

Chesney, Murphy A., XXXXXXX
 Clark, Randall L., XXXXXXX
 Fitch, Ray F., XXXXXXX
 Nafis, Warren A., XXXXXXX
 Peniston, William H., XXXXXXX
 Richard, Eli F., XXXXXXX
 Smith, J. Lewis, Jr., XXXXXXX
 Upp, Charles W., XXXXXXX
 Wesp, Joseph E., XXXXXXX
 Willmarth, Charles L., XXXXXXX

NURSE CORPS

Garvin, Sara E., XXXXXXX
 Lawrence, Evelyn N., XXXXXXX

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Delahunt, John C., XXXXXXX
 Dibona, Philip, XXXXXXX
 Herrin, Daniel M., Jr., XXXXXXX
 Leahy, Joseph H., XXXXXXX
 Merritt, William F., XXXXXXX
 Morden, Harold R., XXXXXXX
 Otter, Henry F., XXXXXXX
 Templeton, Robert C., XXXXXXX

VETERINARY CORPS

Grau, William H., Jr., XXXXXXX

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Bodycomb, Joyce, XXXXXXX
 Madget, Mary E., XXXXXXX
 Smith, Francis S., XXXXXXX

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Will E. Leonard, Jr., of Louisiana, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1975. (Reappointment)

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Howard A. Glickstein, of New York, to be Staff Director for the Commission on Civil Rights.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEW GENERAL MOTORS PLANT OPENS IN WEST VIRGINIA—PUBLIC OFFICIALS PARTICIPATE IN DEDICATION—GM PRESIDENT EDWARD N. COLE GIVES CHALLENGING ADDRESS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on June 13 General Motors Corp. formally dedicated its eastern parts plant at Martinsburg, W. Va.

This was an important event in the State's economic life. I was privileged to be present for the dedication ceremony with Edward N. Cole, president of General Motors; Gov. Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia; Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS; and 200 business leaders.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD was unable to attend and sent greetings by telegram.

This new production facility of the Nation's largest automobile manufacturer already employs 1,100 workers and is expected to add nearly \$17 million to the local economy annually, including a payroll of more than \$10 million.

I joined in the official welcome of General Motors to West Virginia and pointed out the important role it will perform in the life of the State. The selection of West Virginia by General Motors is indicative of the advantages we possess for industry. This also is demonstrated by other new industries that have moved to the State and by the expansion of enterprises already there.

The General Motors plant is adjacent to the new Interstate Highway No. 81, undoubtedly an important factor in selecting a site for a facility that will provide automobile parts for 15 distribution centers in 21 Eastern States.

As I said at Martinsburg, such highways are essential to the economic growth of West Virginia and the rest of the Nation. The fact that there is a backlog of more than \$250 billion worth of needed construction underscores the necessity for moving ahead with a new national highway program.

When the presently approved Interstate System is completed, we must be ready to meet future needs, and the Congress is looking into that challenge.

The late Charles F. Kettering, a talented and brilliant man who was vice president and research director for General Motors, once said: "My concern is for the future because I am going to

spend the rest of my life there." I was reminded of this wise observation at Martinsburg as we welcomed General Motors and extended to it the invitation to spend its future years in West Virginia.

In his welcome to General Motors, Governor Moore said the decision to locate the new plant in West Virginia supports the belief that the State has a bright future.

West Virginia, the Governor emphasized, is on the move again, and General Motors is helping to give the State new confidence and new optimism.

Several thousand citizens toured the vast facility on the day following the official ceremonies.

Paul B. Martin, editor of the Martinsburg Journal, crystallized the feeling of our people in a helpful editorial on June 12. He stressed the partnership that exists between the new General Motors plant and the Martinsburg community.

Mr. President, the remarks of President Cole at the dedication of the plant were a very timely and thoughtful discussion of the automobile industry.

In view of the importance of his industry to the Nation and to West Virginia, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from his challenging address and the Martinsburg Journal's editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

EDITORIAL

NEW GENERAL MOTORS PLANT OPENS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Already GM is proving to be a "good citizen" in our community and so we welcome this biggest of all American industries to Martinsburg and wish for it a long, happy and profitable experience and continued cordial relationships here.

ADDRESS BY MR. COLE

This new Eastern Parts plant has a significant role in our world-wide system of processing and distributing service parts to our dealers. In addition, we are proud to have the opportunity of locating a major GM plant in the beautiful state of West Virginia, adding to the economic impact of the automobile industry in this state.

Latest available data shows that manufacturers of motor vehicles operate 10 plants and offices in West Virginia—not including the new Martinsburg facility. The state's more than 400 new car and truck dealers have an investment of \$46 million in their businesses. Together, the operations of automobile manufacturers and new vehicle dealers account for an employment of 7,300 workers with annual payrolls of more than \$37 million.

The Martinsburg plant, which went into full operation early this year, employs about 1,100 people with an estimated annual payroll of over \$10 million—including wages and employe benefits. In addition, we expect to purchase about \$6 million worth of goods and services from other business concerns in this region each year.

The number of cars in use in this country has risen dramatically during recent years. Along with the greater sophistication of car owners and their demands for higher levels of operational efficiency in their cars and trucks, the magnitude of automotive servicing requirements has increased substantially. The construction of this new modern facility is one of a number of major steps taken by General Motors in recent years to meet increasingly complex and demanding service requirements of our customers.

We operate in a highly volatile and competitive business environment spurred by increasing consumer demands, rising costs and other pressures. Our basic requirement is to provide automotive vehicles which are safe, reliable, durable and which represent a high level of transportation value for the consumer against competition from all other types of goods and services.

But society today expects more from the businessman than just doing a good job of running his business. It looks to him for leadership in seeking solutions to some of the major challenges of our times.

We in the automobile industry are particularly concerned with those social and environmental issues related to the use of our products and the operation of our facilities—traffic safety, air and water pollution, and urban transportation.

We in American business must place even stronger emphasis on our important role as builders of a greater society. We must continue to seek ways of improving the capacity and efficiency of the business resource so that we can better serve the increasingly demanding requirements of our society.

The automobile industry has made tremendous progress in improving the safety of its vehicles over the years. This includes advances both in the capability for avoiding accidents and protecting the occupants in the event of an accident.

We have assigned high priority to the development of features which will improve the capabilities of the driver to avoid an accident. Controllability, ease of handling and rapid response characteristics are basic requirements.

We are concerned, however, that similar attention is not being given by state and federal authorities to improvements in both roads and driver performance. Regardless of the continuing advances in automotive safety design, we cannot expect a significant reduction in traffic deaths and injuries unless there are strong nationwide efforts to upgrade the quality of our highways and drivers.

In the area of air pollution control, we have made substantial progress toward cleaner air.

New control systems introduced in the 1960's have reduced the amount of both hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions

more than 60 per cent compared with non-equipped cars.

With respect to product quality, General Motors has extensive testing and quality control programs designed to insure defect-free products. Our current efforts in this area are more intensive than at any time in our history. From a practical standpoint, we recognize that some defects will still occur because of the complexity of motor vehicles, the system of mass-production manufacture and the ever-present element of human error. In addition, it is impossible to anticipate all of the problems which might occur in the field over extended periods of time and widely varying conditions of weather, road, customer use and maintenance.

Our goal, however, is to insure trouble-free operation for General Motors cars and trucks and we will continue to devote priority attention toward this objective.

Automobile service is another aspect of our business which is receiving wide public attention today and an area directly related to the facility we are dedicating here today. Again, an examination of the basic facts provides a more accurate perspective.

The automobile has grown more complex as the industry has responded to the needs and desires of the motoring public. Today's car is almost like a house—with its own self-contained heating, cooling and electrical systems as well as other important comfort and convenience features.

Over the years, General Motors and its dealers have carried out a number of programs designed to improve the automobile service made available to our customers.

Early this year, GM consolidated its parts distribution activities under the General Motors Parts Division which has the responsibility for procurement and distribution of replacement parts for our car divisions—including Chevrolet trucks. To use a military term—GMPD has seven major supply depots—including the new plant here at Martinsburg. These supply depots process and distribute parts to 43 parts distribution facilities around the United States, from which the nearly 13,000 dealers of our car divisions are served.

The primary area of the Martinsburg plant includes 21 Eastern States. However, the plant also ships a major share of parts needed for North American-type vehicles in overseas countries. Shipments each month total about 1,000 railcars or trucks, in addition to other orders which go by parcel delivery or air express directly to dealers.

I hope my remarks have given you a better understanding of the extensive efforts which we are devoting to provide top-quality products and service for our customers. Charges by our critics which imply that we as an industry are purposely short changing the public not only are unrealistic—but, from a business point of view, are ridiculous.

We have everything to lose and nothing to gain when we deliver products of sub-standard quality to our customers or fail to provide satisfactory service. We pay a high penalty for defects in terms of costs for recall campaigns and warranty expenses. But we pay even more dearly in customer dissatisfaction and loss in owner loyalty which have detrimental effects on repeat sales and public reputation.

We have an obligation to our customers and to the success of our business to do the best job we can in building high-quality, high-value products and in encouraging our dealers to provide prompt and satisfactory service at reasonable prices. As businessmen, no goals are more important. And we will continue to devote our best talents and resources to the achievement of these objectives.

Now, let me comment briefly on the outlook during the rest of 1969.

The automobile industry has enjoyed very good business thus far in 1969. For the entire calendar year, we are projecting sales of pas-

senger cars—including imports—somewhere between 9.3 and 9.5 million, with truck sales in the area of 1,850,000 units. Combined, this will bring total 1969 vehicle sales to between 11,150,000 and 11,350,000 units and will represent a very good year for the automobile industry.

We believe that the overall climate for business will remain at a high level during the remainder of 1969. The automobile industry will contribute to and share in this continuing healthy pace of economic activity.

General Motors is glad to be in West Virginia and in Martinsburg. I want to express our appreciation for the fine cooperation we have received from officials and civic leaders in Martinsburg, Berkeley County and West Virginia. You have been of great assistance in helping us get settled and in full operation—and we are grateful.

PROGRESS THROUGH UNDERSTANDING

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, on June 6 I was privileged to speak at the commencement exercises at Howard University. I found this a special challenge because Howard has been for many years in the vanguard of the black movement. She remains so today, in spite of the disturbances which wrecked her campus among so many others this year.

While I strongly support the movement of which Howard's black students are a part, I am deeply concerned about the corrosive misunderstanding and hostility which has consequently arisen between black and white, between young and old. Realizing how difficult it will be for people with such different world views as these groups, I feel it essential that we approach one another with mutual respect and a willingness to listen honestly.

To underscore my feelings, I wish to include the text of my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROGRESS THROUGH UNDERSTANDING

This is a proud moment for me. I am here to speak to you, not so much because of what I am expected to say, but because I am simultaneously the Representative of two oppressed groups. I am Black, and I am a woman, and I am the first person who in spite of this double handicap has been elected to the Congress of the United States. For that reason, my appearance is a sort of historic occasion. It is difficult to take part in a historic occasion. Every eye is fixed upon one. Every slip will be noticed and criticized with scant mercy.

I have searched my heart to discover what I should say to you today. To make the task more difficult, I am aware that there are two audiences here, and perhaps I should make different speeches to each of them. There are the old and the young, the fairly-satisfied and the fiercely-unfulfilled, the dwellers in the present and the citizens of the future. They seem to have so little in common that they often cannot talk to each other. What can I say to both of them? The gap between the older and younger generations is one of the most baffling and disturbing facts of our time. Why has it opened? Can it be bridged? Whose fault is it? These questions perturb and preoccupy many of us, particularly those of us who are educators.

Here at Howard University, I think it is particularly imperative that these questions

be answered. In some of what I am going to say, I may depart from the etiquette that should govern a guest's behavior and criticize my host. Believe me, I do so out of concern and respect, because I think it is vital to raise some very basic issues here and now. More than any other institution, perhaps, Howard is faced with choices that probably will mean its life or death. They will also be vital to larger institutions of which Howard is a part—the federal city Washington, and our nation as a whole.

It is perhaps the most difficult thing in the world to be at once Black and American. Some have given up trying to live with the contradictions involved. They have rejected the society by which they feel themselves rejected. They talk of revenge and martyrdom, and scorn their elders who chose the course of working for limited, possible gains.

Those elders, although some of them admire and some share the moral indignation of the young, recoil from the behavior that it leads to. Violence, confrontation and rebellion are self-defeating, they believe. They will end in repression and failure.

Probably we all know this dialog, and many of us have taken part in it. For Black Americans, the tensions between the generations have taken on particular acuteness and have especially serious implications. For us, a choice between subservience and alienation is not an academic or philosophical question, as it is with many other Americans. Here at Howard, the extreme attitudes and the range of shades of feeling between the two have all had their spokesmen. The dialog has been, in one way or another, going on for several years. Its outcome is still in doubt. It cannot remain in doubt much longer.

Everywhere today, one sees the same pressure for reformation of our existing institutions. Everywhere one sees the good standing in the way of the better. In our churches the division is between the defenders of the spiritual and moral truths that have sustained hundreds of generations, and those who say that truths are worthless if they are not put to work to serve men in the streets of our time and speak to them in terms they can understand and relate to their real lives. Our cities are approaching paralysis, unable to meet today's problems with yesterday's methods of organization and finance. Many unions, formed to proclaim and defend the brotherhood of working men, have turned out to be jealous defenders of the status quo and obstacles to the progress of men and women who want only their birthright—a meaningful, decent-paying job.

The list could be multiplied, by examination of all our institutions and analysis of what it is in each one that forms its own particular version of the problem. But in each case the challenge is basically the same. The old methods will not solve the new problems. Traditional institutions are unable to meet contemporary needs. They must reform or die.

This is certainly true of the United States Congress, as I am learning and as many new members have had to learn before me. The dead hand of tradition is heavier there than anywhere else one looks. This institution, the House of Representatives and Senate, was designed to be the capstone of our system of representative democracy. Today, whom does it represent? The war industries are well represented, the manufacturers of aircraft and weapons systems. The oil industry is represented. While working people go without to pay their income taxes, it gets a 27½ per cent forgiveness on its share of the cost of government. For what? For using up an irreplaceable national resource. Why should anyone be allowed to profit, let alone receive special consideration on his tax bill, for doing such a thing?

It is because oil states are Southern states, from which the same members are returned to Congress from safe, one-party districts year after year until they become the most senior and powerful names on the Hill.

Examples could be multiplied, but this is enough to illustrate why special interests dominate the Congress and the public interest comes second.

We are waging a tragic, unjust, wasteful and illegal war in which we have no national interest at stake. As the casualty lists mounted and as the character of that war became clear, pressure grew to end it. The last administration was driven from office by that pressure—a lesson that the new administration does not show the slightest sign of having studied. And in Congress, what has been the effect of this outpouring of public opinion against the war? A handful of members—21, of whom I am one—have taken the only practical course. We have declared that until that war is ended and our national wealth and energy turned to fighting the war here at home against poverty, racism and ignorance, we will vote for no more military spending bills. But the response of most House members has been to continue their support of the war policy and military waste. Others have started, in traditional Congressional style, to work both sides of the street. They are talking against the war, but they keep on voting for it.

What kind of human being can know the useless, tragic waste of this war, and the staggering list of unmet human needs in our own cities and countryside, and vote for the war? But apart from that, what kind of representative government do we have when the Congress can continue to do this? It would not be possible if the institution were not frozen—petrified—into its obsolete methods, by which I mean chiefly its seniority system. A safe district and a sound heart are all one needs to become powerful in Congress. It would be funny if it were not so dangerous.

I omitted schools from my list of institutions that are faced with the challenge—to change or die—because I wanted to deal with them at more length, and particularly with the institutions of higher learning like Howard that have in the past been the sources of the leaders of the black race. Howard's past is a proud one. Its list of distinguished graduates includes many truly great men; it and its retiring president have been pioneers in the creation of the great body of civil-rights law; diplomats, scientists, judges, public officials, physicians, teachers who have made enduring marks on their society, have been graduated from this school.

Now, Howard is two years into its second century. Like our nation itself, I think it is on trial for its life. The greatness of its past is no guarantee of its future. In fact, if it remains the prisoner of its past success, it will be sure to fail.

The United States will soon begin its third century. The first two have been marked by prosperity, peace and freedom on a scale new in man's history. But from its founding, this nation concealed a fatal flaw. Its design was intended to establish and preserve freedom. The design was drawn by men who owned slaves. With few exceptions, they did not even feel the inconsistency of their words and their deeds. Ninety years later, the new nation was nearly torn in two as it tried to repair the flaw in its founding. The nation survived, but the wrongs were not righted. They still are not righted, and they will not be righted in our time at the rate things are going.

What is the relevance of this to Howard University, or of Howard to the greater society? This question was asked by earlier generations here, and they answered it in their own way. The eminence of this university is evidence that those answers were not wrong. But were they right enough. Are they right for our time, I think it is hardly necessary to say that they are not.

Students have made known in no uncertain terms what they think must be the role of this university in the future, in this

community and in the nation. They are saying—as they are saying on other campuses for other reasons—"You are not with it." They are saying, "We cannot stay aloof from the problems that cry out for solution. If the future is not going to be better than the past, we do not care whether we have a future."

To the older generation, that sounds like a repudiation of them and of all they have done and endured. But I think it is not. I think it is more of an appeal, a passionate appeal for understanding, alliance and cooperative effort. The fierce clarity of the moral vision of the young is beautiful, and it is true. But it is often not matched by practical wisdom to make that vision real, to make the world flesh. If I ever have to choose between the vision and the wisdom, between rebellion and submission, I must choose the vision and the rebellion. But I do not think it has come to that yet. The time is nearly here, but it is not yet.

What can we do? What can we all do together? There is the answer. We must get together. We must understand and love each other, and we must build a community. Black teachers and scholars have lived in their own special kind of ivory tower. They must come down from it. A Black university has no room at this time for mere "academicians." It needs scholars, but they must be men of action, who are able to apply their knowledge to the world around them in which their brothers and sisters suffer, starve and die. They must hear what their community is saying, and go into it and work.

There are unique, irreplaceable roles that a Black university can play—and this must become truly a Black university if it is to play them. It can assume its rightful position of leadership in the field of urban studies. Here, in the heart of one of the nation's largest cities, it can apply scholarship, research and the skills of the trained mind to defining the problems of the cities and discovering solutions to them.

For instance, it could have pioneered in the fields of legal protection of the poor, and in welfare rights law. This great work is being done, but it is being done largely by others. It should have been done here.

Howard can lead in the recovery and recreation of Black culture, history, art and tradition. It should be a center for the study of non-white cultures, a source of vitality, energy and self-respect for young men and women who are insisting on restoring their rightful heritage, which has been denied them.

These are the kind of things that are meant by the overworked word "relevance." One is weary of some words, and relevance is one of those.

I want to say some things directly to the younger audience here, because most of this has been an exhortation to the older audience. I want to say five things, and I think I will say them in the form of a letter.

Dear Graduates, You will continue to find it difficult, as you have found it, to tolerate what you think of as the apathy and the backwardness of some of your older folks. But try to understand, and learn from them what they still have to teach, as you continue your own independent growth.

You know that you must continue to fight the system that has been denying you the opportunity to be a total man or woman. But fight intelligently. Fight so that you get results and achieve something. You can't tear down everything and build everything new at once. Be practical. You can learn this from the men and women who have, in their own best consciences, fought the same fight before you, as they can learn many vital things from you.

You will have to guard against becoming like some of the older folks when you get out into the community. They have been absorbed by the society as it is and adjusted to things as they are until they would not really think of changing them. Now that you

have graduated, don't cop out. Don't let yourselves be, in the current jargon, co-opted.

Remember, too, that you are not the end. It will not be long before you are an older generation. You must be conscious of your crucial importance as models and images for younger blacks. Your actions and your appearance must command respect, and imitation, and you must stay true to yourselves and your honor and pride in being the first generation of your race in our nation with the prospect of reaching full maturity and individuality as men and women, complete human beings.

And finally, I hope many of you will run for office. Wherever I go, I meet students who come up to me and ask, "How can I get into office?" The answer is to work for it. Get into public life, make your voice heard on public issues, study, prepare, keep trying. We need you perhaps most of all in the political field. Some Americans perhaps can afford the luxury of electing politicians who do not truly represent them—although I think they really cannot. But Black Americans have been under-represented throughout history, and are pitifully under-represented now. Strictly on a population basis, there should be five or six times as many Black Members of Congress as there are in this session. I hope it will be a very short time before that inequity is put right, and I hope that some of you listening to me today will be the ones to do it.

Our task at this moment in history is a great one, and if we are to perform it we must first understand what it is. We must neither withdraw from our society and nation, nor be absorbed by it. We must, for our own sakes and for everyone's sake, find a better way. To adopt what two sociologists, Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, concluded on the problem, we must find forms of education that will help Black people cope with the white world without becoming either completely alienated from it or subservient to it. And we must, in a larger context, build new institutions or reform our old ones so that there are avenues of upward mobility and achievement that will allow Black citizens to maintain creative tension between themselves and the White world, instead of becoming wholly adapted to it.

If we fail, this nation will be poorer for it, and if we succeed, it will be richer indeed.

RETIREMENT OF EDWARD WOOLEY,
SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO SENATOR
JORDAN OF IDAHO

HON. LEN B. JORDAN

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, earlier this month, my special assistant, Edward Wooley, retired, following 22 years of dedicated public service. I first became associated with Ed during my term as Governor of the State of Idaho. Ed was Idaho Land Commissioner when I took office in 1951, and with the advent of the Eisenhower administration he was selected as Director of the Bureau of Land Management and served in that capacity for 8 years, until the change of administration in 1960. At that time I was again fortunate to obtain Ed's invaluable service and counsel.

Ed's knowledge of natural resources and ability to put that knowledge to work on behalf of both Idaho and the United States has been a tremendous personal asset to me. I and my staff will miss Ed as a friend and as a counsel. Ed's expertise in resource matters was

shared with many others less expert in this field who sought his advice which was always available.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles which have recently appeared concerning Ed's retirement. The first is a feature story written by Frank Hewlett which appeared in the Salt Lake City Tribune; the second was written by my wife for her weekly column for Idaho papers, entitled "Where Rolls the Potomac"; and the third is an editorial which was published in the South Idaho Press, of Burley, Idaho.

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

[From the Salt Lake City Tribune,
June 1, 1969]

IDAHOAN ENDS U.S. SERVICE
(By Frank Hewlett)

WASHINGTON.—Edward Woozley, a popular and able Idahoan of pioneer stock, is heading west for retirement next week after 16 eventful years here in key positions with the executive and legislative branches of the federal government.

During the eight years of the Eisenhower Administration he was director of the far-flung operations of the Federal Bureau of Land Management.

Since then he has been an administrative and special assistant to Sen. Len B. Jordan, R-Idaho.

PLAN RETURN

The 67-year-old Mr. Woozley had strong backing this year for assistant secretary of the interior for public lands management in the Nixon Administration but he surprisingly asked that his name be taken off the list of candidates. Instead, Ed and his wife, Iona, are returning to the west where they plan to divide their time between Malad Idaho, and Long Beach, Calif.

Before coming to Washington, Mr. Woozley served for 6½ years as Idaho's state land commissioner. Before that he was a farmer, stockman, land appraiser and field man for the Eastern Idaho Production Credit Assn. and the Federal Land Bank of Spokane.

OWN FARM

Mr. Woozley still has an 800-acre farm in Oneida County, part of which was homesteaded by his grandfather.

The Woozleys have 10 grandchildren and their oldest son Weldon lives at Bountiful, Utah, and is a management engineer at Hill Air Force Base. Their daughter, Mrs. Lenore Stayner lives in Long Beach and their youngest son, Winston, is a businessman at Bethesda, Md.

NEW TECHNIQUE

Looking back over his eventful years with BLM, Mr. Woozley is most proud of how he was able, with the cooperation of the Utah congressional delegation, to set up a cadastral survey system which resulted in the survey of several hundred thousand acres of Utah land and the state at long last being able to get title to school lands which it had been awarded with statehood.

He recalls that the survey teams had telerometer, a new radar measuring device, to speed up the surveys. In some of the roughest areas they also used helicopters and two way radios.

While Mr. Woozley was running the BLM the Continental Shelf Act became law and it was his job to issue the first federal leases in Gulf of Mexico, leases which since have brought over a billion dollars into the federal treasury.

It was also during his years at BLM that Hawaii and Alaska became states and the first private oil field was developed in Alaska, in an area where there now appears to be a major field.

Since 1962 Mr. Woozley has been Sen. Jordan's adviser on public land problems. He has also been working closely with the Public Land Law Review Commission.

WHERE ROLLS THE POTOMAC

(By Grace E. Jordan)

WASHINGTON.—His ancestors were Welshmen. They loved the great outdoors, and being able to watch over his country's outdoors (for pay) has made his own life's labor satisfying. He is Edward Woozley, born near Malad, Idaho, who for twenty-two official years has been looking after the natural resources of both Idaho and the U.S.A.

At 67 Woozley is resigning from the staff of Sen. Len Jordan because he and his wife Iona want to be near their daughter Leonore Stayner, who with her husband and four boys lives in Long Beach. They have one son, Weldon in Utah; and another, Winston, lives here. They want also to do some traveling and get better acquainted with their 10 grandchildren.

Ed Woozley may have served longer in Washington than any other Idaho public servant excepting Sen. William Borah or Rep. Addison T. Smith.

In 1947 Governor C. A. Robins made him executive secretary of the Idaho State Land Board, but long before that he was concerned with soil and manking's use of it. In 1931, at the age of 29, he became an Idaho state land appraiser, and in 1934 a field man for the Eastern Idaho Production Credit Association. In 1936 he took on additional duties as secretary-treasurer of a cooperative under the Federal Land Bank in Spokane. His appointment in Boise followed.

