rights of society," he said.

ESSAY ON PATRIOTISM

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I am pleased to include the following essay written by Miss Diane Shavchuk, a student at Kensington High School in Buffalo, N.Y. During this period of great unrest and confusion among our young people, it is encouraging to have this evidence that patriotism and love of country are still alive in the hearts and minds of our youth. Miss Shavchuk's remarks are a fitting tribute for Flag Day, June 14. They follow:

I WAS THERE

(By Miss Diane Shavchuk)

I am young, in comparison to my friends and enemies, but to you, although I seem old I am held with the highest of respect. Though I cannot speak in words, I give my inspiration to another that you may know of my feelings.

I am young, but nevertheless, I was there with General Washington at Valley Forge where three thousand men died from cold and starvation. I was at each battle during the Revolutionary War, and when England was forced to give us our freedom, I cheered with the best of them, though silently.

Things went as smoothly as could be expected for a new government, until England began pressing our sailors which triggered the War of 1812. We won that and how proud I was. Francis Scott Key wrote our National Anthem and became my friend for life.

Everything began to go well with the North and South but before I could even cry out, the Civil War was upon us. Never again do I want to live through such a war. Brother against brother, father against son. The North was to win, but not before the most tragic of events. In a small theater I saw President Lincoln gunned down and could not even help. Tears were many for the death of this man; yet, mine were the most bitter since I could shed none.

Then came World I and World War II, the Korean War, the Cuban Crisis, the Death of President Kennedy, the Vietnam War. I have lived through them all and my Country has lived through them too, a Country built on pure guts and work. Is it to lose this? I wonder. Eventually, I shall find out, for you see I am your flag, Old Glory.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 16, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The ways of the Lord are right and the just shall walk in them.—Hosea 14: 9.

O Thou whose spirit supports us in every noble endeavor and whose strength sustains us as we labor for the good of our fellow man, bless us with a realization of Thy presence as we begin another

week and enable us to walk in the way of Thy commandments and to live in the spirit of Thy Son.

Thou hast brought forth on this land a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the good of all men. Help us to maintain our freedoms in the spirit of justice and good will. Save our Nation from further discord and violence. Guide our people that they may see the futility

of fostering fear and may seek the path that produces more unity and promotes mutual understanding.

Strengthen our leaders that they may walk with Thee as they make decisions and carry responsibilities. Together may leaders and people endeavor by honorable service and humble spirits to bring peace to our land and to our world. In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.