Succeeding Gov. Robins, Gov. Jordan kept Woozley, but meantime the Eisenhower administration had discovered his talents, and two years later made him director of the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of Interior. He remained in this position for eight years, "the world's largest landlord"—after Hawaii and Alaska became states he had 475 million acres of unreserved public lands to administer.

With the change of administration in 1960, Woozley joined the staff of Sen. Henry Dworshak, and after Dworshak's death Len Jordan again had a chance to secure Woozley as a right hand man.

The scope of Woozley's knowledge and the field of his activities can be discerned from the areas of his work: forestry, mineral land leasing, livestock grazing, wild life management, watershed improvement, reclamation and power, bureau of Indian affairs, agricultural problems, soil conservation, the Commodity Credit Bureau, the Farmers' Home Administration, highway development, forest roads and trails, and flood control.

Could a day or a decade encompass more? His years in the Interior Department gave him an acquaintance with many people on whom he could call for greater effect in serving his state and others. This wide acquaintance, background, and taste for research have been put to excellent use with Sen. Jordan's membership on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Joint Economic Committee, Senate Public Works Committee, and the Public Land Law Review Commission.

In 1957 Lewis Hoffman wrote a book on Oil and Gas Leasing in which he said: "More progress has been made in the four years he (Woozley) has been director of the Bureau (of Land Management) than during any other period in the more than 43 years of my association with the Bureau and its predecessor, the General Land Office."

However, Ed Woozley feels that his greatest contribution has been to his native state, where with the State Land Board he developed badly needed management practices. Under both governors he enjoyed great cooperation and his reforms could be crystallized.

The Woozleys were grade school sweethearts, and Ed says that Iona must also have

credit for anything he has accomplished. They are faithful members of the Mormon Church, and they still own 800 acres of ranch land near Malad, tracts including the homesteads of his father and grandfather.

Ed has two natural gifts: he plays musical instruments, and he has on tap more good stories than Bob Hope. Stories fresher and funnier. Iona is a superb cook and does ceramics.

One of Ed's favorite bits of philosophy comes, he believes, from the Bible. (My Bible doesn't seem to have it.) "Try all things and cleave unto that which is good." He adds, "You might modify that a little, but don't throw it entirely out."

[From the Burley (Idaho) South Idaho Press,
June 6, 1969]

RETURNS HOME

Another Idahoan who has won salutations for his service in the nation's capital and will soon be "coming home" after many years in Washington, D.C., is Edward Woozley. He was offered several top spots with the Nixon administration but declined in view of his approaching retirement age.

Mr. Woozley was Idaho land commissioner for 6½ years under Gov. Robbins and Gov. Jordan and was named director of the Bureau of Land Management with the advent of the Eisenhower administration. During his years directing this far-flung agency of the federal government, Woozley set up a cadastral survey system which resulted in the survey of several hundred thousand acres of Utah land. This effort resulted in Utah gaining title to school lands which had been awarded to it when it was admitted to the Union but had no power of control during the interim period.

During his administration of the BLM which finally succeeded to all of the responsibilities of the old Taylor Grazing Act in the transition period following World War II, the Continental Shelf Act was passed. It was Woozley's responsibility to issue first federal leases in the Gulf of Mexico which have since brought over a billion dollars into the federal treasury.

Colorful events like admission of Hawaii and Alaska as states brought new roles to the BLM and the oil development of the largest state in the Union cast the BLM in a new, responsible role with private developers.

Idaho and the west have contributed much talent and knowledge to the U.S. government as has been reviewed here from time to time. Mr. Woozley's service to the country is no less exciting and deserving of commendation.

For the past several years, Ed Woozley has given mature and able counsel to Sen. Len Jordan in Washington. He and Mrs. Woozley will return to Malad where they own and operate a large dry farm. Idaho welcomes these distinguished citizens back home.

RUMSFELD COMES ON STRONG

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of last Friday, June 13, carried a most useful analysis of the early efforts of the new Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, former Representative Donald Rumsfeld.

Director Rumsfeld is hard at work trying to mold the OEO into a truly effective and innovative force. I commend the Star's article for its excellent analysis of the outstanding work begun by Don Rumsfeld.

The article referred to above follows:

REVIVING AN AGENCY—RUMSFELD COMES ON STRONG

(By Richard Critchfield)

Donald Rumsfeld, far from presiding over the liquidation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has moved in his first 18 days on the job to revive it as the dominant innovative force on most aspects of domestic policy.

The 36-year-old former Illinois congressman has already persuaded President Nixon to ask Congress to give OEO a two-year lease on life, won it a broad role in the war against hunger, expanded its experiments in welfare and income maintenance and discouraged moves to shift complete authority for all federal manpower programs to the Labor Department.

Perhaps most significant in the long run, Rumsfeld's generally sympathetic approach toward the community action programs, designed to help the poor confront local power structures, differs sharply in emphasis from the position held by Daniel Moynihan, Nixon's urban affairs adviser and a Democrat.

Moynihan, an ex-Harvard professor and onetime stevedore on the New York docks, sees little difference between the poor and the prosperous in America except that the poor have less money. He recently formulated a proposed national social policy aimed at breaking up the ghettos and helping Negro families with jobs to give them the income to move into suburban areas.

Moynihan's criticism of OEO, set down in his book "Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding," is that the community action concept in practice has sometimes subjected the mass of Negro families to minority mob rule or other abuses of power, in some cases produced large scale corruption and in others helped to fuel the campus rebellion.

Rumsfeld, a Princeton graduate and ex-Navy pilot who is a product of Chicago's plush North Shore suburb of Winnetka, describes the poor in more abstract, idealistic terms as "detached and alienated" from the affluent society around them.

While he agrees with Moynihan that poverty funds should "not lead to the subversion of society in any way," Rumsfeld feels that some degree of tension between the poor and local governments may not be a bad thing, especially when it comes to changing institutions.

The difference in viewpoint between Rumsfeld and Moynihan—with one or the other likely to prevail when it comes to finally framing Nixon's specific social policies—can be seen, for instance, in their responses to a controversial \$960,000 economic development grant to the Durham, N.C., organization whose staff includes some well known black revolutionaries.

One of these, Howard Fuller, has repeatedly called for destruction of the existing power structure and has been involved in a number of campus rebellions this spring.

In the Durham area, some call him a sort of Negro folk hero and civil rights leader; others call him a gangster and agitator.

When Moynihan heard about the Durham grant, he pointed out that few of the excesses of the Negro revolt against poverty would have been possible without federal financing. Moynihan sees no lack of compassion in his view since he feels the mass of decent Negroes have in some cases been subjected to undemocratic rule and intimidation by black militants.

Rumsfeld, in contrast, said in an interview he would be very hesitant to label a man like Fuller as "anti-social, a militant or a gangster," and that he should be seen more sympathetically as one of those "whose life isn't relevant to what is going on around them."

A DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EXAMPLE

For example, he said, his 9-year-old daughter Marcy, who attends the Fillmore grade

school in Northwest Washington where 60 percent of the children are black, has classmates who "feel in no way part of what's going on around them. So much of what we accept as ordinary life isn't relevant to them in terms of what they're doing, where they're going or what their prospects are in life."

To Rumsfeld, OEO's task should be something more than just raising the incomes of the poor. "We have to decide what we're trying to do. Are we going for total victory, to eradicate poverty as President Johnson put it, or are we trying to find ways to allow all individual Americans to be part of society?"

If the country chooses the second goal, he said, community action will have a major role, not necessarily to set the poor against local power structures, but to bring pressure for institutional change.

"Look," Rumsfeld said. "We have a country. There are problems in this country that are the concern of this agency. These problems are the result of something. They didn't just happen.

"It's one thing to run around with band aids to patch up problems. But you'd never catch up. And you don't really run into resistance there.

"But when you get at what lies behind these problems and start to make demands on the institutions involved, like getting labor unions to change their hiring practices or getting the medical profession to make concessions in caring for the poor, then you have real resistance.

"I'm not convinced that the institutions we have are functioning as perfect mechanisms for dealing with the problems of the poor."

Asked if his views on community action put him in conflict with Moynihan, Rumsfeld said, "You can't get all hung up agreeing or disagreeing with a book or what a person says. I've got my own ideas. I'm Rumsfeld. I'm more inclined to follow my own observations and thought processes than dart in and out of other people's thought processes."

He said he felt part of Moynihan's role is "to stimulate thinking and debate" and that the task of Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Nixon's counselor, is to study what hard information is the basis for decisions. He described Burns as having "a tremendous respect for the facts."

Rumsfeld said flatly that the Vietnam war, by stimulating the economic boom of recent years, is one important reason why the number of poor has fallen by 16 million since 1959 to 22 million today.

How much the OEO has helped, he said with characteristic frankness, nobody knows—adding that "there's just an awful lot we don't know around this building."

OEO'S TROUBLES

Until Rumsfeld took over May 26, OEO seemed destined to be cut down to a small, low-budgeted "incubator" or experimental agency. It had been one of Nixon's prime targets during the campaign and, indeed, a sign in one of OEO's elevators said the day after Nixon's victory last November: "This building will self-destruct Jan. 20."

A Nixon task force headed by Richard Nathan, now deputy budget director, called for shifting OEO's operational programs elsewhere, giving its planning and coordination functions to the White House and whittling down what was left to a social laboratory.

With Nixon's appointment of Moynihan, OEO's most vehement critic, as his chief domestic adviser, the anti-poverty agency was like a foundering ship. More than a third of its top 59 executives—Democratic appointees—resigned. When the Job Corps and Head Start were shifted to other agencies along with a big chunk of OEO's \$2 billion budget, it seemed to most OEO staffers that the White House was rescuing the most valued cargo before scuttling the ship. Nixon, meanwhile, had been in search of

an OEO director and had been turned down by a number of candidates.

The President turned to Rumsfeld, and that was the turning point for OEO.

Just elected to a fourth term in the House, Rumsfeld agreed to give up his safe Republican seat in return for equal status with Moynihan as a presidential assistant (he now attends the daily morning staff meeting at the White House) and Cabinet rank, plus a request for a 2-year extension of OEO and chairmanship of the Urban Affairs Council's poverty subcommittee.

And on April 21, when introduced to the press by Nixon, Rumsfeld himself said, "I am certainly not standing here today with the idea of disbanding OEO."

Since then he has spent 10-to-12-hour working days poring through five years of congressional hearings on OEO and the poverty act, practically memorizing a green folder, the "congressional presentation book," which details OEO's guidelines, strategy and programs and in making sure what was left of the agency stayed intact for the time being.

SHULTZ'S IDEA

But just about the time his appointment cleared the Senate, another would-be ax fell on OEO.

Labor Secretary George P. Shultz sent the White House a draft of legislation to put all federal programs which seek to give jobs to the poor under the Labor Department.

The next move is up to Rumsfeld. And while he says he has no interest in "empire building" or in "how much money happens to flow through this particular faucet," Rumsfeld does not appear ready to help dismantle OEO.

This probable conflict over policy—the disparity of views among Rumsfeld, Shultz, Moynihan and Burns—appears to be what Nixon seeks.

More than just specific antipoverty policy hangs in the balance, and Rumsfeld is taking his place now as an advocate of maintaining a strong Office of Economic Opportunity—an opportunity to him as well.

THE NATIONAL SUMMER YOUTH SPORTS PROGRAM

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, this summer 120 institutions of higher education will open up their athletic facilities to disadvantaged youngsters who, because they live in inner city neighborhoods, lack opportunities to pursue many sports activities. This national summer youth sports program is being cosponsored by the President's Council on Physical Fitness and the National Collegiate Athletic Association, offering an excellent example of effective and beneficial cooperation between the private sector and the Federal Government.

If present expectations are met, nearly 75,000 young people from about 50 metropolitan areas will participate in various activities, including sports skills instruction, health education, and counseling as well as competitive sports.

I would like to commend the President's Council on Physical Fitness and the NCAA for their initiative and foresight in planning this badly needed program. And because their plans could never have been implemented without the cooperation of colleges and universi-

ties, I would also like to commend the participating institutions for their generous donation of their facilities. Many students today criticize our Nation's colleges and universities for lacking social awareness or concern. I believe these students would do well to take note of the national summer youth sports program and of the essential role being played by the participating institutions.

SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I had the great honor of being invited to address the Slovak League of America at its annual convention May 24, 1969, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion, which outlined some of the great contributions of Slovak Americans, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PENNSYLVANIA'S SENATOR HUGH SCOTT'S SPEECH BEFORE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA IN WASHINGTON

It is a special pleasure to be with you tonight, for I feel that an important part of Pennsylvania has come to Washington, in the form of the Slovak League of America. Yes, I am aware that all Slovak Americans do not live in Pennsylvania, but I am also aware that many of your League members do live in my state and have contributed greatly to its growth and diverse strength.

Besides that, the real drama of Slovaks in America—the opening wedge toward recognition of an independent state of Slovakia—occurred in Pittsburgh in 1918 with the signing of the Pittsburgh Pact. If that did not bring immediate independence, it was not the fault of the Slovak League of America which has been fighting through the years, since 11 years before the Pittsburgh Pact, to realize the Slovakian dream of independence. Today, you finally see Slovakia independent of the Czechs to the extent of being a so-called Socialist Republic, equal in stature to the Czech Socialist Republic. But the tragedy of domination persists, in the form of the Soviet tyranny over all of Eastern Europe, including Czechoslovakia.

The history of the spirit of independence in Slovakia and among Slovaks in America is all the more remarkable because the fire of your spirit is fed by the barest sparks of realized freedom. Thus, in 1918, there was jubilation at the Pittsburgh Pact, which was quickly snuffed out; in 1938, another period of joyful independence, which the Nazis crushed; and in 1968, a moment of rebellion, which the Soviets put a halt to. In each of these magic moments, however, the world could recognize the spirit of the Slovaks as the spirit of freedom, and it is a spirit the world envies.

So great is your love of freedom and your pride in your nation and peoples, that Slovak Americans, through the Slovak League made a memorable effort to aid the United States cause during World War II. Not only did many fight in the American uniform, many more helped to forge the weapons of defense in the factories of Pennsylvania, and still others conducted immensely successful war bond drives and airplane-buying fund raising campaigns. Even the ladies pitched

in, with their ladies auxiliary organization. As one who served both in Congress and in the military during the war years, I believe I can express the thanks of a grateful nation for the efforts of the Slovak Americans.

Yes, you have much to be proud of, and you are to be commended for keeping your heritage and your pride in it alive through the Slovak League of America.

We have all noted much about pride in recent news stories. Black pride is viewed as an emerging force in the United States, and in a context of pride in the Negro's contribution to America in history, and pride in one's race and self, it is a wonderful thing. Because I also believe in pride in language, I co-sponsored the Bilingual Education Act which passed in 1968 and which help Spanish-speaking children learn in their own tongue before and during the time they are learning English. The culture of the Slovaks is equally a part of our diverse American heritage.

I mention these efforts to give certain citizens of the United States greater opportunity because I think it shows that Congress and the people of the United States are generally coming to a realization that you and your group has held for a long time: That we as a people are strengthened by our heritage and are culturally richer in our diversity. Slovaks, through the Slovak League of America, put great emphasis on education, convey the importance of pride in the Slovak language, and see to it that generation after generation keeps the flame of liberty alive in their hearts. It is a matter of perpetuating a heritage, and it is an important thing.

Even today the Slovak League of America seeks a righteous patch for the Slovak people, when it requests an independent Slovak section in the State Department, a Slovak Desk with the Voice of America, and a general Consulate in Bratislava. I support these requests and will help you in these endeavors.

I commend the Slovak League of America for setting an example through its organization, and I thank the Slovak League for its contribution to this nation and to the ideal of liberty among men.

THE ABM SYSTEM

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that my congressional mail concerning deployment of the ABM Safeguard system is running overwhelmingly in favor, with only scattered letters expressing opposition to the system.

Although I have only been a Member of this distinguished body since the beginning of the year, I have already learned that constituents normally correspond with their Congressman when they are opposed to a legislative proposal—rarely do they write when they are in favor of a particular measure.

Because of the debate raging throughout Capitol Hill and the Nation over deployment of the Safeguard system, I am taking this opportunity to share with my colleagues the thoughts which my constituents and I have about this matter of such vital importance to the security of the Nation.

From Boise City, Okla.:

I take this hasty carbon method of asking you to do all that you can in supporting the ABM system to the hilt, backing increased capability of our own, and strongly getting civil defense protective measures running and on the ball.

From Tonkawa, Okla.:

I want you to please support the President's ABM program. Don't let the American people down.

From Ponca City, Okla.:

The Soviets are mounting a massive and intensive campaign against the ABM system. The United States cannot afford not to deploy the Safeguard ABM. I am asking you, Mr. Camp, not only to vote for it, but to work for it among your fellow Congressmen.

From Turpin, Okla.:

Please vote for the proposed ABM System. It is not near enough, but it would help some.

From Ponca City, Okla.:

We urge you to support the President in his advocacy of the ABM System. Our only security lies in a strong defense.

From El Reno, Okla.:

Support the Safeguard ABM defense system proposed by President Nixon. This is a matter of vital interest to our Nation and there should be no question as to the feelings of the people in support and voting for this system for the security and promotion of our scientific interests in the plans for peace in our country.

The above excerpts from just a few letters indicate to me that Oklahomans, and above all, Americans, are vitally concerned about the strength of this country's defenses.

In the face of Russian developments in the area of missile capability, how can we justify not deploying the Safeguard?

It is common knowledge that the Russians possess an orbital bombardment system—FOBS—that is capable of hitting any target in the United States from an orbiting satellite beyond the range of any antimissile missiles we now have.

With the advent of the Russian's new intercontinental ballistic missiles, the SS-9, which will have a MIRV-type warhead, we are faced with criticism for testing our own MIRV system to offset the Soviet gain. I understand that the Russians now have 230 SS-9's.

In the last 2 years the Soviets have increased their number of operational ICBM launchers more than three times—from 250 in mid-1955 to 896 by September 1968. The Soviets now actually have or have under construction more ICBM launchers than the 1,048 possessed by the United States.

In the face of this, how can we justify not deploying the Safeguard?

Russian advances in defense efforts are pushing them well ahead of us in nearly every area. In the 1970's, they will undoubtedly be stronger than we are, if we do not embark upon a crash program to upgrade our defense program.

Russia already has 250 attack submarines compared to the United States' 105. Of this number, 100 are missile launching submarines compared to only 41 of the United States. Or surface-to-surface missile-carrying ships, Russia has 25 and the United States has none. Russia has 300 mincraft; the United States has 86. Russia has 150 missile patrol boats which fire the Styx cruise missile, which we all remember was responsible for the sinking of the destroyer *Eilat* by the Egyptians; the United States has none. The United States has 177 destroyers,

163 of them are more than 20 years old. Russia has 86 destroyers, all of them less than 20 years old. Of the 105 attack submarines the United States has, 60 of them are more than 20 years old. All of Russia's 250 are less than 20 years old.

Continual debate and procrastination between the Department of Defense and Congress has stalled plans to produce the F-15 fighter which could match the Russian's MIG-23. The Soviet Union has the numerically largest strategic bomber force in the world today, because the U.S.S.R. has retained its air-refuelable medium bombers while the United States has scrapped a large force of over 1,000 B-47's. The latest information available indicates that we have retained 680 aging B-52 and B-58 bombers, while the Russians have 1,110.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has assured us that we have sufficient strength today in the combination of our strategic forces—our missiles, bombers, and Polaris capability—to respond to any attack that might be launched against the United States. This is reassuring to all of us, and it is now up to Congress to maintain that strength and provide ample protection for our strategic forces—the ABM Safeguard system.

Relying on retaliatory measures is not the answer, as the Russians are proceeding with development of an effective antimissile system. With an all-out first strike and a shield at home against U.S. missiles, the Russians could absorb U.S. retaliatory efforts with little damage.

The proposed Safeguard system is a defensive system, not an offensive system. It is designed to show the Russians that we are serious about protecting our deterrent forces—to show our enemies that they cannot achieve an effective first strike against the United States. It will show them that we are not increasing our nuclear arsenal for a low-risk attack on them and that it would be worthwhile to proceed with negotiations on limiting strategic arms.

Defense of our country deserves the highest priority. How can we justify not deploying the Safeguard?

Let us get proponent and opponent together. Let us turn criticism into constructionism.

Let us turn our efforts toward protection of our American way of life to insure that our children and our grandchildren will look back upon what we did and say that above all, we put our consideration for America's security first.

CONSTRUCTIONIST IN THE SEER'S EYE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the editorial page of the Washington Post for June 10, 1969, carried an informative article by James Clayton on the subject of judicial labels, particularly that of "strict constructionist." The article clearly and concisely discussed the problem in a manner I found most helpful. It follows:

CONSTRUCTIONIST: IN THE SEER'S EYE

(By James E. Clayton)

Like any other catch-word or phrase used to describe the philosophy of a Justice of the Supreme Court, the tag of "strict constructionist" so widely used to describe Chief Justice-designate Warren E. Burger is misleading and inappropriate. It is a nice-sounding combination of words that has a clear meaning, unlike such labels as liberal or conservative, but it conceals more than it reveals and it unfairly characterizes those Justices to whom it is not applied.

The dictionary describes the two words as applying to those who interpret the Constitution "according to its liberal meaning." Thus the appeal of the label to President Nixon and other current critics of the Supreme Court—it says they want men on the Court who will decide cases in accordance with the Constitution and it implies that the Court has not been doing that.

The trouble is that many of the most important parts of the Constitution do not have a "literal" meaning. What, for instance, is the literal meaning of "due process of law" or "equal protection of the laws" or "general welfare" or "commerce among the several states"? If they had clear meanings, the Court would never decide cases by votes of 5 to 4 and would never be the center of controversy. But it is a constitution, not a code of laws, from which they come and it is such phrases that are subject to a wide range of interpretations that have kept this Constitution alive for almost two centuries.

Take, for example, the Sixth Amendment. It says that "in any criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy . . . the Assistance of a Counsel." What is the literal meaning? Is a criminal prosecution only a trial or does it include the preliminary hearing, the grand jury investigation, or the steps that occur immediately after an arrest? If one Justice believes the "prosecution" begins at the time of arrest and another believes it begins only when a defendant is brought into court, which is being the strict constructionist? Neither is giving the words a "literal" meaning.

Thus, Mr. Nixon and others who say that what the Supreme Court needs these days are "strict constructionists," they are really saying that judges who read the Constitution as they do are strict constructionists and those who don't aren't. Someone who reads the Constitution differently can make the same argument in reverse, as columnists Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden did in this newspaper recently.

This idea of strict constructionism is not new, however, and it does have a legitimate place in legal terminology. It can be applied properly to a statute or a contract when it means, according to *Black's Legal Dictionary*, a reading that "recognizes nothing but is not expressed, takes the language used in its exact and technical meaning."

Over the years, some lawyers and judges have tried again and again to apply this kind of thinking to the Constitution. Perhaps Justice Owen J. Roberts expressed it best when he wrote in 1936 that the task of the Supreme Court is "to lay the article of the Constitution which is invoked against the statute which is challenged and to decide whether the former squares with the latter."

The only trouble is that constitutional interpretation doesn't work that way. Roscoe Pound, one of the foremost legal thinkers of the century, described the Justice's idea as "the slot-machine theory" and he and others had a field day demonstrating its fallacy.

The Constitution, for example, says nothing about paying subsidies to tobacco farmers or regulating airplane traffic or shooting rockets to the moon, and anyone seeking support for such activities by the Federal Government will search the literal meaning of its words in vain. Such programs are constitutional because first Congress, then the

President, and later, in some instances, the Court have said they fall within legitimate interpretations of the congressional powers to regulate interstate commerce or to spend money for the general welfare.

One needs only to compare the language of the Constitution with the issues the Court is asked to decide to see how far-fetched talk about "literal" interpretation is. Does a state deny some citizens "equal protection of the laws" by apportioning its Congressmen so that one represents 10,000 voters and another 500,000? Does a statute taking citizenship away from a military deserter violate the bar against "cruel and unusual punishment?"

One of the more humorous aspects of the current discussions is that Felix Frankfurter, who was in the vanguard of those attacking Roberts then, is now being held up by the President and others as an exemplar of a strict constructionist.

Another amusing aspect is that Chief Justice-designate Burger, hailed by Mr. Nixon as a strict constructionist, characterized Hugo Black as the same thing during the Senate hearings. Yet Justice Black's view of the Constitution unquestionably is not the view that Mr. Nixon and most of those who have lavished praise on Judge Burger have in mind.

The idea that Justice Black is a strict constructionist grows largely out of the way he interprets the First Amendment. Yet President Nixon and probably Judge Burger would be among the last to claim that Justice Black's interpretation of the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments meets their definition of strict constructionism, although it meets Justice Black's definition.

The heart of the matter is that the phrase sounds good, serves the purpose of criticizing the Court in a sneaky kind of way, and ducks the hard question of how a Constitution written with broad language in 1789 so it could meet problems then unseen should be interpreted in 1969.

NECESSITY FOR ROTC

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the following editorial from the Des Moines, Iowa, Register and the article that appeared in the June 15 issue of the Washington Post, as indicative of the nationwide support for ROTC in the face of campus protests against the program. I believe these two articles are further evidence that we do need legislation to control campus unrest. The articles are as follows:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, June 9, 1969]

NEED FOR ROTC

Student protests on many college campuses have been directed at the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC). In some cases, the protesters have wanted to kick ROTC off the campus; in others, they have insisted merely that it be made an extracurricular activity without college credit.

. . . It seems to us that ROTC serves a useful purpose in providing officer material for the American forces that is basically civilian trained and civilian oriented. The only other choices would be to obtain all military officers from the service academies and from officer training schools at military installations. These officers are more likely to be indoctrinated with military philosophy and to seek permanent military careers than college-educated ROTC products.

In short, we think ROTC helps to main-

tain a rotating military officer corps that is not imbued with professional military ideals but which holds the civilian and democratic ideals of America uppermost. It minimizes the risk of establishing a permanent military officer caste as an interest group with powerful influence in politics, as has so often been the case in other countries such as Germany and Japan.

... as long as we have large military forces in this country, some young men will want to be trained for at least temporary military careers, and we favor providing this opportunity in public and private universities, rather than relying on the military services themselves to do all the training of officer material.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 15, 1969]

COLLEGES SPEAK UP FOR ROTC
(By Richard M. Cohen)

ROTC, the campus-based military program with an image problem, was endorsed yesterday as "most appropriate" by an association representing 113 state universities and land-grant colleges.

While stressing that ROTC programs should remain under "study and revision," the 15-member executive committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges unanimously declared:

"The basic issue . . . is whether or not it is appropriate for state universities and land-grant colleges . . . to include among them opportunities for those who wish to prepare themselves for service in the Armed Forces. We believe it most appropriate."

The statement, which was signed by the presidents of six universities and the chancellor of one, noted that critics of ROTC charge that the program contributes to the militarization of American society.

"In fact," the statement said, ROTC is "one of the best guarantees against the establishment in this country of a 'military' caste or clique or establishment" since the armed forces rely on the program to supply a "substantial majority" of civilian-educated regular and reserve officers.

A spokesman for the association said that no state university or land-grant college had moved either to abolish ROTC or strip the program of its academic standing as Harvard did when it reduced ROTC to an extra-curricular activity.

Among those signing the statement were the presidents of the University of Alabama, Iowa State University, University of Wisconsin and the chancellor of the State University of New York.

**NOTHING IS CERTAIN BUT
DEATH AND TAXES**

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, we all know the saying, "Nothing is certain but death and taxes." I now suggest this is two words too long. Nothing is certain but death.

Everyone agrees that tax reform is urgent. Reform should precede extension of the surtax or increase in other taxes.

The middle and lower income taxpayers bear more than their fair share of the tax burden, while some receiving annual incomes of \$1 million pay no income tax—because all their income is from tax-exempt municipal bonds.

Major oil companies, through the oil

depletion allowance, can recover not only the original investment in the well, but thereafter can continue to recover 27½ percent of their production from the well tax free, ad infinitum—or until the well runs dry.

Some foundations with gambling casino interests and unusual political and judicial friendships enjoy tax-exempt status.

While major equipment purchases help heat up the economy and spur inflation, our tax laws grant a 7-percent investment tax credit thus encouraging the purchase of certain capital goods.

And, oh yes, at a time when we all decried inflation, this Congress permitted itself a 42-percent pay raise, while seeking to hold the line on wages and prices for labor and industry.

So what happens when tax law revisions are proposed? Municipalities pass resolutions opposing changes in the tax exemption of municipal bond income. Oil company executives object to any change in the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance. Educators and scientists protest any tax, even 5 percent, on foundations. And, railroads, airlines, equipment dealers, and others oppose removal of the investment tax credit.

Once upon a time, a man lost a bet and had to eat a pair of shoes. When asked what part he liked best, he said, "The holes." Perhaps "the holes" are our favorite parts of the tax laws.

Perhaps tax reform, like charity, begins at home. Do we really want it? I appreciate hearing from the folks at home on this. Congress needs all the guidance it can get.

**SELF-HELP: THE PARAPLEGIA
FOUNDATION OF ARIZONA**

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Paraplegia Foundation of Arizona has done and is doing some innovative work that holds great promise for those with spinal cord injuries.

The Paraplegia Foundation of Arizona is a nonprofit corporation dedicated to finding a cure for paraplegia. The founding board of directors and medical advisory board are comprised of recognized civic leaders, research scientists, and physicians. The Paraplegia Foundation of Arizona is the only such organization in the United States.

What is paraplegia? Simply stated, paraplegia is permanent paralysis of the lower part of the body resulting from disease or injury to the spinal cord. Further, it almost always leaves the individual with no feeling below his level of injury, unable to control certain internal functions, and permanently confined to a wheelchair.

Spinal cord injury has tragically changed the lives of over 125,000 individuals in our country. New cases are flowing into our hospitals at a rate estimated to be 15 per day, every day of the year. Medical care and treatment for the paraplegic is financially crippling,

not only to the individual, but to the public sector, which must eventually support him. Various conservative estimates, based upon a life expectancy of half normal, indicate a cost for paraplegic care of over \$50,000 and an additional wage and tax loss to the community of \$190,000. Thus, the total loss to the Nation is over one-quarter of a million dollars per patient. Using only 100,000 cases, this represents over \$24 billion loss to the Nation, or about \$1½ billion annually. This cost is ever increasing, for the incidence is now estimated to be approaching 10,000 per year.

We must all be personally concerned with the plight of the paraplegic; because in less time than it takes to snap your finger, it can be our plight or that of someone in our family. A lifetime in a wheelchair can and does happen so innocently—touch football in the backyard, a tumble from a bicycle, an automobile or swimming accident, to name only a few. Add to this an unusually high toll coming out of Vietnam, and it is obvious that a national problem exists.

Medical history can be made in Phoenix, where a cure for paraplegia may be found through an existing combination of brilliant medical talent and research facilities that are among the most advanced in the free world. The solution for the spinal cord injured paraplegic can be found only through concentrated research into the physiology of the spinal cord. Existing in Phoenix are sophisticated laboratory facilities, an internationally recognized research team, and one-half million dollars worth of the latest scientific equipment. The key to a cure is research, the key to research is money.

The Paraplegia Foundation of Arizona has just made a grant of \$5,000 to Barrow Neurological Institute of St. Joseph's Hospital in Phoenix, Ariz., where this extremely important research will be undertaken. The first \$5,000 merely sets the stage for concentrated efforts which will then be scheduled to begin October 1, 1969. By October 1, \$35,000 will be needed to continue this program for 1 year, and to allow the finest research scientists to utilize these available facilities.

As a result of paraplegia research much "spinoff" knowledge will have been gained about other disorders of the central nervous system; such as stroke, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, and congenital birth defects.

A closely coordinated program has been developed by two of the leading Phoenix hospitals, St. Joseph's and Good Samaritan for the immediate and long-range care of paraplegics. This is the first program of its kind in the United States, although this concept has been endorsed by the Congress for several years. The care of these patients is self-supporting and augments nicely research which will be done as a result of funding by the Paraplegia Foundation of Arizona. However, all research must be supported by private philanthropy and Government research grants.

The private sector in Arizona has undertaken a tremendous responsibility to our Nation's paraplegics. Hundreds of

thousands will be looking this way, in the very near future, for the end of a dream with which they and their families have been living for many years. The Paraplegia Foundation of Arizona must not fail, and will not, with support from both the public and private sector, and with the help of our national institutes.

**NATIONAL HEALTH OFFICER
NEEDED**

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, certainly one of the key officials in any administration is the top health officer. Most reasonable observers would want our President to have sufficient time in order to obtain the highest caliber of individual to fill this vital post. However, I believe that after 5 months without this official, most of us would agree that we are beyond the period of a reasonable time. There are many indications of misuse and abuse of the medicare and medicaid law and much which, at best, borders upon fraud. I, for one, wish to take this opportunity to urge the President to fill this important post in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as soon as possible.

This subject was reported and analyzed in the June 15 edition of the Washington Post. That article is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

**MEDICAL SCANDALS SHOW HEW WATCHDOG
NEEDED**

(By Eve Edstrom)

Multi-million-dollar alleged abuses of Medicaid and Medicare are making headlines across the Nation, exploding medical costs are hitting every taxpayer, the annual total health spending is soaring toward \$55 billion—and yet the Nation has no top health official to watch over the public's interest.

The political controversy that is swirling over President Nixon's failure to nominate such an official has obscured the fact that the issue is not one man's appointment but the delivery of health services to all Americans.

The reported abuses of Medicaid, which is the Federal-state program for medically aiding the poor at all age levels, dramatize the problem.

Scattered audits in several states indicate that taxpayers are being bilked by double billing practices and excessive charges, while many of the needy ill are not getting care.

Unlike Medicare, which is the hospital and medical insurance program for the aged, Medicaid permits payments for drugs if state legislatures opt for such coverage.

Among the charges now being leveled against Medicaid is that drugs are so easily available that tax funds are being used to support narcotics addiction.

And one of the more startling and often-quoted statistics about Medicaid payments concerns the \$328,000 in Federal and State funds that reportedly went to a druggist in an Eastern Kentucky town of 750 people.

The druggist, in an Associated Press dispatch, was quoted as saying:

"I think Medicaid has been good to me and I think I've been good to it."

But the question now being asked in health circles is not what is good for the

Kentucky druggist or even his clients. The question is what is good for all American consumers of health services.

How can they be assured of quality care at costs that are not prohibitive to themselves and to state and Federal governments? And how, in the words of Sen. John J. Williams (R-Del.), can public programs be made to work without allowing "profiteers" to have a "field day?"

Just last Thursday, Williams inserted 16 new examples of Medicare and Medicaid fraud in the Congressional Record.

One concerned a Florida physician who paid kickbacks to patients after listing them on false claims for medical treatment. In one instance, the doctor claimed 21 house calls or office visits for a patient who was in Greece at the time.

In another case based on HEW records, Williams said a doctor defrauded the Medicare program of almost \$350,000 by charging for services not given, by duplicating bills for the same service, and by providing useless treatments.

Such examples underscore the need for aggressive watchdog policies. For example, when New York City established such a system to oversee Medicaid's dentistry payments, it reported savings of \$27.3 million in the year ending last December.

But establishing national policies and making legislative changes to deal with the problems that have arisen in the Medicare and Medicaid fields involve highly sensitive areas, particularly the precarious relationships which exist between the public and private sectors of health care.

And, in these matters, the overall responsibility for being the advocate for the public—and not the advocate for doctors, hospitals or druggists—rests with the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs.

This is why Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Robert H. Finch wants the knowledgeable and gutsy Dr. John H. Knowles, general director of Massachusetts General Hospital, for the job.

Numerous professional health and allied organizations agree, declaring in letters and telegrams to Finch and the White House that Dr. Knowles is one of the most qualified men in the Nation for the post.

Yet last week and previously, Senate Republican leader Everett M. Dirksen (Ill.) has all but said that he and not President Nixon will appoint the Assistant Secretary for Health.

Dr. Knowles, said Senator Dirksen, is unacceptable to him, just as Dr. Knowles is unacceptable to the most conservative forces of the American Medical Association.

By Friday, it appeared that Dirksen may have been successful in his ploy to block Dr. Knowles' nomination.

A White House aide said no final decision had been made, but the odds were that the Knowles nomination was "dead". HEW sources insisted this was not true, that "Knowles is still in the mix" and a decision could be expected by July 1.

Finch left for a 10-day vacation Friday although he previously had told a reporter that it would be "unfortunate" if a decision on the appointment was not made before he went on his holiday.

Finch's predecessor, former HEW Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen, views the five-month delay in filling the Assistant Secretaryship as a "calamity."

He said it amounts to losing almost a year in making decisions on crucial health matters, such as how to best provide brakes on runaway health costs.

While all items on the Consumer Price Index were up 11 per cent between December, 1965 and December, 1968, physicians' fees rose 21 per cent and hospital daily service charges rocketed by 52 per cent.

And now that the Nation is spending \$20

billion in public funds and \$34 billion in private funds for health care, Cohen said there must be some hard decisions on how to make certain that such vast expenditures are used effectively.

Cohen's observations concerning the need to give immediate attention to health matters were echoed on the house floor last week by Rep. Paul G. Rogers (D-Fla.)

Rogers said there are "more than a dozen pieces of legislation which must be considered for extension in the health area this year, yet we have no word on these very important programs, mainly because of the lack of an Assistant Secretary for Health."

Rogers said he was not pleading for the appointment of any particular individual. But he had one request of President Nixon:

Put aside political considerations and fill the job.

**A CONCERNED CITIZEN SPEAKS
ABOUT AMERICA'S TURMOIL**

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of an address given by Gov. James L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Governor Robertson delivered this address in Omaha, Nebr., on May 22. I commend the tone and philosophy, as follows:

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

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

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

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

I find myself increasingly troubled by these developments. It might be inaccurate to say that people are apathetic about it, but too many of us are seemingly content to be hand wringers, head-shakers, and condemners. This is not the way Americans typically re-

spond to difficulties. We tend to be activists and problem solvers. Our motto when confronted with a difficulty is: "Don't just stand there, do something."

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

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

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

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

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

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

The other day the Chief of Police of Los Angeles retired after a quarter century of service and stated that he was about ready to write off a whole generation of young Americans because of their attitude toward

authority. Now, we cannot afford to write off a whole generation of young Americans—not even its small minority about whom I am talking. Every generation plays a vital role in the process of keeping civilization alive. We cannot write off a generation if we hope to transmit to the generations to come the values that man has laboriously nurtured and protected over the centuries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

These ideas will not die overnight, but what is transpiring at this moment in our country is a concerted effort to bring about their demise. The turmoil on the college campuses is but a symptom of it. A minority but an articulate and activist minority of young people—young people who may be future teachers, writers, and political leaders—apparently have been persuaded that

the cementing ideas that made this a great nation are false. Indeed, some of them deny that this nation has achieved anything praiseworthy. These young people have a different set of ideas and ideals.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I, for one, do not think we price liberty too high when we ask that those who wish to

enjoy it give their allegiance to the institutions and ideas that make it possible, even while seeking to change them through non-violent dissent.

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

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

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

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

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

THE WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn is acknowledged as one of the most underprivileged areas of the city of New York.

Yet, while many people in this area are on the lowest rung of the economic ladder, they are strongly civic minded and appreciate any help they can get to alleviate their problems.

Recently, Miss Elizabeth Nanes, administrator of the Adelphi Hospital, 50 Greene Avenue, was chosen by the 88th Precinct Community Council, composed of area residents, community organizations, including churches and school educators as the Woman of the Year in recognition of her "goodwill and thoughtful services rendered to the council in behalf of your grateful neighbors and fellow citizens."

She was presented with a plaque by the community council for the many kind things she has done for the people in this community.

In another citation, Brother Baldwin Peter, FSC, principal of Bishop McLoughlin Memorial High School, hailed Miss Nanes for her dedication to community services and "general assistance to the school and continued goodness to our boys."

Miss Nanes has been administrator of Adelphi Hospital for more than 30 years. The nonprofit institution renders 24-hour emergency service to the poor of the area, and also allows neighborhood organizations to hold their meetings in the hospital's auditorium.

The council's president, Roy Vanesco, in recognizing Miss Nanes, also awarded

service plaques to Police Capt. Robert Boetig, Patrolman Joe Billelo of 88th precinct, and Brother Peter, principal of Bishop McLoughlin Memorial High School.

I believe it is important to recognize people of the caliber of Miss Nanes, and their enormous contributions to the well-being of the less fortunate. Service to our neighbors represents a strong antidote to tensions and distrust.

THE SOUND AND MY FURY

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a copy of a joint resolution enacted by the senate of the California Legislature. This resolution deals with a problem that exists in my congressional district but is not limited to it alone. For those of my colleagues whose districts are fortunate enough to be spared jet aircraft noise, it may be difficult to realize the harmful effects that are visited upon the neighborhoods surrounding our jetports. Paraphrasing the old cliché that seeing is believing, for those individuals not acquainted with airport din, hearing is believing.

The resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 7—is concerned with sonic booms and resultant damage therefrom. I have sponsored a bill, H.R. 8206, that would provide funds for these damages and encourage investigations and planning in this area. With the rise in jet travel and the supersonic transport looming on the horizon, these problems must be faced and satisfactorily resolved, now, before it is too late.

At the same time that the California resolution arrived, I also coincidentally received a letter from Dr. H. W. Colby, superintendent and secretary to the board of the Lennox School District. Dr. Colby's letter shows that the ramifications of the jet noise problem are varied and far reaching. Schools situated next to jet airports are, due to the fact of their physical location, not providing their students with the best education that would otherwise be available. Aside from harmful effects upon the hearing of the youngsters in attendance, their abilities to concentrate are also being impaired. Proper motivation consequently is stunted and a ripple effect of harmful results goes on and on, ad nauseum.

To apprise you of one aspect of this problem, I am inserting a copy of Dr. Colby's letter into the RECORD along with California Senate Joint Resolution 7. It highlights through a sad example the severity of jet noise interference in the area and lends support for the passage of another bill of mine, H.R. 3850, which calls for Federal assistance in the soundproofing of schoolrooms which are bombarded by unwanted aircraft created decibels. When noise causes teachers to quit their jobs, the situation ob-

viously has become intolerable. Children, unlike teachers, cannot transfer or quit schools as easily. We must act now for the sake of the physical and mental well-being of our constituents, especially those who have no voice of their own. Education is too precious a commodity to be shortchanged due to legislative shortsightedness. The aforementioned inserts follow:

LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Lennox, Calif., June 11, 1969.

The Honorable CHARLES H. WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: One of most obvious and easily measured losses our pupils suffer from aircraft noise is the actual number, frequency, and length of disruptions due to commercial aircraft landing at Los Angeles International Airport.

A more subtle loss is the effect the noise has on the districts' recruitment and retention of quality teachers. Last week we had a request from a newly-employed first year teacher to be released from her 1969-70 contract. She stated she is afraid she will be unable to do her best work due to the disruptions. Attached is a copy of the resignation of another of our teachers effective at the close of the term.

These examples remind us that the actual time lost by pupils is not their only loss. Perhaps equally damaging is the danger of lessening of teacher quality in schools so affected.

We would appreciate being kept informed of the progress of your bill relating to this.

Yours truly,
H. W. COLBY, Ed. D.,
Superintendent.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 4, 1969.

To Whom It May Concern:

This year I have taught sixth grade at Jefferson school and on March 26th, I was offered a contract for next year with your district. I enjoy my job and have liked working with my colleagues and principal, but I find that the noise level from the jets is more than I can tolerate. These flying examples of progress can be damaging to hearing (how many times have I seen the children I teach quickly clamp their hands over their ears), and they constantly interrupt my teaching and the children's learning.

Because of these conditions, I must inform you that effective June 20th, the last day of this contract year, I will no longer be an employee of Lennox School District. I have signed a contract with Redondo Beach City School District. Had conditions been otherwise, I would have been very happy to remain a teaching member of your staff.

Sincerely,

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 7

Joint resolution relative to the effect of supersonic jet aircraft

Whereas, Sonic booms caused by supersonic flights of modern jet aircrafts have already caused extensive property damage and untold aesthetic harm; and

Whereas, The destructive capacity of sonic booms is attested to by the fact they have destroyed a substantial control tower and severely damaged houses; and

Whereas, There are presently under construction jet transports capable of speeds in excess of 1,000 miles per hour, which would produce sonic booms of a greater magnitude than those currently being produced and with consequently greater damage; and

Whereas, The Federal Aviation Agency estimates that there may be as many as 200 transcontinental flights daily by these planes

within a decade, subjecting many citizens to these supersonic booms 15 to 20 times a day; and

Whereas, It has also been estimated that property damages from these sonic booms may exceed one billion dollars a year, and cause increases in property insurance rates and taxes, besides causing untold psychological damage; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to comprehensively examine and review the contention of the Federal Aviation Agency and other authorities concerning the inevitability of the coming of the supersonic boom as an immutable condition in the lives of the citizens of California and the United States, and to take appropriate action to forestall any such eventuality with its possible catastrophic effects and determine what can be done to alleviate what could become the most offensive environmental blight of the 20th century; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

AMERICAN FLAG TO BE PLACED ON MOON BY APOLLO 11 ASTRO-NAUTS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have announced that the Apollo 11 astronauts will erect an American flag on the moon denoting our achievements in space.

Certainly this is fitting and appropriate, and in this connection I place in the RECORD herewith the letter from NASA announcing its plans, an editorial in the Chattanooga Times, and a letter to the editor of the Times by a distinguished scholar and philosopher, Dr. Martin Rywell, of Harriman, Tenn., who points out correctly that it is my honor and pleasure to directly represent citizens from both middle and east Tennessee in the Congress as both areas are now a part of the great Fourth Congressional District which I am honored to represent.

The letter and the news articles follow:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1969.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the recent hearings on NASA's budget request there was a discussion of symbols to be used in commemorating the first manned lunar landing.

I can now advise you that NASA's plans are to erect an American flag on the surface of the moon in the course of the Apollo 11 mission. We also plan to take and bring back from the moon an American flag for presentation to the Congress. Our final decisions on the symbolic articles to be taken

on the lunar mission and their disposition are, of course, subject to approval by the President.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT F. ALLNUTT,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative
Affairs.

[From the Chattanooga Times, June 12, 1959]

THE FLAG—THERE AND HERE

At least two American flags are going to the moon with the astronauts of Apollo 11, according to Rep. Joe L. Evins who is in a good position to know—the chairmanship of the House appropriations subcommittee which oversees funding for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA).

The Middle Tennessee congressman reports that one flag will be planted on the moon and the second one returned to earth for presentation to Congress.

No symbolic claim to the moon is involved in placing the American flag there. The gesture is simply one of what we consider pardonable pride in the realization of an historic goal.

Our own hope is that Apollo 11 will carry not two, but four flags. It would be highly appropriate and desirable, we believe, to place beside the U.S. flag on the moon the flag of the United Nations and to return a second U.N. flag to earth for presentation to the general assembly when it reconvenes. That could be this nation's way of acknowledging the works of scientists and scholars of many lands whose contributions have helped to make the moon mission possible.

We make these comments also by way of acknowledging National Flag Week here in earth's greatest country. Let all the standards be proudly unfurled on Flag Day next Saturday. Every family needs a flag. As these banners fly with the wind, and even as excitement escalates over the moon quest, let every American's deepest patriotic conscience be focused on the nation's obligation and its opportunities here at home: To rid America, morally in its own high self-interest, of racism and racial discrimination conscious or unconscious; to promote social justice in strong, sustained social action; to exorcise the twin curses of the extremes, right and left, that imperil the historic progress of us all.

[From the Chattanooga Times, June 14, 1969]

"FLAG, THERE AND HERE"

(By Dr. Martin Rywell)

I found your Editorial page though it was not listed in your index of June 12, 1969. I am a disciple rather than a reader of the Chattanooga Times and hope you have many more disciples. We forgive you your omissions and transgressions.

And you let us down in your editorial about the American Flag. We disciples are in Roane and Anderson county (Oak Ridge), a large part of your readership. You even have a circulation manager here. And don't forget Hamilton County was carved out of Roane County. We are proud of our Congressman Joe Evins. Therefore we resent your editorial description of Congressman Evins as the Middle Tennessee Congressman. His district takes in one-third of our state. Therefore we of East Tennessee urge that you give more publicity to Congressman Evins if you wish to cater to your readers and disciples.

As for your editorial contention that we add two U.N. flags to the moon flight, I, for one, think it uncalled for gesture. The U.S. financially maintain the U.N.; and its ineffectiveness is proven by U Thant's order to withdraw the U.N. troops and provoked the 6-Day War and its aftermath in the Middle East.

It is American technological skill and it is the daring of Americans that made the moon trip possible. We earned the right to proudly

plant our flag on the moon not as a conquest but as a peaceful venture. By what right has the U.N. flag earned such an honor!

NEWSPAPER EXPLAINS FARM STORY

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to place an artificial limit on farm program payments has been the subject of much emotional appeal unrelated to facts about farming and our Nation's farm program.

The issue is complicated, and the substitution of emotionalism for logic is a gross mistake with dire consequences for U.S. farm policy and will have severe effects on both large and small producers.

An informative account of the facts and figures relating to payments to farmers from the Department of Agriculture has been printed in the Colbert County, Ala., Reporter. I want to commend Mr. Dick McGrew, copublisher of the paper, for his excellent presentation of this complicated problem, and I include the article as a part of my remarks at this point:

[From the Colbert County (Ala.) Reporter, June 12, 1969]

COMPLETE STORY ON PRICE SUPPORT

(By Dick McGrew)

Farmers wouldn't take something for nothing, even if you stood there and gave it to 'em. And Colbert County farmers are no different either as a report in the Congressional Record and another North Alabama newspaper would lead you to believe.

The report of facts and figures relating to payments of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service leaves a lot to be said and even more to be desired. Bare figures fail to represent the true situation.

Most farmers, whose privacy was grossly invaded, would like to see the whole story told, but would fear to kick up the dust in view of further damage and embarrassment from those who have to have the last say, namely newspapers.

The report came from the Congressional Record, which at the request of Illinois Congressman Paul Findley, listed all farmers who received more than \$25,000 in federal farm payments during 1968.

A close examination of why the payments are ever made in the first place is in order: Colbert County farmers surveyed this week by the Colbert County Reporter were quick to point out that the payments are price support and not "subsidy."

It is costing the farmers far more than the 20-25 cents a pound just to produce his cotton. The parity price is set at 45 cents a pound; the government pays the farmer the difference between the support price (20 cents) and 65 percent of parity, provided that he does not exceed his allotted acreage in cotton planted.

The legislative reference service of the Library of Congress reports farm income in the absence of farm programs would drop so low as to bring about wholesale agricultural bankruptcy throughout the nation.

Land values, according to the studies, would deteriorate proportionately and the purchasing power of agriculture would be reduced so drastically that a national depression such as experienced in the 1920's, and

again in the 1930's, could well be brought about.

A 1967 USDA survey shows that more than 23 percent of the nation's cotton farmers received less for their cotton including all price support payments than the actual cost of production.

The ASCS farm program is aimed at curtailing the increasing surplus quantities of cotton while making sure the farmer stays in business. This method is far better than directing public tax funds to pay storage costs of surplus crops.

And it's not all the "poor ole farmer"; Colbert farmers told the Reporter this week they believed that the government is making up a cost that the public is failing to bear.

Ed Mauldin, who farms in both Colbert and Lawrence counties, explained the ASCS payments he received was distributed in part among more than 50 families, who participate in farming operations with him and others from whom he leased acreage. Tenant farmers get three-fourths of the payment based on the acreage they have planted.

The same report listed Mauldin having received \$154,966 in payments; the figure is believed to be in error.

The report published this week would have led most to believe that the farmers just stuck the bundles of public money in their hip pocket.

But that just isn't so. "It's not all take home," remarked R. Gordon Pruitt, a Tusculumbia, Rt. 4 cotton producer. Six families thrive off the economy of the Pruitt operation.

"I don't feel a bit sorry about getting mine. Everybody produces a product, puts prices on it and sells it in a store at a profit. When they support my product, we're just barely making a profit.

"They are not supporting the farmer, they are supporting the consumer," Pruitt explained.

W. E. and W. C. Reid of Cherokee said their farm operation carried over a loss of \$25,000 from the 1967 crop, another item not reflected in the report on the "poor ole farmer" image.

The Reids were reported to have received \$72,121 in ASCS payments while Pruitt received \$41,588.

With the price of American labor, it is impossible to produce cotton for 20 cents a pound, Pruitt said. "You can't compete paying \$1.15 and \$1.30 per hour with countries like India where they may be paying only 15 cents a day for their labor," he added.

Eilbert Reid said it cost their operation \$21,000 to buy and lease additional cotton acreage to be eligible for the ASCS payment, thus leaving \$51,000. Deduct the loss from the 1967 crop and the difference between the going market price and parity, and you have an empty pocket book, one that is eaten to threads in expense.

"I want the public to know that I'm not ashamed of this price support. It's not subsidy, it's the difference between the price you can sell cotton for and its actual worth," Reid commented, adding that parity is set at 45 cents a pound. He estimated cotton will bring only 23 cents a pound this year on the market.

"We've been spending \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year for 10 years getting this land in a state of cultivation," he said, citing another item not reflected in the figures published this week.

The Reids reported a yield of 980 pounds of lint cotton per acre last year. This year with the prevailing market level, the Reids face a loss of \$28,000 on the cotton they will sell.

More than \$200,000 of the \$1,434,928 in cotton payments was paid to farmers outside Colbert County in areas from where cotton allotments were transferred.

CXV—1007—Part 12

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC PROGRAMS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution for the purpose of creating a Joint Committee on Oceanic and Atmospheric Programs. The Congress has for some time now been cognizant of the great need for a concentration of effort to increase man's knowledge of the oceans and utilization of the resources which have been locked in the depths of the seas.

In 1966, the Congress passed the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act, which set forth the policy of the United States to develop and maintain a comprehensive, long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind. To further these objectives, the act established the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, composed of the Vice President of the United States and various Cabinet officers, to serve as a coordinating body. It also created a Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources to review existing programs and recommend a long-range national program for the United States.

The Commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. Julius A. Stratton, submitted its report entitled "Our Nation and the Sea" to Congress early this year. The report is a truly monumental analysis of the manifold challenges facing the United States. It analyzes in detail our present national capability for the exploration and utilization of our global marine environment and sets forth over one hundred recommendations to implement a national program.

The Subcommittee on Oceanography, of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under the leadership of our distinguished colleague from North Carolina (Mr. LENNON) is now conducting hearings to analyze each of the Commission's recommendations. Many distinguished spokesman from private industry and the academic community have testified before our subcommittee, and with few exceptions have overwhelmingly endorsed the recommendations of the Commission.

The principal recommendation—perhaps the cornerstone of our future efforts in the field of marine science—calls for the establishment of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency to unify the activities of those Federal departments and bureaus which are most intimately concerned with the future growth of marine science and technology.

As a corollary to this agency, the Commission has also recommended the establishment of a National Advisory Committee for the Oceans composed of individuals drawn from outside the Federal Government and broadly representative of the Nation's marine and atmospheric interests. This committee would

serve in an advisory capacity to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, the President and the Congress.

The Commission has rightly pointed out that the organization of Congress, as well as the executive branch, does not now reflect a clear realization that the development of our oceanic frontiers requires a unified, coherent approach. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there are at least eight committees of the House, and an equal number in the other body, which are concerned with aspects of marine science. There are at least 21 Federal agencies likewise concerned with our oceanic programs which report to one or more of these various committees. We must recognize and come to grips with the fact that there are areas of national concern which are so broad in scope that they cannot be dealt with piecemeal or by fragmenting them among different legislative committees.

If we are to implement the declaration of policy of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act, it can only be done through a realignment of the traditional spheres of legislative oversight. The varied activities which interrelate in the effort to expand knowledge of our marine environment must be focused within one or at least a minimum of legislative committees.

I have studied a variety of approaches to this problem and have concluded that the most direct and expeditious means of achieving this realignment would be through the establishment of a joint committee similar in organization to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

The Commission's report, as well as witnesses before the Subcommittee on Oceanography, has stressed the need for a "mission oriented" agency which will devote its energy exclusively to the fields of marine and atmospheric science. The success of this concept, which I endorse, will depend to a great extent upon the ability of the Congress to keep in step with the rapid expansion of basic knowledge and technology in these fields.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, of the difficulties involved in severing traditional areas of jurisdiction from standing committees. However, the challenge of inner space is no less important than that of outer space. Indeed its potential is of far greater significance to the immediate needs of mankind. I am confident, therefore, that the Congress will recognize this need for a departure from narrowly defined committee jurisdictions.

The jurisdiction of the proposed joint committee as stated in my resolution is admittedly broad and lacking in specifics. The framework is there, however, ready to be filled in. Thus, when the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency is created, the jurisdiction of this committee should be amended to expressly encompass that organization.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the term "atmospheric" as employed in my resolution. The report of the Commission on Marine Science clearly demonstrates the fact that the oceans and the atmosphere surrounding the earth are a single environmental system upon which man is heavily dependent.

Hurricanes, for example, can only arise from tropical oceans. Weather is an oceanic phenomenon whether you are in the middle of the Atlantic or farming the plains of our Midwest. Progress in long-range weather prediction will only be achieved through the development of marine and atmospheric science on an equal, integrated basis. For this reason, a failure to unite these two basic areas would be a serious flaw.

In offering this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will renew their commitment to a long-range national program in marine and atmospheric science.

REPORT TO THE SEVENTH (MISSOURI) CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this week I will place in the mail my report to the people of the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri.

My letter will deal with the problems facing our Nation at this time, and the new administration's order of priorities to deal with them. I insert this letter at this point in the RECORD:

The first 100 days of the new Administration have come and gone, and the deliberate, contemplative pace has been in sharp contrast to the brash, pellmell, spending spree that marked the beginning of the "credibility gap" of a few years ago. If nothing else, it has proved, that lightning speed is no criterion for legislative achievement.

The measured pace of this Administration has been keyed by the desire to put "first things first." To develop a set of priorities, give the priorities the careful and considerate attention they should have, to insure their soundness and workability, then submit them to the Congress for action.

After a recent talk with the President, I am convinced that action, in the form of legislation, will be dealt with in the following manner:—

PRIORITY NO. 1—PEACE

The President has put peace with honor in Vietnam at the very top of the list of priorities. He has made it clear that the United States is ready and willing to negotiate a mutual withdrawal of all foreign troops. The peace talks in Paris are slow and tedious, but appear to be taking on a more positive attitude. Soon the South Vietnamese forces will be able to take on more of their own defenses, and when that occurs, we can expect to see the beginning of a withdrawal of some American troops. The President is handling this effort personally, and is optimistic!

PRIORITY NO. 2—INFLATION

The present inflationary spiral, now in its fourth year, represents a National self-indulgence that we can no longer afford. We cannot stop inflation by just simply printing more money, or by raising more taxes. There is only one way, as any housewife can tell you, and that is to operate from a balanced budget. Income will have to be more than outgo. An unchecked "joy ride" could end in unemployment and financial distress for millions. I believe the budget will be brought into true balance with income in Fiscal 1970 and we will pay on our debt in Fiscal 1971.

PRIORITY NO. 3—CRIME

Crime cannot be eliminated by loud voices and good intentions. It can only be contained by carefully conceived and well executed "action" plans. The Department of Justice, headed by Attorney General John Mitchell, is setting into motion plans to assist in the formation of State-wide units to help investigate and prosecute crime. It takes time to invoke proper and complete enforcement. It is my hope that soon Americans will once again be able to walk the streets at night without the constant fear for their lives. I believe that people respect the law, according to its enforcement.

The President and the Attorney General have also made it clear that violence and anarchy can no longer be tolerated on the campuses of the Nation's colleges. If the college administrators cannot set their houses in order, there are Members of the Congress who are ready to take further legislative action. Certainly there is beginning to be a change for the better in the Supreme Court, so that before long the Judiciary can and will again back the constabulary.

PRIORITY NO. 4—WELFARE

The Office of Economic Opportunity is being completely revamped to meet the needs of today. Many bad programs are being eliminated and the good ones retained and strengthened. The Job Corps and other less successful projects will be reorganized and placed in more appropriate agencies, or done away with entirely. The Head Start Program has been moved into the Department of Education and placed in a newly created Office of Child Development. Reorganization and consolidation is important and relates to numbers 2 and 3 above.

PRIORITY NO. 5—PORNOGRAPHY

Three new proposals have been suggested to the Congress. The first would be to prohibit the sending of sex materials to any child or teenager under 18. The second would prohibit the sending of advertising designed to appeal to a prurient interest in sex. It would apply regardless of the age of the recipient. The third measure complements the second by providing added protection from the kind of smut advertising now being mailed, unsolicited, into many homes. I have personally submitted legislation to the House of Representatives (H.R. 11134) to carry out these proposals.

Soon I will be mailing out my annual questionnaire. It will be sent to people all over the Seventh Congressional District asking their views on the vital issues facing the Nation today. It will greatly assist me in properly representing you.

I am sure that there is no greater wish in the hearts and minds of every citizen of our great Country than, that the Vietnam War may be ended with a just and honorable peace. President Nixon and his Administration are doing everything in their power to see that this is done. In my next campaign for re-election to Congress, it is my sincere hope that it can be based on the issues of a Nation at peace with the World, and we will "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility," and again "promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to our selves and our posterity."

TODAY'S COLLEGE STUDENTS

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, today's news media seem to take some sort of pleasure in presenting to us all the news that is dreary, disturbing, and unap-

pealing. More and more we hear the comment, "There doesn't seem to be any 'good' news anymore."

This especially seems to hold true when we read news about the young generation of Americans now attending colleges and universities.

I am pleased, therefore, to bring to the attention of my colleagues a little piece of "good" news about some college students in my 24th District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD the following short article from Nation's Business magazine of June 1969:

STUDENTS WHO DO NOT MAKE HEADLINES

It's high time somebody investigated the unconventional behavior of students at tiny Thiel College in Greenville, Pennsylvania.

A group of Phi Theta Phi fraternity brothers staged a walkathon through more than a dozen nearby communities and raised \$1,630 which they donated to Children's Hospital in nearby Pittsburgh.

The Chi Omega sorority sisters have adopted a Navajo Indian girl in New Mexico and contribute to her support. At Christmas time they sing carols at the St. Paul Home for the Aging.

Thiel students raised almost \$1,000 for college-related charities and local Community Chest. They are regular donors at the Greenville Hospital Blood Bank.

Each week a group of Thiel students visits St. Paul Children's Home to tutor orphans. The Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity house is the scene of an annual Christmas party for these youngsters.

Students teach Sunday evening parish classes at St. Michael's Church. In the summer they paint, repair and do odd jobs in Greenville community centers to help create a better atmosphere for local youngsters.

FLAG DAY

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday was Flag Day throughout the Nation, and I was pleased to see so many of our citizens displaying Old Glory to commemorate the day. Earlier this year, my colleague, Congressman WALTER FLOWERS of Alabama's Fifth District, delivered an address at a flag dedication ceremony in Fairfield, Ala. I found his remarks to be most appropriate, and I would like to insert them in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY HON. WALTER FLOWERS

We are gathered to dedicate an American flag—Old Glory—to the memory of those American servicemen who have been killed and wounded in our country's service in Viet Nam—and to those brave men who are still protecting our freedom—yours and mine—by their presence there today.

This is a most appropriate action, for the flag is the symbol of our country, of our freedom and of our citizenship. The thirteen stripes tell of our past glories, and the fifty stars of our present greatness. Together, their combination tells of our historic continuity and our political oneness.

The flag means freedom, and when fused into our kind of political system, it means democracy. And in a democracy the individual is all important. A democracy has no other purpose—no other reason—than to give men, women, and children the freedom to live their lives according to their own choice; provided, my friends, that the choice

does not interfere with its proper exercise by others.

If one were intent upon "softening up" a nation in order to make inroads in its traditions and undermine its democratic institutions, it would be logical to begin by undermining a nation's love and respect for its symbols, and especially its love and respect for its flag.

This has happened more recently than we would like to think, when our flag has been dragged through streets, trampled upon and burned. Those who do this to our national banner seek to degrade the very foundations of our country, to dishonor our heritage, and to tread upon its institutions.

35,000 fine, loyal American servicemen have made the supreme sacrifice in Viet Nam. Every week the Defense Department sends members of Congress a list of the latest casualties by name and address. It is a sad thing to see page after page reflecting bright hopes now gone—promising futures now destroyed—happy homes now darkened. It is heartbreaking to pick up the phone and the voice at the other end of the line back in Alabama says, "Congressman, we just got a telegram from the Defense Department—it says 'our son has been killed', or its says, 'My husband is missing in action', or it says, 'Our son has been wounded'. Can you get us more information?"

Whenever I see Old Glory flying proudly in the breeze, I know that these men are dying for me and they are dying for you, and they are dying so that our flag may continue to fly for the finest and the fairest and the freest nation on this earth.

There have been occasions when patriotism, or Americanism, has been derided and made "fun of". It has been hinted that our traditions come from the horse and buggy days; that we cannot be progressive and at the same time be patriotic.

That is one reason why all of our national holidays are important; one reason why flag dedications, such as this one, are important. Patriotism and Americanism are not outmoded. Be proud of our flag and what it represents.

Look at it often and remember what a great price has been paid to bring our nation this far in history. And most important of all, remember what it will take to keep it flying over the "land of the free and the home of the brave".

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ENGAGE IN FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, for appropriate reference, a bill that will hopefully transform an otherwise inhospitable area of my district into an oasis of productivity. This measure which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility investigation of the potential Amargosa project is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague from Nevada, as the program it covers lies partly in that State and in California.

The Bureau of Reclamation completed a reconnaissance survey on this project in 1968 and determined that large quantities of high quality groundwater un-

derlie about 93,000 acres of irrigable land in the Amargosa Valley. The study further shows that a project of about 21,000 could be successfully developed from this water supply and that sufficient water would remain to supply the community needs that would arise when the irrigation is developed.

Our information indicates that the lands are suited to a wide range of highly specialized crops that can be grown only in the long growing season of the valleys of the Pacific Southwest. Moreover, the construction would be relatively inexpensive by current day standards, in that the entire undertaking would cost less than \$9 million. The benefit-cost ratio is an outstanding 3.6, indicating this to be one of the more favorable opportunities to come before us in recent times.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of the Members to this most worthwhile program and confidently hope that they will support its authorization when the committee brings the bill to the floor.

WILSON PRAISES INVENTIVENESS AND DEDICATION OF CENSUS BUREAU EMPLOYEES

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been just a few short months since I had the honor to be elected chairman of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. They have been busy months, both for myself and the other members of the subcommittee. We have learned much about the Census Bureau and its statistical programs. We have visited the Bureau, spoken with its employees and officials, toured its facilities, and have been much impressed with the dedication and inventiveness of its personnel.

It is in reference to this latter point I wish to talk today. At some time in the near future, I will address this body again regarding the 1970 Censuses of Population and Housing—a controversial subject on which the subcommittee is currently holding hearings. I do wish to make clear, however, that the hearings on the 1970 census are in no way a reflection on the professional competence and dedication of the Bureau's personnel. They are a group of people which any agency could be proud to have on its employment roster.

As is true of all of us when engaging in areas in which our knowledge is not that of the expert, we tend to overlook the "intermediate process." The telephone dial connects us with the world; the letter we drop into the mailbox somehow reaches its destination; and each individual census questionnaire is automatically transformed into a statistical report.

If we think about it, even momentarily, we realize that these things do not hap-

pen by themselves, that a complex and sophisticated management and technical control must be developed before the input to a system becomes usable output.

In my opinion, the Census Bureau has done a particularly noteworthy and outstanding job in the development of the techniques and equipment needed to handle its "intermediate processes." Nor am I referring to electronic computers, even though the Census Bureau back in 1950, was among the very first of Government agencies to install an electronic computer system.

Let me describe a few of these machines, all of which have been patented in the name of the U.S. Government, and give proper recognition to the gifted employees of the Census Bureau who were responsible for their development. It is indeed a tribute to Mr. A. Ross Eckler, the distinguished Director of the Bureau of the Census, that, under his direction, not only has the development of new electronic data processing equipment been encouraged, but a climate has been maintained which has led the inventors to remain with the Census Bureau when, I am sure, they could have gotten jobs with private industry at substantial increases in salary.

I am giving a brief description of the equipment which so favorably impressed the subcommittee.

THE 1970 CENSUS AUTOMATIC MICROFILMING MACHINE

This wonderful machine automatically photographs the 1970 census questionnaires to provide the microfilm input to the census computers. A unique feature of the machine is its page-turning device which makes possible the automatic microfilming of each page of the multi-page census questionnaire.

The persons responsible for the development of the automatic microfilming machine, together with a brief description of their individual contribution, are:

Mr. Anthony A. Berlinsky, chief, Engineering Development Laboratory—for great ingenuity in conceiving and developing the basic design of this unique paper-handling and microfilming equipment and for outstanding leadership of his staff in implementing its design, testing, and construction.

Mr. Robert J. Varson, assistant chief, Engineering Development Laboratory—for valuable service as assistant project leader in all phases of design, testing, and construction of this equipment and for especially important contributions to the development of the electronic logic employed in it.

Mr. Martin J. Brennan, electronic technician—for designing electronic control circuitry and paper detection systems essential to effective coordination of the machine's paper-handling and microfilming functions.

Mr. Gordon W. Pearson, mechanical engineering technician—for designing mechanical page-turning and paper-feeding devices.

Mr. Ignatius N. Bellavin, electronic technician—for adapting camera units to the unusually demanding requirements of this high-speed microfilming equipment.

Mr. Niles S. Blackwell, assistant foreman, Mechanical Laboratory—for design of paper-stacking devices and planning for mechanical fabrication and assembly procedures.

FOSDIC 70, FILM OPTICAL SCANNING DEVICE FOR INPUT TO COMPUTERS

This fascinating electronic machine reads the microfilm copy of the 1970 census questionnaire and produces the computer tape from which the various census statistical reports are tabulated. It has replaced a massive key punch operation eliminating the preparation of hundreds of millions of IBM cards.

The persons responsible for the development of FOSDIC 70, together with a brief description of their individual contribution, are:

Mr. McRae Anderson, chief, Engineering Research Branch—for outstanding inventiveness in personally conceiving, designing, and supervising assembly of the FOSDIC 70 system—a contribution that resulted in a Bureau cost reduction of \$2 million for the 1970 Census.

Mr. William M. Gaines, assistant division chief for engineering—for effectiveness in general support and direction of the development of FOSDIC 70 and planning for its timely installation and maintenance.

Mr. Leighton M. Greenough, chief, Optical Measurement Laboratory, National Bureau of Standards—for developing specifications for the cathode ray tube assembly and optical assembly on FOSDIC 70 and consulting services on document design, filming processes, and film scanning techniques.

Mr. James R. LeFevre, electronic technician—for providing detailed machine drawings, working from rough sketches, for all parts manufactured for the FOSDIC 70 system.

Mr. Carl W. Walker, electronic engineer—for contributions in testing and modifying the prototype FOSDIC 70 system.

Mr. John E. Forkish, electronic technician—for expediting construction of production models of FOSDIC 70.

MAP AREA COMPUTER AND COORDINATE LOCATOR

These sophisticated machines, developed especially to meet the geographic and mapping requirements of the 1970 Census, automatically calculate land area and compute and display geographic coordinates for any specified map segment.

The persons responsible for the development of the map area computer and coordinate locator, together with a brief description of their individual contribution, are:

Messrs. Berlinsky and Brennan, whose major contributions to the 1970 model automatic microfilming machine have been cited, also played leading roles in the design and development of this special equipment for the Bureau's Geography Division.

Mr. William T. Fay, chief, Geography Division—for recognizing potential applications of equipment, establishing basic design requirements, and working most effectively with technical personnel toward successful development and mod-

ification of equipment to meet Bureau needs.

Mr. Ben E. Kappes, assistant chief, Electronic Laboratory—for electrical construction and modifications of coordinate locator machine.

Mr. Jean D. Domingue, machinist—for mechanical design and construction of sensing units and mechanical packaging of electronic components of coordinate locator machine.

There is no question, but that dedicated and hard work on the part of many people has been the essential ingredients of the highly successful equipment development program of the Census Bureau.

But to the Census Bureau, equipment development is but one part of its charter. Dedication, hard work, and professional competence on the part of all its employees has achieved for the Census Bureau its major goal of providing the United States with the finest statistical system in the world.

As chairman of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee, I am proud to be a part of the Census Bureau family and I take great pleasure in being able to commend the Census Bureau and its personnel. It is one of the finest agencies of the Federal Government. With the help of this great legislative body it will continue to be the premier statistical organization.

SMALL INVESTORS "PENALIZED" BY CURRENT SAVINGS BOND INTEREST RATE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 my colleague, the Honorable ROBERT MICHEL, of Illinois, introduced H.R. 7015. This bill, which would give the President the authority to raise the interest rate on series E Government bonds from the present ceiling of 4.25 percent to a new ceiling of 5 percent, is an extremely important piece of legislation. As Mr. MICHEL has repeatedly pointed out, recently there have been far larger amounts of series E bonds cashed in by the public than bought for the future.

Many people in my own district in Wisconsin have written to me about this. They wonder why such bonds have a return rate below that of commercial banks or other Government securities which are available to only large investors. The answer is simple. The present rate was fixed by law way back in 1917 when interest rates in general were lower. To make the investment in Government bonds attractive to the small investor, the interest rate on them must be increased. Presently we are literally penalizing those patriotic citizens who do buy series E bonds.

Today I am introducing a companion bill to H.R. 7015. It is my hope that Congress will act promptly in this area. The interest rate change proposed in these

two bills is the least which should be done. Hopefully, the administration will also propose change in this area. Until then, though, I feel Congress would be wise in taking preliminary action to equalize the interest rate available to both small and large investors in Government securities and between series E bonds and the commercial market. By doing this, financial investment in our Nation's future will be aided, not hindered as is presently the case.

STUDENT UNREST ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the latter part of May, 22 Republican Members of the House divided into groups of three and four to gage the depth of student unrest on some 50 college campuses across the country and to investigate the cause of the underlying problems.

Although the White House was not responsible for their trip, the President is to be commended for calling some of the Congressmen to the White House after their trip and to request that they compile a full report for him.

It is quite clear from their preliminary account that the congressional group found student unrest to be rooted in fundamental causes not necessarily provoked by "outside agitators."

One month earlier, a Member of the other body from my State, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, toured 11 college campuses, 10 of them in Illinois. The Senator did not make the trip to inspect the damage of student rioting; indeed, at only one of the 11 campuses had there been any overt student action against the administration.

Nevertheless, the Senator found that the situation on the campuses was far from what it should be. And it was apparent that administrators, trustees, faculties, public officials, and members of the surrounding business community all have a role to play in the problems that abound on campuses and, hopefully, will now play a role in solving them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD Senator PERCY's remarks at Western Illinois University, Macomb, which deal with the question of student unrest, as well as a series of articles published in the Rockford Morning Star written by Steve Blain, an able reporter who accompanied the Senator on his tour:

PRELUDE TO A BETTER WORLD

I am here because I deeply feel that we must try to work together to rekindle in ourselves and all Americans the embers of mutual care and concern for our fellow man.

If that task is within our power to achieve, it is because your generation, as it appears to me for the most part, is more humane, more concerned with personal honesty and has a more basic commitment to unselfish purposes than any previous generation in modern times.

For in the new generation on campus there is a long-delayed and vitally needed reaction against the impersonality and arbitrary quality of our social institutions—the big university, big government and the mass media. It is not surprising that this feeling carries over into a general disaffection with the size and the impersonality of the world beyond the campus. Too much appears to reach us these days in mega-packages: megaopolis, megatons and even megadeaths.

To a degree perhaps unsurpassed by any previous generation in modern times, the students of today are painfully seeking to experience first-hand a meaningful relationship between learning and life.

The student of today legitimately is seeking a larger say in university affairs. And faculty and administrators on the campus—not without some pain—are beginning to realize in ever greater numbers that students—along with themselves, the alumni and the surrounding community—do have a proper role to play in charting the course of university programs and policies.

On dozens of campuses across the land, lawful student protests have brought in their wake a healthy and overdue re-examination of administrative and faculty policies. Unhappily, extreme tactics, violence, disruption and flagrant disrespect for the rights of others has at times undermined trust and broken communication between the students and the world-at-large.

I believe changes are needed. I believe protests are needed. For at the heart of most campus protest is an underlying legitimate grievance. *But I also believe that protest to be effective must be responsible.*

We live in a nation in which freedom of dissent is absolutely fundamental and essential. But we also live in a nation in which respect for law and order with justice is embedded in the cornerstone of our democratic society. These twin principles—dissent and protest, law and justice—are not contradictory. They are complimentary for one without the other would undermine our free institutions: our universities, our press, our government.

Recent uprisings in the the universities are not unrelated to uprisings in the ghettos. For these are the two main areas of life where the conventional styles of American politics have patently failed. The student alienated from his campus has much in common with the ghetto youth alienated from his city. Both suffer from an inability as individuals to materially influence institutions than can better or worsen their lives.

Happily, there are many in the student generation, just as in the new black generation, who believe that change is possible in American life.

I think yours is a generation that is fully capable of reviving our democratic institutions and breathing new meaning into them. At the same time, I do not believe that either on a campus or in the ghetto lawlessness and violence are a necessary prelude to change.

Despite the potential present in the new generation, each young man and each young woman must choose his or her own way.

Doubtlessly, some will remain apathetic, unresponsive and unconcerned with the challenges that surround us; occupied with merely the most superficial aspects of social success.

Meantime, others will embark upon and continue an inward retreat from the pressures of society and perhaps ultimately adopt life-styles that are dependent on drugs and couched in escapism.

The road is open and the choice is yours. Today, I would address myself to those who are discontent with things as they are and, finding the world far from perfect, would attempt to lead the new generation to a new understanding of social responsibility. My words are addressed to the activists and, yes, the protestors, who would react to a troubled world not by turning their backs to its problems but by coming to grips

with them. I speak today to those who believe with me that change is possible in our society and those who would do their part in bringing about a better world.

For I firmly believe that we have reached a crossroads in American life and that it is largely up to the new generation—the young, the ambitious, the educated and the committed—to determine what new path we shall embark upon from here.

The basic problem in our society is not its inability to change. It is rather our inability to order that change in a way that yields the greatest good for our people.

Now in a nation founded upon a Jeffersonian agricultural tradition, three-fourths of our people live on 10 per cent of the land. Nearly 20 million American have moved into urban areas—just in the last two decades. On each coast and in our midwestern heartland these changes have often created the kind of congestion in which it is difficult to move around, to get to work, to get home and, quite literally, even to breathe. Simply stated, our cities are where we live and their problems must be solved.

At the same time, 80 per cent of our population is sharing the great prosperity of the post-war years while 20 per cent is not. Poverty and lack of opportunity in America, and the frustrations these conditions produce among our people, continue to undermine our economic order and to gnaw at our sense of social justice. Something simply has to be done about better housing, quality education, opportunity to work at meaningful jobs and good nutrition for all of our people.

America is simply not spending enough of her material resources where they should rightfully go. Our economic problem is no longer to find ways to create and preserve wealth: it is rather to find ways of distributing our abundance in a more reasonable and responsible way. In fact, our sense of spending priorities needs to be shaken up.

We spend as much for chewing gum as for model cities.

We spend as much on pet food as we do on food stamps to feed the poor and the hungry.

We spend as much on hair dye as we do for grants to provide for urban mass transport.

We spend as much on cigarettes as government at all levels spends for higher education.

Our failures to sensibly allocate our wealth are just as glaring in the expenditure of tax dollars as in the private sector.

Why should we spend nearly \$3 billion a year in farm subsidies—two-thirds of which goes not to the poor but to the more affluent farmers?

Why should we provide for a military budget of more than \$80 billion to prepare for every conceivable battle on every conceivable battlefield—when most of us are more deeply concerned about the threat to our security at home than some external threat, serious as it might be.

Our problems are not only economic; they are social and spiritual as well. At a time of unprecedented material affluence in the United States, the Harris Poll reveals that more than 33 million Americans regard themselves as alienated from the mainstream of our society.

Many are poor. Many are black. Many never went to school beyond the eighth grade. But the problem of alienation in our society runs deeper than merely the special problems of the disadvantaged.

In a cross-section of American society, most of those polled—54 per cent—believe that "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer in America. Some 42 per cent believe that "what I think does not count very much: and 36 per cent believe that "people running the country don't really care what happens to people like me."

So I would ask the college student of to-

day: what, if anything, do you propose to do about this situation?

You are without a doubt one of the most privileged group of citizens of a rich and powerful nation: university students in a world where two-fifths of mankind can still neither read nor write.

As our President has said, we are approaching the limits of what government can do alone. In his Inaugural Address, the President said: "Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government to enlist the energies of the concerned and the committed."

It does not fully serve our national purpose merely to levy taxes and to enact massive Federal programs. Despite unprecedented spending, millions of Americans are still angry, frustrated, alienated and unfulfilled.

Shall we turn our backs on their despair? Shall we say to ourselves that our obligations end with a welfare check?

An investment in person-to-person social work—volunteers seeking to show people how to budget their time, their energies and their funds more intelligently would provide a human return for society.

How many here could help? How many are capable of making an effort in a direct and personal way in caring about the fate of our fellow human beings? To help strengthen and enrich just one human life could be a source of immense satisfaction to every person here.

How many of you here could spend two or three free afternoons a week tutoring a boy or girl who without that extra effort probably would never get to go to college?

How many businessmen could provide study courses for workers whose present lack of reading skills erases whatever chance they might have for advancement?

How many housewives could shop and prepare meals for elderly shut-ins?

How many imaginative young people could fashion practical programs for aiding hard-core unemployed in our ghettos?

All these volunteer tasks are within our ability to perform if we would look outside ourselves at the problems that surround us and then make the extra effort.

Moreover, I believe that the Federal government could play a useful role in catalyzing and shaping student involvement in community affairs.

I would like to see a coordinated program of Federal grants to colleges and universities for the specific purpose of developing models of community action programs. New curriculums in the social sciences would be accompanied by laboratory work in urban planning, housing, air pollution, traffic control, tutorial work and so forth.

If we can spend millions to build new classrooms and laboratories for the colleges, if we can finance scientific studies on campus that lead to better health and a better understanding of the world around us, then we can also put some of our resources in utilizing these skills and energies of our campuses in community action efforts.

In these ways, we may in time put to work the huge potential energies of a restless young America. The Peace Corps and the domestic VISTA program have shown us the way.

Now every service club, every business and trade association, every church, every parent-teacher group and, most particularly, every campus must ask itself what can we do in the way of providing a better spiritual and material life for all Americans.

If you decide to make that extra effort—here and today—I know that together we can succeed.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, Apr. 28, 1969]

PERCY: FIRST JUSTICE, THEN LAW, ORDER
(By Steve Blain)

PEORIA.—Law and order will not be established in this country until the present in-

justices are eliminated. U.S. Sen. Charles H. Percy told a group of Bradley University students today.

"American society today is unjust and hypocritical as to the promises this country offers and the realities that exist," Percy said. Percy spoke in response to a question from one of the student leaders who asked about his stand on the law and order issue.

"Law and order means different things to different people," Percy said. "To the affluent, it means protecting their property. But to the poor, it's their enemy. This is why I say there must be law and order with justice."

Percy is on the third day of a five-day, nine college tour of Illinois campuses. He arrived at Bradley at about 10 a.m. today and was scheduled to go to Western Illinois University, Macomb, this afternoon.

On a trip billed as a non-political, Percy is seeking student opinions on state and national issues as well as asking questions of his own.

VIETNAM WAR

Percy sat in on an informal discussion this morning with about 25 student leaders at Bradley. Questions covered a broad variety of topics, but concentrated, along with law and order, on the war in Vietnam and student protests on campus.

A Bradley student said construction is going on at the Peoria campus using federal funds, but it has been discovered that construction unions working on the job use discriminatory membership policies. The student asked Percy that if all other methods of protesting against the unions' policies are unsuccessful, Percy would condone a student take-over of the building to stop construction.

"As a lawmaker, I can't suggest that you break laws," Percy said, "But there are other means of voicing your wishes, such as picketing. I urge your steps be lawful as possible but if you do break laws, make it clear you are willing to pay the price."

Percy said the issue brought up by the student is "an area of great need in this country; the right of a person to hold a job."

UNIONS MUST ACT

Our barriers are being broken down in the employment of minority groups. Percy said, but trade unions must be willing to open their membership lists to all.

Percy has already appeared at Illinois College, Jacksonville, and attended a meeting of Vista and Peace Corps alumni Sunday at the Center for Continuing Education at the University of Chicago.

On Tuesday, he will appear at Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, and Southern Illinois University campuses at Edwardsville and Carbondale. He will be at Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, and DePaul University, Chicago, on Wednesday.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, Apr. 29, 1969]

PERCY GOES BACK TO SCHOOL TO GET STUDENT'S OPINIONS (By Steve Blain)

MACOMB.—U.S. Sen. Charles Percy is conducting his own poll on student's opinion regarding national issues while on his tour of Illinois college campuses.

Students at Bradley University, Peoria, and Western Illinois University here are in general agreement that there should be a gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, that a decision should be deferred on installation of the ABM system and that Negroes are still deserving of more rights.

Percy visited Bradley and Western Illinois Universities on the third day of the flying tour of college campuses in the state.

INFORMAL SESSIONS

While he delivered a formal address to the Western Illinois student body Monday

afternoon, the bulk of Percy's day consisted of give-and-take sessions, first with selected groups of student leaders and then with assemblies of the student bodies.

Bradley students voiced concern over major issues such as the war in Vietnam, campus uprisings and racial discrimination. Western Illinois students, however, in the meeting between student leaders and Percy, cited clashes of interest between the school and the town of Macomb.

At student assemblies at both universities, Percy asked for a show of hands on several major issues.

At both universities, the larger majority of students favored a negotiated peace in Vietnam with the gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops.

ABM OPPOSED

The large majority at both schools favored deferring a decision on the ABM until it is determined if negotiations can be established with Russia. This is a position Percy favors in opposition to the Nixon administration which wants to install the system now.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, Apr. 30, 1969]

PERCY URGES ESCALATION OF HUNGER WAR (By Steve Blain)

CARBONDALE.—U.S. Sen. Charles H. Percy, R-Ill., called Tuesday for a complete revision of the nation's approach to feeding the hungry which includes lowering of the price of food stamps and in some cases eliminating the cost of the stamps.

"There are thousands of men, women and children in America—some not very far away from where we sit—for whom hunger is an ever-present experience," Percy said.

Percy spoke Tuesday night to a student assembly at Southern Illinois University here, it was his third appearance of the day on an Illinois college campus.

Present remedies to combat hunger, such as the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities, the food-stamp program and school lunches have been helpful, Percy said, "but we know that they have been only partially effective in some cases."

And hunger, Percy said, is only one of several symptoms such as inadequate housing and lack of medical care and education that "make up the syndrome which we call poverty."

Concentrating almost completely on the need to feed the nation's hungry, Percy said the surplus and commodity program at best reaches only about six million of the country's estimated 27 million poor.

"The school lunch program is equally deficient," Percy said. "Only two million of the six million poor children in school receive free lunches."

Among suggestions made by Percy regarding revision of the food-stamp program were:

—Lowering the price of the stamps and in some cases eliminating the price completely.

—Weekly stamp sales instead of the present policy of monthly stamp sales.

—Establishing more convenient distribution points and providing transportation.

—Making eligibility requirements less severe.

"In a modest way, students on campus can join in the war on hunger," Percy said. "Young men and women at this and at other universities can help make a change in these conditions by working voluntarily to educate hungry people to what programs are available and how their small resources might best be used to provide them with the best possible diet."

"I can think of two instances where we have committed ourselves as a nation to goals which, although important, fail to contain the high human values of a national war on hunger," Percy said. "One was putting a man

in space and the other was creation of our modern system of superhighways. Each required resources equivalent to or more than would be needed to eliminate hunger. Both are being successfully accomplished."

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, Apr. 30, 1969]

NEGRO COLLEGE STUDENTS AIR COMPLAINTS

EDWARDSVILLE.—Negro students at Southern Illinois University campuses at Edwardsville and Carbondale said they have difficulty in feeling allegiance to their schools and asked for more Negro teachers, administrators and courses in black history.

The Negro students were among several who spoke to U.S. Sen. Charles H. Percy, R-Ill., Tuesday during Percy's tour of Illinois college campuses.

In a question and answer session at a student assembly on the Edwardsville campus Negro students told Percy "We have listened to many leaders and heard many dialogues and this is good, but the problem is America has betrayed the blacks. We appreciate you (Percy) coming here to listen to us but just being here is not enough. You have to go back to Washington and other places and spread the word."

At a dinner Tuesday evening on the Carbondale campus, at which student leaders were invited to express their views, a Negro girl said more black teachers would add another dimension to the educational process.

"White teachers speak from their standpoint," she said. "And it would broaden both white and Negro students' experience to learn from black teachers."

WHITE TEACHER

A black history course is taught at the Carbondale campus, the girl said, but the instructor is white.

"He (the teacher) doesn't know how it feels or what it means to be black, the girl said." He just sits there and reads the textbook aloud. That's not relevant to me."

A white administrator at the dinner contended there is no such thing as a white viewpoint or a Negro viewpoint.

The girl said there are different viewpoints because of living conditions and environment.

"There are just the color white, the color black, the color brown and the color yellow," the man said.

"And there are white neighborhoods and black neighborhoods and you know the difference," the girl said.

At Edwardsville, a Negro student was critical of what he termed the federal government's policy of "setting up a multi-million-dollar program and putting a Negro in charge of it who has only a high school or junior high school education. He won't be able to handle the program, of course, and when he flops all Negroes are blamed."

There are about 300 Negro students out of about 10,000 students on the Edwardsville campus and about 1,700 Negroes out of 19,000 on the Carbondale campus.

Percy appeared at Edwardsville Tuesday afternoon, and Carbondale Tuesday night after a morning appearance at Eastern Illinois University in Charleston.

Percy said in Charleston that a program of guaranteed jobs is "much more logical than a guaranteed annual wage which might destroy a person's incentive."

TRAINING PROGRAMS

Giving tax credits to businesses which use on-the-job training programs would involve the private sector in solving the unemployment problem, he said.

Such a program would be similar to the GI Bill of Rights under which veterans gained education and training.

After his comments, Percy participated in a panel discussion with six Eastern students which included some questions from the audience.

One panel member questioned Percy's proposal that tax money in the form of credit to business be used.

NATIONAL PROBLEM

"I think it's a national problem that we just can't ignore," Percy said. "As one example, 49 percent of the people on welfare in Illinois originally came from Mississippi. A guaranteed job program would reduce the welfare rolls which are also supported by tax money."

Percy's comments drew little reaction from the audience of about 75 students, in contrast to his appearances Monday at Bradley University, Peoria, and Western Illinois University, Macomb.

Percy will appear at Northern Illinois University in DeKalb and DePaul University in Chicago today.

Percy's tour of Illinois college campuses began Saturday.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, May 1, 1969]

STUDENTS URGED TO WORK WITHIN COLLEGE SYSTEM

(By Steve Blain)

DE KALB.—Protests against the establishment and efforts to change it can best be accomplished by working within the establishment system itself, U.S. Sen. Charles H. Percy, R-Ill., told a group of Northern Illinois University students here Wednesday.

"People, like Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael or the students who took over Cornell University will not have a lasting impact on the nation," Percy said.

Instead, he said, it is persons such as aggressive young senators and representatives "who have the power to change the course of the establishment by influencing its law-making process" who will have the most impact on the nation's future.

Percy spoke to a group of NIU student leaders here Wednesday on the last day of his five-day tour of Illinois university campuses.

AGAINST WAR

His opposition to extreme civil disorders and campus uprisings came near the end of a two-hour discussion session with the student leaders. Earlier, Percy had reiterated his stands against the war in Vietnam and deployment of the ABM missile system.

Percy, who throughout his tour has favored "responsible" student protests and dissent, said persons who suffer most from riots and student takeovers of university buildings are the rioters and students themselves.

"They are the best allies the extreme right has," Percy said.

In addition, he said, "I've toured riot neighborhoods long after the disturbance was over. The burned out buildings are still there, the debris is still there, the remaining businesses can't get insurance and because their competition has been burned out they charge higher prices."

QUALITY SUFFERS

The quality of education at a university besieged by its students will soon suffer, Percy said, because "the good" instructors and administrators will leave in flocks. They have better things to do than fight fires and try to run the university from their homes."

In reaffirming his opposition to the ABM deployment, Percy said he thinks the issue will be defeated in the Senate. Two weeks ago, Herbert Klein, communications director for President Richard M. Nixon, told an NIU audience he thinks the measure will pass in the Senate by a slight margin.

ABM SYSTEM

The ABM system is a "useless tool that will continue the arms race," he said, and "we have enough deterrent power now to destroy the Soviet Union."

Percy also called for a gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam and estimated

nation-wide sentiment was about even on whether or not this country should get out of the war.

Percy concluded his tour of campuses with an appearance Wednesday afternoon at the University of Chicago. He visited nine university campuses in five days.

MEETING THE POLLUTION PROBLEM

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the question of water and air pollution is on the minds of many of us. The problems we face in this regard were outlined in exceptional manner by Dr. Leslie L. Glasgow recently.

Dr. Glasgow is Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources. He has a very distinguished record of constructive work in fisheries, wildlife, and forestry not only in Government but in academic and business life as well.

Speaking on June 8 at commencement exercises at the University of South Alabama in Mobile, Dr. Glasgow highlighted the problem in very effective ways.

Because of its value to those of us here and to the general population I include it at this point in full:

A COLLEGE GRADUATE'S RESPONSIBILITY TO THE ENVIRONMENT

(Remarks by Dr. Leslie L. Glasgow)

Perhaps you heard about Comedian Bob Hope's commencement address. He had been asked to give some advice to graduates entering the nonacademic world. So he told them, "Don't go."

I am more optimistic; do go! I propose a discussion of some of the ways we have mismanaged our environment. But then, from the far side of the generation gap, I want to invite you to hurry up and join us in the struggle to save our air, water, soil, and vegetation. We are all in this mess together and we need your help.

Communications media of many kinds bombard young people more continuously and more effectively today than ever before, and some of the bombardment is distasteful, gloomy, or tragic in content. But although it might be reassuring to new graduates to be reminded that there still are places where peace and quiet are natural and available, and where humans can feel normal as a part of the living world, these places are disappearing.

It is not a time to be lulled, for the environment is changing, usually in ways we dislike, and the quality of life in the world is deteriorating. It will continue to change for the worse unless the educated and trained people bring their skills, their knowledge and their influence to bear on protecting their world. The trick is to avoid irreversible damage to our environment; to understand consequence of our industrial development, human population growth, housing growth and resource uses before the damage is done; to plan so that uses are compatible rather than destructive. We must reverse the present trend of environmental destruction. If we do not, what will your world be like in another 50 years?

In line with this need to consider long-range consequences, President Nixon's announcement of his establishment of Environmental Quality Council is an important mile-

stone in the Nation's conservation history. For the first time, at the highest level, we will have a means for developing and coordinating a comprehensive Federal effort to meet environmental problems. The Council will provide better coordination of our scattered ecological programs. As matters now stand, agencies find themselves diametrically opposed in environmental concerns. My Department encourages farmers in the Dakotas to preserve potholes as habitat needed for those "duck factories." The Agriculture Department pays farmers to drain them. My Department pits itself against developers who have permission from other agencies to destroy valuable estuarine sites or alter the environment of streams beyond the ability of marine life to adapt. A sister agency is leading the pollution fight against reluctant city councils, industries and others. The President's plan will provide a high court for settling disputes such as these. It would focus attention on all environmental problems that become major issues.

We who are already engaged in the environmental campaign mean to enlist all of you. I hope that by now those of you from the biological and associated disciplines are seriously concerned with ecological matters. But you graduates from other departments, this appeal is beamed at you as well as parents and friends.

The young business and management graduate bound for Wall Street should be aware that a pedestrian walking around Fun City for a day, breathes in carcinogens equivalent to two packs of cigarettes. He is, as are so many others, a prisoner of the environment.

I want to hasten to disclaim any favoritism in singling out New York. Other cities have also accomplished impressive pollution of their air. Depending upon one's industrial preference, you may seek out communities which will permit you to breathe—even insist upon it—smoke, flyash, dust, mist, oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide, acid, aldehydes, organic acids, hydrocarbons, mercaptans, hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, solvents, sulfides and fluorides.

From my windows in a corner office in the Interior building in Washington, I can watch the jets taking off from National Airport, following the Potomac River, leaving a dark wake of unconsumed fuel as they get up, up and away.

I don't know with any precision what that amount of kerosene, year after year, is going to do to the spring herring run, to the vegetation in the parks and to the pedestrian, but it doesn't help them. The jets are Johnny-come-latelys among the Potomac polluters.

For that matter, air pollution is a relatively recent field of study. Not much was done about it until 1930, when the Meuse Valley in Belgium underwent an inversion. Donora, Pennsylvania, experienced its fit of strangulation in 1948. London, England, had its prolonged fog in 1952 which prevented the escape of noxious gases from the local atmosphere. Pollution is not free. Eventually it appears on a price tag. Sooner or later someone must pay that bill. In the Meuse Valley, Donora and London, the price was sickness for a great many people, and some invalids were hastened to their graves. Pollution carries a very stiff price, and it is not at all necessarily paid by the people who cause it.

In the Appalachian Region, about 10,500 miles of streams in eight States are affected by mine drainage. About 5,700 miles of streams are continually polluted. The most significant pollutant is acid. Eighty percent of the acid mine drainage in Appalachia comes from abandoned mines, whose former owners are not going to pay the bill. Some-one must, and estimates are that \$3.5 million in added annual costs are imposed by acid mine drainage on industrial users, municipal water supplies, navigation and public facilities.

ties. These are readily measured costs. Our Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife estimates that when other costs are reckoned—for destruction of aquatic life, general environmental degradation and aesthetic destruction and so on—the annual bill may run between \$16 and \$20 million.

Less than two-tenths of one percent of the United States has been disturbed by surface mining, but the damage has been extensive. Surface mining occurs in every one of the 50 States. Alabama has 134,000 acres of land disturbed by mining.

About 25 percent of the acid mine pollution comes from surface mines. And strip mines are heavy silt polluters. In Kentucky a recent study found that silt pollution from strip mine soil banks amounted to 27,000 tons per square mile annually. In contrast, silt runoff from nearby land, of similar slope but forested, amounted to 25 tons per square mile per year.

Silt and soil sediments not only fill up streams and lakes, but also carry along some hitchhiking pesticidal chemicals or other substances which make the effect worse. There are rivers of pesticides running into our rivers. Remember the heptachlor-fire ant fiasco. It began right here in Mobile.

The persistent, or "hard" pesticides remain in the soil for years. And they do get around, transported by flood waters or dust particles to the sea or around the world in atmospheric winds. DDT has been found in the Antarctic, where it never has been used. Like other organochlorides, DDT can build up in small amounts, gradually growing through the food chain process, to a dangerous extent in the food web.

During World War Two, DDT was credited with saving millions of lives. Its success in eliminating typhus and malaria fired the imagination and we hailed it as a miracle chemical. But we have been shocked into awareness now that this "great friend" has some habits so intolerable we should outlaw it. We are going to have to switch to chemicals that are less residual. They may complicate the task of manipulating insect populations, but they will not have the shocking ecological after-effects of the hard chemicals.

Most of the users of DDT and other organochlorides have been and still are using them in accordance with guidelines and procedures which had been approved by the appropriate authorities.

Only recently have we awakened to the fact that these "acceptable" uses and procedures are resulting in such massive contamination of our soil, water and air.

There has been widespread publicity over the DDT buildup in Lake Michigan. The introduction of coho salmon caused a revolution in fishing there. Fishing in the Great Lakes had not been so great in the memory of living fishermen. The cohos, fed by banquet diets of alewives, grew to such sizes the men who caught them did not even have to lie about them. Then a few weeks ago the Food and Drug Administration seized commercially caught cohos, because they contained DDT residues greater than 5 parts per million. It was a shocking development. DDT has a half life of 10 years. Lake Michigan is essentially a closed system with little drainage. The problem will remain serious for at least 10 years, even if we should discontinue use of DDT. We have lost a great fisheries industry, and lost millions of dollars in tourist trade.

Recent monitoring studies by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife have shown that significant amounts of organochloride compounds occur in fishes of Alabama and many waters throughout the Nation. Of 590 samples of fish collected at fifty stations, during 1967 and 1968, DDT or its metabolites were found in measurable quantities in 584 samples. Thirty eight of these or 6.5 percent contained residues greater than the FDA's interim action level of 5 parts per million in fish.

Similar findings have been found in surveys sponsored by several States. For example, 16 percent of the 257 fish samples taken in a Massachusetts study from 1965 through 1967 contained residues of DDT and its metabolites greater than 5 ppm. A less extensive study in my own State of Louisiana showed that average DDT levels above 5 ppm were common in fish taken from agricultural areas. Here in Alabama fish collected in the Tombigbee River contains more than 5 ppm.

Miss Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* was an important catalyst, perhaps the most important of all, to stimulate thinking on the total environment. Her primary target was a narrower one, but the volleys she fired at chemicals were heard over a much larger field. Although we have not yet exhausted our stock of robins, as she feared, we are awake to factors we might have ignored without her little book. But can we save our national symbol, the bald eagle? Experiments have shown that DDT in the diets of some birds results in thin-shelled eggs that crack easily. Perhaps this is why we have had a rapid decline in the bald eagle population.

Pesticidal chemical changes are believed to cause many changes in the bodies of animals when they become stored in body fat. I have mentioned the difficulties with coho DDT readings. Persistent chemicals have also interfered with hatchability of fish spawn in that lake, and in Clear Lake, California, and Lake George, New York. A serious fish kill at the Mississippi River Passes five years ago was traced to endrin dumped into the river many miles upstream at Memphis.

Man fouls his streams in other ways besides pesticidal pollution. For example:

Enrichment changes. Addition of fertilizing wastes from sewage plants and agricultural wastes makes a river or lake turn green with algae and lose oxygen at night. The City of Omaha has a normal population of about 250,000 people, but the stockyards cause a waste load on the Missouri River equivalent to 80 million people. The changes are hardly beneficial to the river.

Thermal changes. Heat from atomic power generation plants and industrial cooling sources is raising the temperature of many streams and estuaries and a few lakes up to several degrees, enough to drive out or kill aquatic organisms.

Industrial and household wastes. Soaps and detergents are hard on stream animals. Creamery wastes, pickle liquors from steel mills, ore tailing from mines and a hundred other types of wastes, including that from paper mills, are changing aquatic environments.

The Torrey Canyon and Santa Barbara oil spills are so fresh in memory there isn't much need to dwell on oil pollution.

The potentials for bigger spills are on the shipways now. Supertankers are under construction, and designers are planning super-supertankers, if the language can stand the strain on the superlative. The reason is so called "economy." Before the Arab-Israeli war, a 50,000-ton tanker could transport oil from the Persian Gulf to Western Europe for about \$3.60 a ton, via the Suez Canal. Now a 200,000 ton tanker can take a ton of oil between the same ports, but avoiding the canal and sailing instead around the Cape of Good Hope, for about \$2.40. The apparent saving is obviously one-third. But who has reckoned in the costs of spills four times as big as before?

And supertankers are on the increase. Two years ago about 10 percent of the tankers were too big to navigate the Suez Canal. Now 45 percent of the tankers are too big. According to some estimates, by 1971 almost 60 percent of the tankers in use will be too big for the canal.

Such heavy metals as copper, mercury, zinc and lead in our wastes, and in our automobile fuel, eventually harm fish and wildlife which become exposed to them.

There is a point where Man can beat an environment to death, wound it so badly it

cannot regenerate. Lake Erie, the Monongahela, the Tombigbee and the Ohio Rivers may be close to the end point now.

I have learned from President Widdon and members of your faculty of the University's growing activity in marine biology and other marine sciences. Our Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is providing some assistance to the faculty in grant-supported research on estuarine-marine subjects. Estuaries are a particular concern in daily affairs in our Department. We are collecting information on the current status and the resource potentials of estuaries and coastal zones. Congress requested it. The National Estuarine Inventory which results will be recorded on tape for automatic data processing. It will contain maximum available information on 864 estuaries and their adjacent coastal zones.

As you might have expected, our estuaries are in trouble.

Estuaries play a dominate role in the support of a major portion of our commercially important fisheries. Approximately 65 percent of the U.S. annual commercial fish and shell fish harvest, either by volume or value, consists of species which occupy estuarine areas during some phase of their life cycle. As the typical estuary may provide a wide range of environmental conditions, many species with different life histories or environmental requirements can be accommodated simultaneously. In this respect, one cannot help but reflect that our troubled cities may have something important to learn from the oysters, redfish, speckled trout and so forth.

This harvest of estuarine fishery resources is over 3 billion pounds annually with a value of nearly \$260 million to the fishermen. These estuarine fishery resources include 10 of the 15 most valuable groups of species in our commercial fisheries, such as shrimp, which support the most valuable commercial fishery; menhaden, the most important in volume; salmon, our second most valuable fishery; mollusks, the third most valuable; plus at least 70 other commercially important species.

Marine organisms are extremely sensitive to persistent pesticides. This is especially true for crustaceans; as little as 0.6 parts per billion in the water will kill or immobilize a shrimp population in two days. Also, a concentration of one part of DDT per million is sufficient to destroy oyster larvae. The death of adult and young oysters usually attracts the immediate attention of oystermen. That way the public can find out what pesticides are doing. But destruction of larvae goes unnoticed. In the case of the oyster beds, we cannot put any faith in the "old saw" about no news being good news.

Dramatic kills are highly visible, as I shall relate. But losses of both fish and shellfish to sublethal concentrations of pesticides are typified by gradually declining populations, not publicized executions.

Physical pollution is rapidly destroying many valuable estuaries and other estuarine areas. Land fills, draining of marshes, dumping and dredging channels destroy natural areas which are fish and wildlife habitats. We have only scattered data, but enough to show clearly that the problem warrants immediate attention.

In the northeast, 45,000 acres of tidal wetlands from Maine to Delaware were lost between 1954 and 1963.

Twenty square miles of Tampa Bay, Florida, have been filled and converted into residential areas.

The San Francisco Bay estuarine complex offers a dramatic example of what has happened in urbanized estuarine areas. Of the original 435 square miles of water area, 17 square miles have been reclaimed and 240 square miles are in immediate danger of being reclaimed. Of the original 300 square miles of marsh area surrounding this bay, 240 square miles have already been reclaimed.

Altogether, more than 2.5 million acres of estuarine habitat in the U.S. have been lost in recent years. Over one-half million acres have been destroyed in the past 20 years from dredging and filling alone.

At the present rate of attrition, the final pattern of unspoiled estuaries throughout the country not in public ownership probably will be determined over the next 5 to 10 years.

Both domestic sewage and industrial waste contain substantial quantities of solids which are rapidly settled in sea water and cover the oyster bottoms. Highly polluted harbors of the Atlantic Coast are typical examples including Jamaica Bay, New York; Bridgeport Harbor, and New Haven Harbor, Connecticut; Narragansett Bay, Boston Bay and Great Bay in New Hampshire.

Pollution detrimental to fish and wildlife is rarely a local problem. Each estuarine habitat—a bay, marsh, or inlet—is a link in the life cycle of important estuarine animals and plants, a nursery, or spawning area, a summering or wintering area. The population size of any given fish or wildlife species is largely dependent on the sum and quality of available habitats. When one habitat is destroyed an entire population is affected accordingly. Rarely will a pollutant affect only a single part of the environment. As the types of pollution interact so do the effects.

Eliminating or reducing one link in the food chain may similarly affect some of its higher members.

Subtle, insidious, and sublethal effects that increase the mortality or reduce the reproductive potential of our valuable estuarine resources may evolve so slowly that the consequences may not be obvious until the very extinction of a species is threatened.

Mass mortality of fish and wildlife, on the other hand, occurs from sudden and deadly changes in their environment. Massive kills appear to be increasing, and a few examples suggest the magnitude and widespread occurrence of this problem. In 1963, 3,500 striped bass entering the Roanoke River on their annual spawning run died within a matter of hours from pollution. One massive single kill of 38 million fish took place in San Diego Harbor in August 1962. Approximately 3 million dead alewives drifted from the Anacostia River into the Potomac early in September 1962.

In 1963, a massive fish mortality occurred in Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. It was estimated that more than 9 million fish died in the Potomac River alone.

In the Carolinas recent massive kill of blue crabs of yet undetermined origin has wiped out an estimated 50 percent of that population.

Obviously there are environmental dangers to fish and shellfish. But we are part of earth's population, too. Pathogenic bacteria and viruses in estuaries contain a hazard to the health of this graduating class. You are part of the interrelationship. Many acres of oyster beds are not harvested because they are in contaminated water.

In your own Mobile Bay, oysters decline and beds are closed. For three months, 99 percent of the Bay has been closed to oystering. And in the lower two-thirds of the Bay, about five percent of the producing reefs are permanently closed. What a contrast for a bay that at one time was one of the highest producing fisheries areas in the South. Even before settlement by the white man, the fisheries resources of Mobile Bay supported one of the highest concentrations of Indians in North America.

Other commercial aquatic resources are affected. The large, harvestable kelp beds ringing the Palos Verdes Peninsula and Point Loma in California, deteriorated to the point where there was little or no harvesting. Studies of effluents discharged into the area did not reveal any chemical or effluent toxic enough in itself to destroy the kelp.

The explanation is based on the subtle changes in the ecological balance of the kelp environment.

Dumping of wastes in the Gulf and the oceans constitutes a new threat.

If I seem to have accentuated the negative it is because I think we have ample daily reminders of the great accomplishments of our technology. We can fly to the moon but we have not yet learned to protect our environment. Should any industry, collectively or individually, be permitted to force you to breathe contaminated air, drink foul water or eat contaminated food? I think not. The common good of people certainly should prevail over the profit of industry. Of course we know we must utilize our natural resources. I am not at all sure that the public puts enough emphasis on the wise use of our resources, or their wise conservation.

Secretary of the Interior Hickel summed it up succinctly for a graduating class on the West Coast the other day. He said "your future hangs on your environment."

Perhaps I have been preaching to the saved. As I started out to say, I am not here to convert the already converted, but to recruit you as educators of the uninformed. You are the bright, educated young people we need. President Nixon put it this way:

"To the young people of America, I say this: It is true that you are inheriting a world you never made. But that has been true of every generation. The great, exciting difference is that you live in a world you can change.

"America needs the vision, the dissent, the constructive action your generation can provide in the years ahead."

It is fashionable today to deplore the "alienation" of the voters from those who serve them, the "frustration" of the average citizen who attempts to get something done, the "apathy" of the officeholder regarding reform. You know the current code words. Possibly you have been misled by them.

I suggest it is not very intelligent to claim that government and industry are self-propelled and self-sufficient. I mentioned what Rachel Carson did with an angry book. The individual can accomplish a goal—and in the face of great opposition.

Recently at a town meeting in Dedham, Massachusetts, a motion under consideration called for widening a street by ten feet on each side. A resident of the street rose in opposition. He said his home had a tree, one of the few remaining at that end of the block, and he didn't want it cut down just to accommodate more trucks and cars. He wanted to preserve the grass against concrete, preserve elms and oaks against parking meters, preserve the breathing space against parking space.

Here was a bare bones defense of environmental value. And the town meeting accepted his appeal and killed the street-widening proposal by a vote of 133 to 98.

This warm little anecdote is even better than you think. The hero who saved the street was a 15-year-old boy. If a youngster not yet halfway through his teens can stand off the powerful factions who serve the automotive interests, then young men and women with college training can be expected to do great things.

We cannot rely on 15-year-olds to rectify the errors of the past and present. People who go it alone in any public competition are handicapping themselves. But citizens who coordinate their efforts can accomplish wonders and with persistence, anything.

I think that anyone with experience in a public position will affirm in the most fervent terms the power of organized interest groups. And the groups cover every spectrum of opinion. Some of them are out to get something done you do not wish done. It really is in your own selfish self-interest, the national interest aside for the moment, to see that the short-sighted spotters don't run away with our heritage.

If you have the misconception that your opinions are not considered, I only wish I could share my mall with you. You will be read and you will be heard. The well-informed, well-educated and articulate voter swings more weight than cynics suspect. So join the crusade for a better environment. There are never too many on the battlefields. While you need not make a career of it, although we wish more would, at any rate do your bit.

The Nation needs your skill, whatever profession you have chosen or may decide upon in the future. But don't ever let it blind you to your permanent responsibility to the environment.

We are giving you a world admittedly burdened with flaws, and you are going to determine what happens to it. Your generation is the best informed, the most intelligent, the most idealistic this country has ever known. We have great faith in you. Heaven knows we wish you the very best of luck! All our hopes are riding with you.

So this week all across the land, the torch for a better environment is passed to a new generation. I hope the graduating students all over American carry it high and that they carry it far.

OUR AMERICAN FLAG: LONG MAY THE BANNER OF FREEDOM WAVE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the Flag Day weekend concludes, it is fitting and appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to preserving, promoting, and perpetuating our cherished American way of life as symbolized by our flag. In this connection I place in the RECORD herewith my latest newsletter, Capitol Comments, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important part of our American tradition.

The newsletter follows:

[From the Capitol Comments, June 16, 1969]

OUR AMERICAN FLAG: SYMBOL OF THE
GREATNESS AND PROMISE OF OUR NATION

(By Representative JOE L. EVINS)

As the Nation honors the American flag on Flag Day weekend, it is fitting and appropriate to emphasize the significance and importance of our flag, the most dramatic symbol of the United States of America. Our flag represents far more than the red, white and blue colors authorized by Resolution of the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777.

Our flag represents the essence of our cherished American way of life—freedom and democracy, love of God and country, pride in our great heritage, faith in the American tradition, and national unity—"one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The House of Representatives in special ceremonies honored the flag and the great tradition this Banner of Freedom represents. Speakers called for a rededication to the principles and the heritage embodied in the Stars and Stripes. Only a few miles from Washington, at Fort McHenry, on September 14, 1814, Francis Scott Key was inspired to write the Star Spangled Banner, our national anthem, when he saw the flag waving proudly over Fort McHenry in "dawn's early light" following a night of bombardment and "the rockets' red glare."

Outraged and distressed over defilement of the flag and the lack of respect for our heri-

tage and our Nation by a small minority of Americans, the Congress has passed legislation making desecration of the flag a Federal offense.

A timely and appropriate announcement concerning the flag came this week from officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration who announced that the American flag will be placed on the moon as a symbol of national pride and achievement. This announcement came after these officials were questioned in our Subcommittee on Independent Offices, which I am honored to serve as Chairman, about their plans in this respect. The Apollo 11 mission is scheduled to plant the flag on the moon in July.

The great spirit of America—the courage and faith of free men—as symbolized by the flag that flew over Valley Forge in that awful winter of 1778 will be renewed and reaffirmed when American heroes of this generation place an American flag on the moon.

As we reflect on these events and the greatness of our Nation demonstrated through two centuries of challenge, this is an appropriate time to reflect on the meaning of our flag and to rededicate ourselves to preserving, promoting and perpetuating our cherished American way of life.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to explain to my fellow colleagues my reasons for opposing H.R. 11235, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969.

While I fully agree with and support the proposition that the older people of our Nation are entitled to every opportunity for a full and meaningful life, I feel that this legislation is both wasteful and unresponsive to the real needs and welfare of our older citizens.

In a recent article in the Post of Frederick, Md., Mr. Martin E. Segal, an authority on retirement, revealed that a study in Boston, Mass., showed that very few older persons said they ever needed the services available to them—for example, visiting nurse, homemaker services, job retraining services to mention a few. In all cases, the percentage needing these services was less than 10 percent of the total aged population of greater Boston. What is more, there were almost no aged who said that they needed a service that they had not received.

From the mail that has come from the senior citizens of my district, their primary concern is the rising costs of living—of food and rent and the increasing inflationary spiral which is destroying their purchasing power, particularly those who are attempting to live on a fixed or limited income. They are also concerned, as I am, with the increasing costs of the Vietnam war in terms of lives and money resulting from our no-win policy.

Last week I received petitions signed by 250 people in my district who are seeking my help and assistance to increase social security benefits. Their concerns are with the daily rising costs for

the basic necessities of life, and not with the Older Americans Act which, I understand, would provide such services as free dancing lessons and bus rides to the zoo.

They are concerned also with the Government's policy of deficit spending, which, in my opinion, is one of the most significant factors in creating and continuing the inflation which we are experiencing.

I believe that the most important step we can take as Members of Congress to aid and assist our older citizens is to bring to the conduct of Government measures of fiscal responsibility and soundness that will improve the economic conditions of our society to such an extent that our older citizens will be able to enjoy lives which are full, healthy, and active and carefree. Increasing and expanding Government programs and deficit spending will not accomplish that objective. I firmly believe we will never accomplish it until we end the Vietnam war, committing to that task whatever resources it will take. Then we will be able to restore to our economy and domestic scene conditions of economic progress and stability that will permit Americans of all ages increased opportunity for fuller and richer lives.

Therefore, until the Vietnam conflict has ended and our soldiers have been returned safely home and until we make a greater effort toward fiscal sanity and balanced budgets, I intend to vote against such legislation as the Older Americans Act Amendments with its request for the appropriation of \$252 million. While I am deeply concerned with the living conditions of our elderly and needy, and will do all I can to support measures that will insure to them the necessary means for a full life, I am convinced that our present foreign and domestic problems dictate a reordering of priorities which have necessitated the vote which I have cast.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ENGAGE IN FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATIONS OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring my colleagues' attention to a bill I am cosponsoring in the House of Representatives today to begin an investigation of the feasibility to economically utilize and develop land and water resources of the Beatty, Nev.-Death Valley Calif., Amargosa Valley area for agriculture, municipal and industrial purposes.

I also want to remind my colleagues of the special benefits such exploratory work in Amargosa Valley will hold for the future of the burgeoning population of the southwestern United States. I urge approval of the bill, which my fellow colleague and chairman of the Interior Committee Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, Representative

HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of California, is cosponsoring with me.

There are vast amounts of untapped underground water lying just beneath the surface of the Amargosa Valley. The plan, as proposed by the bill after the feasibility study, calls for the drilling of additional wells and to construct distribution and drainage facilities to supply water to 21,000 acres of irrigable lands. Let me point out explicitly, that Beatty in my State of Nevada and Death Valley in California are located in the highly potentially valuable Amargosa Valley where there are about 93,000 acres of arable land overall and the huge underground Amargosa River running near Beatty could be tapped to develop substantial portions of the land.

This will take a Federal reclamation project to adequately develop as the current status of the economy in the Beatty area is not sufficient enough to garner local financial support for the hard-working citizens to develop the venture alone.

I have a report on a 1968 reconnaissance taken of the area which backs up this theory and shows that irrigated farming can be a very successful enterprise which in turn would make a major contribution to the economic growth of the area today and in the future.

While this is a large project, the cost is seemingly low. To adequately complete a construction project to insure proper use of the water, the cost, according to the 1968 reconnaissance report, is set at about \$8 million.

Constituents in both Nevada and California have expressed their keen interest in such a project.

ARIZONA WILDLIFE FEDERATION OBJECTS TO CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, many individuals are concerned over the Gun Control Act of 1968 enactment and its implementation by the Internal Revenue Service. I am enclosing copies of two resolutions adopted by the Arizona Wildlife Federation in January 1969, and a covering letter sent to me by the president of the federation, Mr. Fred W. Greenwald:

ARIZONA WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Phoenix, Ariz., April 10, 1969.

Congressman SAM STEIGER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: During the 46th Annual Convention of the Arizona Wildlife Federation, formerly known as the Arizona Game Protective Association, held in Springerville, Arizona on January 17, 18 and 19, 1969, the Convention delegates considered the Gun Control Act of 1968, otherwise known as Public Law 90-618.

It was the unanimous consensus of the delegates at this Convention that the Gun Control Act of 1968 did not constitute rea-

sonable legislation, and that it would not accomplish the purposes of the legislation as set forth in Section 101 of that Act.

It is more apparent since the promulgation of Federal regulations ostensibly to effectuate the purposes of the Act that the Act and the regulations do place an unreasonable burden upon the acquisition, disposition, use and enjoyment of firearms and ammunition by law-abiding citizens for reasonable and proper purposes, and it was for that reason that Resolution No. 22, as set forth in the accompanying compilation of Resolutions, was adopted at the Convention.

As you are aware, the Gun Control Act of 1968 is a composite of new legislation and an adoption of or an amendment to provisions of the National Firearms Act and the Federal Firearms Act. It is not the position of our Association that there should be no firearms legislation, nor would we realistically support repeal of the entire Gun Control Act of 1968 inasmuch as the Act does embody legislation which had been in existence for many years.

It is for that reason that reference to our Resolution No. 22 will indicate a carefully selected request for repeal of provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968 while retaining restrictions imposed upon acquisition and disposition of destructive devices, firearms mufflers and silencers as defined in said Act and while retaining restrictions which would prevent firearms or ammunition from being received, transported by or to those individual persons ineligible under the Act and as defined in Section 922, subsections (d) 1, 2, 3, 4; (g) 1, 2, 3, 4; (h) 1, 2, 3, 4; and (i), (j), (k) of the Act.

We earnestly seek your aid in the introduction of legislation designed to effectuate the purposes of the Resolution, and your support of any legislation introduced to accomplish the purposes of this Resolution.

Our Association would furthermore like to call your attention to Resolution No. 11 which was passed at our Convention so that you may be advised that the Arizona Wildlife Federation is opposed to any additional legislation providing for gun registration and/or individual licensing of gun owners and users.

Very truly yours,
FRED W. GREENWALD,
President.

RESOLUTION No. 11

RELATIVE TO FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Whereas, there is no concrete relation between strict gun controls and crime reduction; and

Whereas, the possibility of removal of firearms from private ownership is frightening; and

Whereas, the financial responsibility of enforcing stricter gun laws is placed on an already over-taxed population; and

Whereas, placing restrictions on basic freedoms are dangerous; and

Whereas, assassinations of a few key individuals is not cause to burden whole society with bureaucratic red tape;

Now therefore, be it resolved that the Arizona Wildlife Federation be actively concerned with all further Federal, State, or municipal firearm legislation; and is specifically opposed to gun registration and individual licensing; and

Be it further resolved that the Arizona Wildlife Federation supports severe penalties and strict enforcement of existing laws concerning criminal use of firearms.

RESOLUTION No. 22

RE: GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968

Whereas, provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968 place an unreasonable burden upon the acquisition, disposition, use and enjoyment of firearms and ammunition by

law abiding citizens for reasonable and proper purposes; and

Whereas, provisions of said act unreasonably and arbitrarily declare as felonious acts, transactions concerning the acquisition and disposition of firearms and ammunition unrelated to actual or intended criminal use thereof, or the competency or good citizenship of the persons involved; and

Whereas, the Internal Revenue Service has created regulations which greatly exceed the letter and intent of the Gun Control Act of 1968, the net result of which amounts to registration;

Now therefore, be it resolved, that the Arizona Wildlife Federation in convention assembled requests that those provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968 and regulations relating thereto restricting, regulating and prohibiting the acquisition or disposition of ammunition and firearms other than destructive devices and firearms mufflers and silencers as defined in said Act in intrastate, interstate or foreign commerce be repealed except as applicable to licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers and as provided in Section 922, sub-sections (d) 1, 2, 3, 4; (g) 1, 2, 3, 4; (h) 1, 2, 3, 4; and (i) (j), (k) of said Act.

AGRI-BUSINESS FARM CENTERS— BIG NEW THREAT TO RURAL AMERICA

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the following reprint of a radio address was reprinted in the June issue of the Independent Banker. The radio talk was prepared and given by Mr. Ed Wimmer, who is vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

I found his article extremely interesting and I would like to share his thoughts on this matter with you, as follows:

AGRI-BUSINESS FARM CENTERS—BIG NEW THREAT TO RURAL AMERICA

(By Ed Wimmer)

Plans are underway to open a chain of huge, agri-business farm centers that could be far greater threat to rural America than anything the big chains or federal government have caused in the last 50 years. National Farm Stores, Inc., has announced that it is starting a nationwide chain of one-stop 40-acre, new mall-type shopping Agri-business shopping complexes to furnish all the needs of the farmer.

INTERNATIONAL POWER

Financial backing for the building of these 40-acre agri-business, all-engulfing raids on rural America was announced by Litton Industries, now involved in an antitrust suit. Litton is so vast an operation that its officials informed the White House and our State Department and embassies that interference of the Federal Trade Commission in its acquisition of a German typewriter company "may provoke German government action and revive old animosities against United States dollar imperialism."

But let us look at Litton Industries before we say anything more about corporations becoming so giant that when a federal agency attempts to cut back on their giantism, they notify U.S. embassies and warn of possible disruption between friendly governments.

Litton is a conglomerate—one of the fastest built in the U.S.—with revenues of over \$2 billion in 1968, assets of \$1,200,000,000, and profits before taxes of over \$100 mil-

lion. Before swallowing the German typewriter firm, it bought Royal Typewriter Co. (Royal McBee) which, with its German holdings, the FTC says, constitute too much typewriter control. The German company had a string of subsidiaries, of course, which went with the typewriter merger.

FOURTEENTH LARGEST DEFENSE CONTRACTOR

Litton is the 14th largest defense contractor in the U.S., so how many boys have died to give it acquisition money? It owns or controls Data Register of Sweden, Streator International, Western Geographical and subsidiaries, American Book Co. and subsidiaries, Litton Tool, The Rust Corp., Arrow Service, Cole Steel, Eureka Corp., Pittsburgh Paper, Hewitt-Robbins, Engalls Shipbuilding, Allen-Hollander, Dennis Supply Co. Stores, Bionetics Laboratories, Kimball Systems, Leopold Corp., Stouffer's Foods, Wilson Marine Transit, Monroe International Corp., Monroe Calculating of Holland, Profex Ray Co., Litton Precision, Litton Systems, Litton Systems of Canada, McCray Corp., Jefferson Electric, Landis Tool, and frankly, I don't know what else!

Now tell me if you believe that even a fairly large chain store operation could compete against 40-acre, Litton-financed Agri-Business Farm Centers, and what will happen to rural towns all around these centers if they are the success they must be to continue expanding, as they say, "all over the United States?"

A big oil company is mentioned as a supplier of fertilizers, petroleum products, farm chemicals, service station and propane gas needs. It is said to be the same oil company that is opening grocery stores in Detroit. Litton Services Group will arrange all interim construction, and arrange whatever permanent financing is needed.

KILL OPPORTUNITY

So I ask you again, what chance would your boy have of ever starting a small business of his own against such an octopus of corporate power? Where will the small town business and bank be five or ten years from now; and because the corporate farms have been advancing in all agricultural centers, and because they buy so much of their needs direct from the biggest suppliers, killing off the independent farm equipment and other suppliers, what happens eventually to Litton's Agri-Business, 40-acre farm centers? What happens to America?

When the Federal Trade Commission stepped in on Litton's typewriter deal, it was knocking off a little fringe benefit of Litton—one it would hardly miss; a mere midget of a corporation with only \$61 million in assets. Where FTC has been weak is in our antitrust laws that allowed such combining as Litton has done, and in the failure of Congress to strengthen those laws and provide the money to enforce them.

SOCIALISM THROUGH MONOPOLY

Litton talks about "German government retaliation," but not even our own federal officials mention that before he died, Konrad Adenauer said that the biggest threat of a return to Nazism was the return to monopoly capitalism building up in Germany. Kurt Foreburg, prominent Berlin banker, said the German economy was well on the way to "collectivism and monopolycapitalism," and Dr. Folkert Wilkin wrote:

"The continued flow of tribute to industrial conquerors is no device of progress, but a work of frustration and ultimate destruction."

Serge Dahlin, Soviet economist, put the consolidators in the same light when he said the "free enterprise economies of Western major nations are transforming themselves into socialism through the monopoly process." His rather frightening conclusion was:

"It is collectivization of capitalistic property—a negation of private enterprise within the domains of capitalism itself."

NEED LOTS OF "SOMEBODIES"

Consider, however, the views of Dr. Howard Perlmutter, with MIT for 10 years and now with Wharton College. Dr. Perlmutter sees superinternational giants taking over; General Motors jumping from \$20 billion to \$160 billion in sales. He sees superinternational unions wanting to share in the prosperity of the super-international corporate giants, so he says their leaders will go along. His final conclusion (which we have seen all along):

"The only obstacle: the sovereign state which will ultimately demand outright nationalization."

We either have to believe in a society that makes millions of somebodies out of nobodies, or a society that makes millions of nobodies out of potential somebodies. We can believe in a society that concentrates on the development of the individual, best seen in the family farm and independent enterprise of all kinds. Or we can permit the submergence of the individual in a coterie of huge corporate farms, 40-acre (or more) agribusiness monopolizers like Litton's National Farm Stores, big unions, huge banking combines, and unlimited, omnipotent federal government.

Young people of America should be given every possible opportunity to strike out on their own, run their farms and businesses, and become important in the profession, in government, in community affairs. Jefferson and Madison were right when they warned future generations always to be against all forms of undue power. The efforts of the Justice Department, Federal Trade Commission, Congress, and trade organizations that are trying to open up a free and fair market deserve our support.

Willis J. Ballinger, a former economic advisor to the Federal Trade Commission, told a Senatorial investigating committee in the 1930's that the multiplication of stores and banks under a single control is "the executioner of man's ambitions, and what is a more perfect crime than to strike down the would-be proprietor on the doorstep of his dreams, and go unpunished."

AFFECTS EVERYONE

Litton Industries, like so many being questioned today, would go on swallowing company after company until it became one of the super giants seen by Dr. Perlmutter. In the case of the 40-acre Agri-Business Farm Centers, what will be the toll of individual enterprises, the drain of capital from the towns, the ruin brought to chambers of commerce, civic clubs, and churches, because too few people do not understand that upon the destiny of goods and services rests the destiny of the nation?

Each and every one of us is tied in one way or another to what the Littons and their kind do to that structure.

A VIEW OF STUDENT UNREST

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, against the background of growing national concern over disruptive activity on college campuses, I believe a well-reasoned expression of a freshman student of Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va., will be of interest to the House.

I include, therefore, an article by Frank Humphreys which appeared in the Madison College newspaper, the Breeze, on May 27, 1969, as follows:

RADICALS CAUSE CONCERN

(By Frank Humphreys)

Summer is rapidly approaching, and most college students will be departing the academic community in pursuit of economic endeavors. At scattered campuses across the nation rise the waves of an ever-increasing number of major, violent disturbances. And it could well be that these recent outbreaks will turn the tide of academic freedom that has been rising in recent years.

REPERCUSSIONS HEARD THROUGHOUT SOCIETY

Repercussions from these demonstrations are being heard at all levels of our society. The current administration in Washington is considering counter-action aimed at putting federal funds out of the reach of radicals. College administrations and facilities are all wondering when their campuses will be hit. And the vast majority of students who fail to participate in these insurrections are doing everything in their power to avert any violence on their campuses.

What has really happened to colleges today? In order to determine this, one must examine 1) the nature of the "demands" put forth; 2) methods employed to coerce compliance with the same; 3) the practicality of the demands as they relate to the academic development of the student; and 4) the effect of "hasty" action by various administrations and faculties.

The first illegitimate children of the protest movement were conceived at the University of California, Berkeley Campus. These young rebels were stressing free speech, a cause espoused by numerous individuals in the course of our history. The use of the four-letter word detracted from what appeared to be seemingly worthy objectives.

CAUSES EXPAND TO INSANITY

From this early beginning revolts, or rather demonstrations, sprang up in other areas. The causes were many, and who can combat the exuberance of youth in supporting a cause? In many instances, the demands were sound, and many helpful beneficial programs resulted.

Sanity has finally been left by the wayside, however. A close examination of the recent disturbances clearly supports this point. From the initial demands for freedom of speech, things have now progressed to the point where the young radicals feel that they can no longer attend an institution unless they have complete power over it.

Marches and peaceful assemblies were the early tools of the protest trade. Students moved to obstruct traffic or occupy a building simply to gain recognition of their point of view. When these tactics were slow in yielding results, the next logical step led to violence. Buildings were forcibly seized and held, "hostages" were taken to use as levels against the "establishment", and civil disobedience became an advocated way of life.

As a malignant cancer rapidly spreads and consumes completely when not properly treated, so did the rash of violence put its blot on scores of colleges and universities. Daily reports from across the nation told of another campus being hit by insurgents. Students no longer carried books to class. Instead firebombs, knives and guns became every student's closest companions.

PEACEFUL STUDENTS ARE CASUALTIES

Where this violence and coercion was used in great quantities, the casualty toll rose rapidly. The president of a north-eastern university suffered a fatal heart attack while attempting to mediate the differences around him. In the foreign country of California, for surely nobody actually considers it part of the United States, truly peaceful students intent on getting an education were the victims of severe bodily harm at the hands

of the lawless. One girl was so badly mutilated as the result of an explosion in an administration building that extensive plastic surgery will never bring her anywhere near her original beauty, and as yet no one has found a way to restore sight to eyes that have been ripped by such a blast.

What could possibly be so important that groups of young people would resort to such tactics just to achieve a given objective? Besides free speech, the demands included academic freedom, a voice in the selection of required courses, a voice in the hiring and firing of faculty and administration, creation of black studies programs, and abolishment of entrance requirements for Negro students. And it is also possible that somewhere along the line someone was advocating "a chicken in every pot", or was it "some pot for every chick."

Admittedly most bastions of higher education could use a complete revision of their basic studies courses. The courses now required were put in this category years ago and no longer meet the needs of our mobile society. Along with this is the desire by most students to have a more flexible curriculum. Rather than having to take all required courses and regurgitate back the information for four years, most students would prefer a wider curriculum under which they could develop their own particular talents.

STUDENTS GIVEN VOICE IN CHOOSING PROFS

Giving an active voice to students in hiring and firing of members of the faculty or administration is like giving a lighted torch to a pyromaniac. Both would prove equally destructive. To further illustrate, suppose an apprentice carpenter told the union that he would decide which of the journeymen he felt was qualified to teach him the trade. Common sense tells us that the apprentice had better consider another vocation, for he would not long be a part of the carpenter's union.

This holds true even more so in the academic field. How can undergraduates suppose themselves to have the intelligence necessary to determine who is going to teach them? To gain a position of responsibility and to gain knowledge of any given subject, one must have a qualified teacher to present it. And there has never yet been the student who is qualified to say which teacher is most able to present the required material before taking the course.

What of the black militants advocating the creation of "Black Studies" departments? The suggestion itself points up the complete folly of such a position. The cry of the blacks is that "whitey" controls their entire way of life. The best way to combat such a situation is not learning of all the shortcomings and failures of one's ancestors; rather an in-depth study of the successes of those in power is called for. A minority cannot hope to gain any power through violence, mainly because they are physically outnumbered. More effort should be placed by the black militants on learning about the governmental structure of the society in which they live so that they could legally penetrate this system and gain respect from those they profess to hate. After all, even Hitler used the existing legal means to begin his rise to power.

ACTION COMMITTEES REPRESENT BOTH SIDES

In the midst of all the violence and chaos, what have the administrators and faculty members been doing to alleviate some of the problem areas? Many institutions have created action committees on which both sides are well represented. These groups attempt to solve problems before they arise, a sort of mental and academic birth control. These endeavors are successful where both parties involved participate in an open and honest manner. Great strides made by these action groups go largely unnoticed, but such is the case of most significant "peaceful" accomplishments.

Numerous other instances of hasty, thoughtless actions by those in power have resulted in the degradation of the entire academic profession. Take the actions of the Cornell University faculty as a shining example of opportunistic decision making.

The faculty originally repudiated the dean for compromising his position in the face of threats from a heavily armed group of black militants. The faculty also upheld the earlier decision of a regularly constituted committee of students and faculty to censure guilty students for their violent acts. They then reversed themselves, opening the floodgates for further acts of violence not only on their own campus but on others as well.

TIME FOR STEADFAST ACTION IS NOW

This capitulation did not go unnoticed either. The noted American philosopher Sidney Hook, in commenting on the eventuality of government involvement in campus disorders, said of the government, "It cannot permit assault, arson, possible loss of life merely because administrators—and faculties—are cowardly." Seemingly a severe indictment of all faculties and administrators, Hook's views serve to point up the fact that the time for steadfast action in the face of impending danger is now—before it becomes necessary for the government to move in to control a situation which promises to get worse before it gets better.

It is imperative that the summer months ahead be used in wholly constructive efforts to return college campuses to their roles as places of learning rather than training grounds for social guerrillas. It is incumbent upon the students to rationalize their demands and present them in an orderly fashion. It is equally incumbent upon the faculties and administrations to throw aside petty prejudices and archaic points of view in a concerted attempt to return to academic achievement rather than academic anarchy.

Our academic institutions can ill-afford another "winter of . . . discontent." The survival of the freedom of academic pursuit hinges on the return to peaceful and responsible control of the learning facilities and processes by those properly qualified to exercise that authority—not on the violent overthrow of the same by a group of irresponsible militants.

EXCESSIVE INTEREST RATES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent recordbreaking increase in the prime interest rate to 8½ percent, I am sure, is of great concern to all of us. This action coupled with the already high interest rates, a subject on which I have received many communications and personal contacts, prompted me to write to the President and issue a press release.

I believe there is an immediate need for a rollback of interest rates. To continue with the high interest rates can only, in my judgment, lead to most difficult experiences, especially for our middle-income and low-income people. The cost of living will be increased for many who are already caught in the inflationary spiral of prices. Credit, so vital to many of our citizens, will become almost prohibitive. One can well appreciate what this will mean to home construction and the cost of installment buying.

Representatives from the homebuilding groups, real estate firms, saving and loan companies, and labor have contacted me expressing great concern.

I do not believe that we can continue with inaction. Therefore, I have called upon the President to take immediate steps to effect a rollback of interest rates. Presidents in the past have been effective in rolling back commodity prices, as well as wage increases. I do not believe that we should be satisfied with less from President Nixon.

My letter to the President and a press release follow:

JUNE 13, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your immediate attention and action are requested with respect to the recent increase in the prime interest rate. The prime interest rate at 7½ percent was already too high; and the increase to 8½ percent is outrageous.

This latest irresponsible action, which will further increase spiraling prices and costs, comes at a time when we are already in the midst of run-away inflation and will result in a justly indignant citizenry.

I believe high interest rates, especially with this latest increase, to be one of the most serious problems affecting the average American citizen today. The high rates will cripple private industry, and to cite one example, and a most important one, is the effect it is having on the homebuilding industry, especially low-income housing. If the big financial interests are deliberately attempting to stop middle and low income housing, they are succeeding by this action.

Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that you should take immediate action to effect a rollback of interest rates. In the past, Presidents have been effective in rolling back commodity prices, as well as wage increases. I can think of nothing more vital to the lives of most of us than the cost of money. Therefore, as our President, I believe you have an obligation to take an active role at this time on this crucial subject.

For long, your Party and the banking institutions of this country would appear to have had a close working relationship and an association that would give you an excellent opportunity to take a position of leadership in reducing the outrageous high interest rates.

Respectfully,

GLENN M. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

Congressman Glenn M. Anderson of the 17th Congressional District (California) today called upon President Nixon to effect an immediate roll back of interest rates.

Anderson labeled the recent record-breaking increase in the Prime Interest Rate to 8½ percent as "irresponsible action that will further increase spiraling prices and costs, coming at a time when we are already in the midst of run-away inflation, and will result in a justly indignant citizenry."

Anderson described the action by the banking interests as "outrageous" and expressed his concern that higher interest rates will cripple private industry. He cited one area—that of homebuilding—as being particularly hard hit. Anderson said, "If the big financial interests are deliberately attempting to stop middle and low income housing, they are succeeding by this action."

He called upon President Nixon to take immediate action to effect a rollback of interest rates. Anderson further stated that in the past, Presidents have been effective in rolling back commodity prices, as well as wage increases. "Therefore, as our Presi-

dent," Anderson said, "I believe you have an obligation to take an active role at this time on this crucial subject."

Anderson also called to the President's attention that the Republican Party and the Banking Institutions "appear to have a close working relationship and an association" that would give President Nixon an excellent opportunity for leadership in bringing about reductions in "the outrageous high interest rates."

AMNESTY FOR MEN RESISTING THE WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a petition from the Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam demanding amnesty for men resisting the war in Vietnam.

The question of amnesty for those men who are in jail, who are in self-imposed exile, and who have deserted the military, because of their conscientious opposition to the Vietnam war, has become critical. In terms of numbers, we speak of an estimated 700 jailed men, hundreds more awaiting sentencing, close to 5,000 emigres, and untold numbers forced by conscience to hide in their own country. They have committed the crime of acting on individual moral commitment.

The law that makes this commitment illegal, that has sent thousands of men to prison, is the draft. By the draft, literally millions of young men, chosen inequitably, have been forced to fight, to kill, to die in a senseless war which we as a Nation hardly understand, let alone want. This is an unjust and oppressive law which has punished and is punishing these thousands. It is time to repeal the draft and to extend amnesty to the men who have suffered.

Even if one believes that the draft law is legitimate, there are several reasons why amnesty should be granted to Vietnam war resisters.

Over the last 5 years since the war became Americanized, there has grown an intense dissatisfaction with our Vietnam policy. There now appears to be widespread national agreement that our war effort, for moral, legal, and practical reasons, is bankrupt.

We owe this national awareness in large degree to the war resisters. They were the first to speak the truth about Vietnam, for which we rewarded them with disgrace and cries of treason. They were the prophets whose words have proven accurate. They must be allowed to come home to a place of respect in a country which has finally recognized their truth.

Amnesty will also serve to partially repudiate our participation in the war. Of course, it must be accompanied by an immediate end of violence and political settlement. But while the negotiations will end the war, amnesty will symbolize our national repentance. It will repudiate our barbaric destruction in Vietnam, which cannot be dismissed or easily forgotten when it is ended.

The men who have been punished for resisting the war are political prisoners. Incarceration for political beliefs is abhorrent wherever it occurs; it is in total contradiction with the ideals of a free democracy. It must end in America.

Finally, even those who endorse our war policy must admit that the resisters are acting out of most deeply agonized consciences. They are among the most sensitive of American youth. When a nation imprisons its finest young men for daring to act on conscience, it is clear that that nation has gone badly astray. We have confused conscience with criminality, just as we have confused senseless brutality with protecting the South Vietnamese from outside aggression.

The war resisters who have given years of their lives to oppose governmental criminality in Vietnam, which they were drafted to participate in against their consciences, have suffered unjustly for too long. We would prove that we are a nation worthy of them by granting amnesty.

THE SPIRIT OF UNITY IN CAMEROON

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, while the headlines of current newspapers may shout at us about unrest and violence in the developing nations, no less sensational have been reports of the productive activities of the Federal Republic of Cameroon. On January 1, Cameroon entered its 10th year as an independent nation and its accomplishments since 1960 have silenced a great many skeptics. For in the beginning this small African country was faced not only with the problems of establishing itself as a member of the world community, but also with internal conditions which challenged its very existence as a nation.

The significance of January 1, 1960, tells only half of Cameroon's story; it was at that time that the eastern region, a United Nations trust territory under French administration, became a sovereign republic. The picture was not complete until October 1, 1961, when Western Cameroon left the protectorate of the British to join Eastern Cameroon and form a federal republic. Observers were discouraging about the potential of such a union, with its cultural and political differences, a precarious agrarian economy, and, to top it off, a language barrier, a vestige of the colonial era.

Today, the 6 million people of Cameroon can gaily scoff at the claims of their earlier critics. Two years ago, the political parties of Cameroon—numbering 382 among over 200 different tribes at the time of independence—agreed to forget their differences and work together for progress in their country. And it was progress they attained, a steady climb upward, a stable series of successes.

Two 5-year development plans have been developed; as a result of the first

plan, schools and medical facilities have been expanded, accompanied by government subsidies to encourage agricultural production. Now the second plan finds Cameroon emphasizing the improvement of agricultural development, by providing rural training centers to teach farmers scientific methods. By enhancing an agricultural way of life, the government not only uplifted the basis for its economy, but also prevented the population from drifting to the towns, thus averting the dangerous development of urban slum areas. Moreover, resettlement programs for the urban unemployed have brought many back to the farms, an effort which has helped alleviate a problem common to most African countries, indeed to almost every nation of the world.

Nor did the Cameroonians allow the presence of two different languages to impose an additional burden upon them. The constitution, as well as all official documents, are printed in both French and English. And besides having practically all bilingual schools, the government has set up special schools to meet its needs for bilingual personnel. Surely a sincere desire for the common good is at work in Cameroon.

But all the planning and technology known to man can be of no use without guidance. Cameroon has found such guidance in the administration of its President, Ahmadou Ahidjo, whose decisiveness has overcome division, whose effectiveness has proven far from ephemeral.

To President Ahidjo and his country, and to a continuing spirit of unity, let us pay tribute.

AN ACCOMPLISHMENT OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Anchor-Hocking Corp. has recently completed a gigantic new distribution warehouse near Lancaster, Ohio. The size of this structure is truly overwhelming; its exterior dimensions are 600 by 1,500 feet; the floor space would accommodate 18 football fields; the foundations alone contain 43,000 tons of concrete. The building will have a storage capacity of 120 million items of glassware manufactured in the company's Lancaster plant.

This facility will feature the most modern developments in loading, storage, communications, fire protection, and worker safety. Products will be shipped from this warehouse to all 50 States and to 105 foreign countries.

This structure will stand as a tribute to the constructive forces of private enterprise in this great Nation. The Anchor-Hocking Corp.'s multimillion dollar investment will create additional jobs, help provide better consumer products at lower prices, and will add to the overall strength of the American economy.

This example should be brought to the

attention of all who insist on more and more Government involvement in our economic development. Free enterprise built our industrial might that is the envy of the rest of the world. It is apparent that free enterprise is still doing the job.

ABIDING VALUES OF AMERICAN SOCIETY

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, writing editorially in United States News & World Report of June 9, 1969, reprinted the full text of an address of Hon. James L. Robertson, Vice Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System. Mr. Robertson's remarks pointedly articulate both the challenge and the answer to America's domestic crises, particularly the rebellion of the young.

Because I think this address is one of the finest I have ever read, I am including it in the RECORD at this point in the hope that all of the readers of the RECORD will take the time to read it and in turn to pass it on as broadly and widely as possible in this great country. To Mr. Robertson is owed the obligation and gratitude of all citizens who realize that unless this problem is solved within the framework of our existing social structure, there will be continuing disintegration of our society toward anarchy and eventual dictatorship. Such loss of our precious freedoms which our forefathers not too long ago gave their lives to preserve must be an urgent concern of all Americans.

The article referred to follows:

A "CONCERNED CITIZEN" SPEAKS ABOUT
AMERICA'S TURMOIL

(By James L. Robertson)

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

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

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

another took a handful of his French fries; and the third picked up his coffee and began to drink it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

in some degree of harmony and to work for common ends; that these laws are our protection against others trampling on our rights; that if we ignore or destroy the law, we jeopardize our own liberty as well as the liberty of others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It was expected that when the majority decided that the national interest led the country into conflict with a foreign enemy, all citizens, regardless of their personal views

or national origin, would support and defend the United States. Thus it was that Nebraska's great statesman, Senator George W. Norris, after having vigorously opposed America's entry into the first World War, declared his unstinting support for the Commander-in-Chief once war was declared.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

could the long, agonizing struggle to obtain the four freedoms begin anew.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DOUGLAS—MOSCOW AXIS II

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, twice last week I rose to call to the attention of our colleagues the aid and comfort given Communists in this country and in Vietnam by Associate Justice William O. Douglas. The papers this weekend again point up the erratic activities of this disgrace to the bench.

Last week his aid to a convicted magazine pornographer, with further cases pending was made public. The society column of the local paper reports his conversation with anti-Communist gossip columnist Pearson at the British Embassy. This week he prepares to attack the Army Corps of Engineers in another lurid magazine. Ad interim, he again does as I have warned he would do—by interfering with troop movements to Vietnam.

I have no knowledge of the merits of this particular case, but point up again to my colleagues that the power to prevent, by judicial fiat, the movement to Vietnam of one fighting man is the power to prevent such movement by every fighting man. The full Supreme Court has never upheld an order of Douglas in a whole series of these military cases.

Only last week the Moscow Summit Conference of International Communism called on all "progressive forces" to obstruct American shipment of troops and supplies to Vietnam. Mr. Douglas has responded. I ask that the three items be inserted following my remarks:

[From the Evening Star, June 14, 1969]

MARINE'S SHIFT TO VIETNAM DELAYED BY JUSTICE DOUGLAS

Marine Pvt. Paul Winters evidently has won his legal battle to stay away from Vietnam.

Justice William O. Douglas yesterday ordered the Marines not to send the 24-year-old Winters to war until the Supreme Court can act on his appeal for release from the Marines.

That won't be until October, at the earliest, and Winters is due to be discharged in August.

Winters has been at odds with the Marine Corps since 1967, when he was called to active duty.

The Marines said the Forest Hills, N.Y., man had failed to perform his reserve obligations satisfactorily. Winters said his enlistment terms called for attendance at only 90 percent of the drills and that the rules were changed later to require 100 percent attendance.

At one point, in October 1968, Winters was on his way to Vietnam, but when the plane stopped in Alaska for refueling, he was taken off on a court order. Another time, he was discharged through a clerical error, and went home. When the Marine Corps found it had made a mistake, he was returned to Camp Pendleton.

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 1969]

DOUGLAS HITS ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

CHICAGO, June 14 (UPI).—The Army Corps of Engineers is a Washington "sacred cow" that commonly outmaneuvers the President and can spend \$10 million on any project without congressional approval, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas writes in the July issue of Playboy magazine.

Douglas says the Corps is Public Enemy No. 1 among Federal agencies.

"It commonly outmaneuvers the President and has its way, irrespective of his wishes," Douglas writes. "A member of Congress who is in good with the Corps will receive favors; those who may have been critical of it will be kept waiting."

"There are few members of Congress who do not early learn the lesson that an obsequious attitude pays off when it comes to pumping millions of dollars into a district that may save an election for a deserving Democrat or Republican but destroy a lovely free-flowing river."

Douglas says the Corps is one of the Nation's largest polluters and that its dams destroy the rivers.

The Corps, with 40,000 full-time employees, has special permission from Congress to spend \$10 million on any project without approval—unlike any other Federal agency, Douglas writes.

He mentions rivers from the Potomac to the Columbia in the Northwest saying, the Corps has built dams on them without regard to conservation or ecology.

[From the Evening Star, June 13, 1969]

QUEEN'S HANDSHAKE SAVES THE GREAT DAY

(By Joy Billington)

On the Queen's Birthday, Catherine Freeman used the queen's handshake as she stood at her husband's elbow to shake more than 2,000 hands last night.

By 6 p.m. a thousand guests had greeted British Ambassador and Mrs. John Freeman at their first garden party in Washington. By 7:05 p.m., she had one white glove off.

Closeted under a tree were Justice William O. Douglas and Drew Pearson, in deep conversation and oblivious of the crowd. The justice, a grass widower while his wife visited relatives in Oregon, said he hadn't read anything about the recent obscenity trial in Montgomery County.

"I don't read about anything likely to come up before the court," he said, explaining that he skims headlines to avoid such accounts. "At the time of the Alger Hiss case I avoided reading about it," he said. "So I still don't know a thing about it."

MRS. RUTH MACPHAIL—OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF INITIATIVE AND PUBLIC SPIRITEDNESS.

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, when an example of a citizen who shows some public-spirited initiative in making their community a better place to live, I like to bring it to the attention of the House. It is good to read of people who do not wait for someone else to do the work and solve the problems.

A good example of this in my district was made the subject of an editorial in her hometown newspaper, The Keene, N.H., Evening Sentinel. I am particularly pleased to put it in the RECORD because Mrs. Ruth MacPhail is a friend of mine whose public spiritedness and charity manifests itself in many ways.

As one who wishes to encourage such displays of initiative and perseverance, I offer this editorial for the RECORD. At the same time my congratulations to my friend Ruth MacPhail for a fine achievement—one of many.

The article follows:

MACPHAIL'S FOUNTAIN

The famous motto of the U.S. Post Office Department could be paraphrased to read: "Neither sleet nor snow nor wild horses nor apathy discourage a woman from doing something she has her mind made up to do." Especially if that woman is Mrs. Ruth MacPhail of Water Street.

Early last August—nearly ten months ago—Mrs. MacPhail, who makes her presence felt in downtown Keene, decided that the people of the city would enjoy and therefore should have a fountain in the Common in Central Square.

The Common had been "renovated" because some of the old trees were dead or dying and had to be removed, and Mrs.

MacPhail was one of many who thought the renovation left something to be desired. But while others talked and criticized, Mrs. MacPhail talked about it and then went to work.

Her independent, one-woman, money-raising campaign got launched in a healthy fashion with an anonymous gift of \$1,000 from a local retail establishment. At that stage she didn't think that very much more money would be needed to build a fountain. But when she began getting estimates, she learned that while water runs into fountains, fountains run into money.

Streetcorner gossip indicated that in the early stages of Operation MacPhail Fountain, only a few people took the project seriously. But as donations began coming in from responsible business firms as well as individual citizens, the idea caught on. And as stories began appearing in the paper and announcements on the radio, reporting that the fund was growing steadily, there was no doubt that Mrs. MacPhail was going to get a fountain built in the Common.

The next step was forming a committee, with representatives in city hall, and ironing out the details.

This week it was all over but the shouting and the masonry, plus some last-minute technicalities; because Mrs. MacPhail now has in her possession a bank book with a balance of more than \$5,300—enough to build the fountain and pay for additional wiring and plumbing.

She deserves the admiration of the entire community for her spirit and determination in first deciding that something ought to be done, and then setting about to do it. It's a classic and heartwarming lesson in perseverance.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF NAURU, GAMBIA, GHANA, TUNISIA, WESTERN SAMOA, CEYLON, BURMA

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

NAURU

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1968, the tiny oval island of Nauru became independent. It had previously been governed by Australia under the auspices of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Nauru, with a population of 6,056 and an area of 8.4 square miles, is one of the world's smallest countries. (Monaco is the smallest with an area of less than a square mile.) It is located 400 miles northeast of Guadalcanal and 1,300 miles northeast of Australia.

Despite its size, Nauru had proved to be quite capable of economic viability. This fact is mainly due to the super-rich phosphate deposits, which are themselves due to the generosity of generations of guano birds. The phosphate is an excellent natural fertilizer and has been very valuable for agricultural uses in Australia and New Zealand. Because of these rich deposits, Nauruans have a higher per capita income than Australians. After the country gained control of the phosphate business in early 1969, the total income has soared to nearly \$24,000,000.

The Nauruans have been described as an "extremely homogeneous group with strong family ties and a gentle, kindly

and generous nature." Under the able and distinguished leadership of President Hammer De Roburt, who was also Nauru's chief architect of independence, Nauru will undoubtedly continue to give its island inhabitants the comfortable and peaceful existence they so desire.

A TRIBUTE TO THE GAMBIA

Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, the heading of a derisive article on the ceremonies surrounding the independence of a small nation in Western Africa read "Enter Gambia, Laughing." But it is this same tiny country—half the land area of Massachusetts and half the population of Boston—which can claim the last laugh. As Gambia enters its fifth year of independence, I bring to your attention only a few accomplishments of a country whose prospects were deemed gloomy by observers on February 18, 1965.

Gambia has rightly earned the title of the "model of independence"—the evidence is considerable. Its economy, based largely on the production of peanuts, has flourished despite the limitations imposed by the very poor, sandy soil. Much to the credit of Gambia is the fact that the peanut output was one-half ton for each member of the population, which enjoys an exceptionally low cost of living. The swamplands, which are often flooded during the wet season, are being cultivated for rice production. And the winning combination of a mild subtropical climate and the small-country hospitality of the Gambians has fostered a potential for a profitable tourist trade. It is no wonder that the Gambia brought British budgetary assistance to an end 1 year before a target date which was set with little optimism in 1965.

The political stability in Gambia has made it unique among the four former British West African colonies. Government has evolved without coups-d'etat, order accompanies the healthy climate of varied political thought. In fact, just last year, the country's main minority party swept the capital city's municipal elections with a handsome plurality, a fact which is an unmistakable sign of democracy at work.

Not only has she maintained her independence in her own right, but she has also avoided becoming part of a larger state, Senegal, which surrounds Gambia, a pencil-shaped country, on three sides. Indeed, Gambia has worked to encourage economic cooperation with the former French colony. Moreover, acceptance in the United Nations and a working relationship with Great Britain add to Gambia's contribution toward international understanding.

When Gambia embarked on the new experience of being a new state, it was said that "in a more rational world Gambia would simply not exist as a separate entity." In this world, Gambia has done more than merely exist. Her history is a commendable record for independence; her future looks more than promising. And it is with great pleasure that I extend my sincere best wishes for her continued prosperity and peace.

A SALUTE TO GHANA

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1957, the Nation of Ghana was born, and with its re-

lease from the British protectorate came probing questions as to how the former Gold Coast colony would fare. Inasmuch as Ghana was the first of the sub-Saharan African countries to achieve independence since World War II, the hopes for all of Africa rested on the example set by her; and she has fulfilled her responsibility well. Many of her achievements are now milestones in her history. I need not mention the distinction Ghana brought upon herself with the success of the Volta River dam project; nor can one help but admire the record of the economy, with a trade balance which has moved from a \$245.1 million deficit in 1967 to an encouraging surplus of about \$68 million in 1968.

But what of Ghana in relation to the rest of the world? The United Nations has found a respected member in Ghana, whose Government has placed international cooperation and understanding high on its list of values. In addition to her role in world politics, her activities for the benefit of Africa have been remarkable. For even though Ghana is a developing nation, she has aided her African neighbors. Add to this fact the initiation of conferences to further African cooperation and a constitution which sets the union of Africa as a fundamental principle, and one can credit Ghana with a sizable contribution to the promotion of African unity.

Since it became a republic on July 1, 1960, Ghana has not had an easy time of it in the realm of internal politics. Beset by the unfortunate circumstances associated with the Nkrumah government, the limitations of its constitution on political diversity, and the regrettable incident recently revealed by the head of the National Liberation Council, Ghana would appear to be doomed to one political failure after another. But Ghana was not destroyed by these setbacks. Indeed, the people almost thrived on the problems and turned them to their advantage.

In 1966 the legacy of the Nkrumah government was what seemed to be an insurmountable total of debts. Rather than trying to shirk the wrongdoings of their predecessor, the leaders of Ghana have negotiated repayment of the \$800 million debt without denying funds to development at home.

A little over a year ago, a revolutionary step was taken by the military government: the drafting of a new constitution. For the establishment of this document marked the beginning of the end for the military government; by September of this year the affairs of Ghana will be administered by civilian leaders. There is also much to be said for a document whose longest chapter is devoted to individual liberty. The rigidity of a one-party system, to which a great deal of African instability has been attributed became an anachronism with the constitutional provision for any number of political doctrines. Freedom abounds in Ghana in both speech and press.

Nevertheless, that time-honored companion of freedom, responsibility, has not been forgotten by the leaders of Ghana. In keeping with its pledge to end corruption in government, the National Liberation Council accepted the resigna-

tion of its leader, General Ankrah, who admitted to accepting funds illegally; the matter was handled with dignity and honor. And an easy transition can be expected to the leadership of General Akwasi Afrifa, whose devotion to Ghana and democratic views will aid in preparing his country for the changeover to a civilian government.

Ghana has succeeded in meeting the problems of a new nation from the outset and throughout its development. I salute the resourcefulness and justice which exemplifies to Africa and to the world a growing democracy: The Republic of Ghana.

INDEPENDENCE DAY SALUTE TO TUNISIA

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to express my belated congratulations to the Tunisian people in this 13th year since their call for independence. From the historic day of March 20, 1956, until the present the relationship of this great country to the United States has been a friendly and constructive one.

On June 1, 1959, Tunisia's new Constitution went into effect. It is striking to note that the Tunisians refer to it as an "American-style" document because under the Constitution the President wields similar powers to those of our own President. The Constitution provides that the President of Tunisia shall "fix the general policy of the state" and be the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces.

No one would deny that Tunisia has a long way to go before achieving complete self-development, but at least it is generally recognized that for the past 12 years this country has endeavored to solve its problems with the greatest energy and dedication.

Tunisian leaders have often expressed their thanks for American assistance in their development programs. Tunisian President Bourguiba, for example, said in October 1967, of the Peace Corps: "I think that this organization, which is an honor to America and which we owe to President Kennedy, is bearing its fruit . . . I wish to thank you for what the Peace Corps has brought in the way of aid to Tunisia."

It has been through the efforts of President Bourguiba that the political orientation of the country has remained decisively pro-Western. President Bourguiba said in February 1968: "We are convinced that the American people constitute a firm support for the protection of civilization. We also believe that United States power is an element of security which keeps the world safe from a certain form of totalitarianism." On April 1 of this year President Nixon met with President Bourguiba following the funeral of General Eisenhower. Gestures of goodwill such as this illustrate the respect that our two countries have for one another.

We have developed especially friendly relations since World War II. Together our troops fought to liberate Tunisia from the Axis powers. And typically the United States has proved itself to be a generous friend. Through our foreign assistance programs we are helping the government build electric power stations and in various other ways develop the Tunisian economy.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that as

a Member of Congress I salute the government and people of Tunisia.

SALUTE TO WESTERN SAMOA

Mr. Speaker, Western Samoa celebrated its seventh anniversary last January, as a free and sovereign state. Under the leadership of the head of state, Malietoa Tunamafili II, and the prime minister, Fiamu Mata'afa, the new country has grown, with the population increasing rapidly.

Western Samoa is often pictured as a romantic South Sea island area where nature supplies most of the simple needs of the people with a minimum of effort. The Western Samoans know that although the islands are endowed generously with beauty and a favorable climate, these are not enough to face the harsh realities and demands of independence.

The economy is based on tropical agriculture. The three chief products are copra, cocoa, and bananas. New food and export crops are needed to provide for the rapidly growing population but further land development is, of course, limited.

Since its discovery by the Dutch in 1722, the Samoan Islands have played an important part in the history of the South Pacific. Strategically located as a military base and a crossroads for trading ships, the islands were soon coveted by many nations. The United States sent its first expedition to the islands in 1839, and the first American consul was appointed in 1856. The climax of this particular struggle for possessions abroad occurred in 1889 when the United States, Germany, and Great Britain successfully checkmated one another's forces. The large islands of Upolu and Savaii with several lesser islands became Western Samoa under Germany.

As a result of World War I, Western Samoa was taken by New Zealand, which held a mandate over these islands, first through the League of Nations, then under the United Nations. New Zealand recognized the rights of sovereignty for her trust territories and a constitution was promulgated in October 1960. Independence was proclaimed January 1, 1962, thus ending 46 years of New Zealand administration and 70 years of foreign rule.

Now the progress of the first Polynesian state of the 20th century is being watched closely by other island groups in the Pacific that are approaching independence. Samoa, in turn, is working hard to set a good example and make itself an effective and responsible member of the world community.

CEYLON

Mr. Speaker, after more than four centuries as a colony of the Portuguese, the Dutch, and then the British, Ceylon became a sovereign state on February 4, 1948. I would like to take this opportunity to send my belated congratulations to that country of 11 million people on their 21st anniversary.

Ceylon is now a self-governing member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Lying on the southeastern tip of India, it has always been an important trading center between East and West.

Like many other developing nations, Ceylon has adopted a socialist economic

policy, which has included the nationalization of several industries and agricultural plantations. Social and economic conditions have improved considerably. Over 65 percent of her peoples can now read and write, and 80 percent of her children between the ages of six and 14 attend classes. The population explosion has to a great extent subsided from a 2.8 percent rate of increase in 1960 to only 2.2 percent in 1967.

Happily for Ceylon, the downtrend in her population growth has been accompanied by growing economic progress. A 10-year plan, which began in 1959, called for diversification and increased production in the agricultural sector. The Government has financed over \$2.85 billion—61 percent—of the expenditure for the plan, and the rewards have been many. The New York Times reported in January 1969 that Ceylon was the first developing nation to achieve the goal of a 5-percent rise in per capita income set by the United Nations Conference for Trade and Development for the "Development Decade" of the 1960's.

We sincerely hope that Ceylon continues her remarkable progress, and that she does so with the tranquillity and wisdom that has come to characterize that warm and friendly nation.

BURMA

Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1969, Burma celebrated the 21st anniversary of her independence. "Independence" has been Burma's watchword in an attempt to find a middle-of-the-road posture in a bipolar world. It has been difficult but hardly impossible.

Under the leadership of General Ne Win who gained control of the Government on October 29, 1962, Burma has pursued a course of "non-Communist socialization." This has often meant the nationalization of industries and commercial enterprises in order to give the country the needed amount of national planning and to insure economic prosperity and social justice for her people.

Factionalism and tribalism have plagued Burma for years. In fact, the oldest active guerrilla war in Southeast Asia is in Burma. General Ne Win is trying to resolve these problems.

On international affairs, Burma has pursued a policy of nonalignment in foreign affairs, which is partially the result of her natural desire to avoid foreign entanglements and partially the result of an acute case of xenophobia. But Burma has actively participated in the United Nations since her admission in 1948. She has participated in the UNESCO Research Center on Social Implications of Industrialization in Southeast Asia as well as in the Colombo Plan Council for Technical Cooperation in South and Southeast Asia.

Symbolic of Burma's trust in the United Nations is her distinguished citizen U Thant, currently serving as Secretary-General.

Up until now, Burma has successfully trod the difficult path of neutrality and relative peace in a region engulfed with violence and turmoil. We can only hope that she continues on this path and that she brings prosperity and justice to her peoples. If she can, she will set an example from which all Southeast Asia can learn.

MEMORIES SPAN A CENTURY

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the Waynesboro, Ga., newspaper, the True Citizen, on June 11 regarding a lady who celebrated her 99th birthday, Mrs. Mary Savannah Barrett Cohen.

Although there is no doubt that having reached one's 99th year would be reason enough to be the subject of much thought and prose, in my case I feel especially fortunate to have a grand lady of this caliber residing in the First District of Georgia. Mrs. Cohen's senior years seem to enhance her charms, her keen interest in things happening around her, and her delight in reflecting back over her years from childhood to adulthood and remembering the vast changes in her hometowns of Waynesboro and Augusta.

I am indeed proud to be able to call Mrs. Cohen a neighbor and constituent, and I certainly hope that she will enjoy her 99th year in the same spirit and with the same zest for living as she has exhibited in all the wonderful years past.

The article follows:

HER MEMORIES SPAN A CENTURY

(By Joyce Odom)

Mary Savannah Barrett Cohen was 99 years old last week.

That in itself is a remarkable thing, but Mrs. Cohen reads three newspapers every day, can remember the ages of her great-grandchildren and writes letters in a graceful, flowing hand.

Bright blue eyes sparkle when she talks about her memories which span a century. She's confined to a wheelchair now at Keysville Nursing Home, and for the first time in her life is a bit less than completely independent.

She was born in Augusta June 2, 1870, and spent her early years in Waynesboro in a house where a service station is now on the town's main street, Liberty.

She remembers that during her childhood her father, Jim Barrett, and an uncle bought "an old broken down paper mill in Bath, S.C., that you had to get to uphill through sand beds." Mrs. Cohen said the mill first made paper from rags which came baled up and in all colors. Workers had to pick out the white ones to use for paper. Then "a man from Massachusetts" came and taught the Barretts to make paper from wood. "Papa took us down to the mill and we watched them grind up the wood; it looked like mush."

"I know they sold the paper made from wood to some newspapers to print on, but they must not have got much for it because the mill went broke," she laughed.

The family also had a plantation here where they planted indigo. She remembers an overseer named Hodges who had a peg leg.

The family moved to Augusta when "Vannah," as she was always called, was seven and lived in a House on Carnes Road, now 15th Street. Her father was "in the cotton business." She lived there until she married Russell Cohen, the son of John J. Cohen of Augusta. Her children were born and went through elementary school in Augusta (a son, Russell, 75, who lives in Waynesboro, and a daughter who died 25 years ago).

The family lived in Nashville, Tenn., while Mrs. Cohen's son Russell attended Vanderbilt and became a football star there. After the children were grown, Mr. and Mrs. Cohen moved back to Augusta, and finally back to Waynesboro.

Mr. Cohen died 20 years ago, and since that time until just a few months ago, Mrs. Cohen has lived alone, driven her own car, cooked her meals and kept house. "I'm not sick or anything now, I just can't walk," she said. She fell and broke her leg recently.

Mrs. Cohen remembers Waynesboro when the downtown area consisted of one block of stores, the streets and sidewalks were unpaved and "every grocery store sold liquor." "Young girls were not allowed to go to town on Saturday night," she said. Most of the stores were just shanties, she said, with the exception of those owned by the Fulchers and the Grays.

In answer to the inevitable question asked the very old, Mrs. Cohen said, in her honest, straightforward way, "I don't know why I've lived so long; my family members usually don't, but I did have an aunt who lived until she was 90."

She sees well and reads everything she can get her hands on including the Atlanta and Augusta daily newspapers and The True Citizen.

Mrs. Cohen's mother, Sophie Settagast, came from Germany and took her children there when "Vannah" was nine for a ten months visit. "Mama wanted us to learn to speak German, but we used to tell her, 'Nobody talks like that!'"

Mary Savannah Barrett Cohen has a fond memory of Augusta which she especially likes to tell about: She remembers riding horseback to a drug store on Broad Street, in the now-traffic-jammed metropolis.

MARTIN LUTHER KING—THE TRUTH CAN NO LONGER BE HIDDEN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time in 14 days I rise to call on the administration to make public information in its possession concerning the illegal, immoral, and subversive activities of the late Martin Luther King.

This information is known to exist. Some of it has already been destroyed.

Unless prompt action is taken, I have reason to believe that more will be destroyed or concealed.

The appropriate committees of the Congress should be given immediate access to what is left of these files before the whitewash is complete.

King's apologists no longer bother to deny his involvement—his close cooperation—with well-known leaders of the Communist conspiracy, both here and abroad.

The American people have learned, a little at a time, of his close association with such identified subversives as Abner W. Berry, Myles Horton, James Dombrowski, Bayard Rustin, Jack H. O'Dell, Carl and Anne Braden, Herbert Aptheker, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Gus Hall, Dorothy Ray Healy, Mike Zagarell, John Abt, Daniel Rubin, and Arnold Johnson, all functionaries and officials of the

Communist Party and all close "advisors," "aides," and "assistants" of King.

The close ties between King and such latter-day subversives as James and Dianne Bevel, Stokely Carmichael, Paul Booth, John Hulett, James Forman, Rap Brown, Jerry Rubin, Fred Shuttlesworth, and Michael Wood are no longer denied. King's close association with known sex perverts Bayard Rustin and Ralph Abernathy is not even denied by his frantic defenders.

These facts are now too well known to the American people. The truth will not go away.

Instead, following the adage that the best defense is a good offense, the left has launched a vitriolic attack on the FBI in general and on J. Edgar Hoover in particular.

Mr. Hoover's monumental record of a lifetime of devoted service to his country needs no defense. History will recall him as one of the great Americans of all time. His meticulous care in the protection of the privacy of the individual while conducting the investigations vital to the security of the community has charted a course which is an invaluable addition to our way of life.

Americans, armed with the facts, have no trouble deciding the question of credibility between this man and his detractors. The latest coyote to join the yapping is Carl T. Rowan, whose column published in the Washington Star yesterday, I insert it at this point in my remarks:

IT IS TIME FOR J. EDGAR HOOVER TO GO

(By Carl T. Rowan)

A society is never in more peril than when the people lose the ability to identify a genuine threat to personal liberty.

This society is in a lot of peril if we may judge from the public reaction—or lack of it—to courtroom admissions of a variety of illegal FBI wiretaps and buggings of homes and hotel rooms.

A justice department official acknowledged in Federal District Court that Dr. Martin Luther King was under electronic surveillance in 1964 and 1965, and the FBI agent who supervised this surveillance told the court "it was my understanding that it went on after that."

The whole truth is that Dr. King's phones were tapped, his hotel rooms bugged, and he was personally shadowed right up to the time he was slain in Memphis on April 4, 1968.

Another FBI agent, C. Barry Pickett, told the court in Houston, Texas, that for four solid years he had listened eight hours a day, five days a week to the conversations of Elijah Muhammad, leader of the Black Muslims. Pickett employed both a telephone wiretap and a microphone planted in Muhammad's home.

These cases of electronic eavesdropping, which violate both federal law and a presidential executive order, were disclosed in a hearing on former heavyweight boxing champion Cassius Clay's effort to overturn a five-year prison sentence for his refusal to be drafted.

These buggings, which caught some Clay conversations in their "net," are but a fraction of the illegal wiretaps that have moved this country far closer to a police state than most Americans realize.

Why the bland, indifferent reaction on the part of most Americans?

First, there is the general FBI justification for such tactics: "national security."

Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who states emphatically that the FBI had no authority to wiretap or bug Dr. King, asserts that "the implication that people thought Dr. King was a security threat is outrageous."

Still, that term "National security" is more powerful than "motherhood," for it evokes fear, and men still surrender more things—including liberty—out of fear than they do out of love.

The puzzling thing about Clark's statement is that he acts as though he is surprised to hear of the wiretapping and bugging of Dr. King. Could Clark possibly have been unaware that FBI officials were going before congressional committees and partly justifying larger appropriations by titillating some congressmen and feeding anti-King ammunition to Southerners who despised the civil rights leader—all by way of revealing "tidbits" picked up through the wiretaps and buggings?

Was Clark unaware that certain FBI officials were roaming the country leaking to newspaper editors poisonous stories about Dr. King and what the buggings allegedly had revealed?

Everybody else in Washington of any consequence knew it, and many deplored it, but no one seemed to know how to go about making the FBI bend to the laws of the land.

There is a not-too-flippant assumption in Washington that J. Edgar Hoover has been FBI director for 45 years because all the recent Presidents have assumed that he knew too much about them to be replaced. So not only was he not replaced by any of the younger, very able FBI men in the normal course of things, but Presidents Johnson and Nixon have felt it wise or expedient to waive a law saying Hoover has reached the rocking-chair age.

Hoover ought to be replaced as FBI director—immediately.

As Washington agency heads go, Hoover may have done a better job than most. But the people of this country knew something when they limited the time one man might serve in the presidency. They saw personal fiefdoms as inimical to the democracy, the personal freedom, that we have come to cherish.

If it is dangerous to have one man serve three full terms as President, it is far more dangerous to have one man take lifetime possession of a powerful police-investigative agency that prods into the deepest secrets of the most prominent, most honored citizens and has the power to discredit, even destroy, almost anyone. The kind of abuse of and contempt for the law manifest in the King and Muhammad eavesdropping become almost inevitable when a man is left in a key job as long as Hoover has been.

Were Hoover a more thoughtful man, or as concerned about the preservation of democracy and liberty as his speeches suggest, he would have resigned long ago. He would not keep putting Presidents in the political bind of deciding to keep him or ease him out.

It is clear Hoover has no intention of resigning. So when does the President muster the courage to say: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Goodbye."?

Mr. Speaker, this column sheds little light on King, except to suggest that which cannot be denied—much is known about his unsavory character and conduct. Rowan's intemperate attack on security surveillance and his personal attack on J. Edgar Hoover shed a great deal of light on the author and the clouding operation, however. Over the past 30 years the Communist Party had conducted the same attack Rowan has paraphrased without apology the party line. For comparison with his attack today, I insert at this point in my remarks a sum-

mary of this Communist Party line, according to its official organs, prepared and released by a committee of this House nearly 20 years ago:

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD: LEGAL BULWARK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY (Prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., September 17, 1950)

5. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Investigate the Federal Bureau of Investigation because of "vicious assaults upon civil liberties" Editorial, (*Daily Worker*, March 13, 1940, p. 6).

An article in the *Daily Worker* indicated that the FBI had gone beyond the scope of its authority in conducting general intelligence investigations. Reference was made to the increase in the FBI's appropriation over a period of years, and it was alleged that because of its Director's "absorbing interest in investigating alleged subversive activities" the FBI was falling behind in its regular job of dealing with other types of specific Federal violations (*Daily Worker*, March 25, 1940).

The Nazi Gestapo is Hoover's Model of Conduct for FBI (*Daily Worker*, December 19, 1940, p. 5, columns 5, 6, and 7).

Federal Bureau of Investigation Director J. Edgar Hoover was referred to as "Chief of the national thought police * * *" (Editorial, *Political Affairs*, January 1948, p. 10).

It seem that the FBI * * * is worried that the American people may get wise to its real function—which is thought control on the Gestapo and Japanese police model (Editorial, *The Worker*, June 6, 1948, p. 6).

The FBI and the Department of Justice have developed into a secret political police which exists outside the law and beyond the U.S. Constitution. * * * An aroused nation must stop the FBI effort to replace the American Constitution by the reign of the political spy (Editorial, *Daily Worker*, June 13, 1949, p. 7).

Continuation of * * * protests can turn the rumors about J. Edgar Hoover's resignation into actual and heartening fact (Editorial, *Daily People's World*, June 16, 1949, p. 6).

The FBI's "undercover network" is a menace to the internal security of the nation * * * The American people must rid the nation of this "undercover network," which serves not the nation but a class, the minority of the financial-industrial cliques. The Bill of Rights and the FBI's "undercover network" are incompatible. One or the other must go. We have no doubt which the people will choose (Editorial, *Daily Worker*, June 21, 1949, p. 8).

Surely the American people must see the FBI with new eyes today. The time has come to investigate its methods, its scandal-mongering lists, its blackmailing data, its misuse of public funds, its usurpation of power, its tentacles gripping all parts of our country and its people (*Daily Worker*, p. 10, June 29, 1949, written by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn).

Mr. Speaker, to make an intelligent judgment as to the credibility of two men whose testimony conflicts, it is necessary to know something of each of the men and of their motivation.

Although J. Edgar Hoover, who called Martin Luther King "one of the most notorious liars in the country" is well known to our colleagues, and his accomplishments are known and respected throughout the world, it is otherwise with Carl T. Rowan who attacks him.

At this point in my remarks, I insert from the recently published Biographical Dictionary of the Left, by eminent his-

torian Dr. Francis X. Gannon, the most recent biographical sketch of Rowan:

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF THE LEFT

(By Francis X. Gannon)

Carl Rowan was born on August 11, 1925 in Ravenscroft, Tennessee, son of Johnnie Bradford and Thomas Rowan. He married Vivien Murphy. He attended Tennessee State University and Washburn College. He is an alumnus of Oberlin College (A.B., 1947) and the University of Minnesota (M.A., 1948). He is the author of *South of Freedom* (1953), *The Pitiful and the Proud* (1956), *Go South to Sorrow* (1957), *Wait till Next Year* (1960), and *No Need for Hunger* (1962).

From 1948 until 1961, Rowan was with the *Minneapolis Tribune* as a copywriter (1948-1950) and as a staff writer (1950-1961).

From 1961 until 1963, Rowan was a deputy assistant secretary of state for public affairs. In that position, he was used as a speech writer and traveling companion for Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. His major achievement for the State Department, however, was to serve as the Kennedy Administration's efficient hatchetman against Moise Tshombe of the Congo's Katanga Province. When Tshombe's anti-Communist regime seceded from the rest of the chaotic Congo, Rowan branded Tshombe as an "international Uncle Tom" who was nothing more than a hand-picked stooge for Belgian businessmen.

In 1963 and 1964, Rowan was U.S. Ambassador to Finland. In 1964 and 1965, he was Edward R. Murrow's successor as director of the United States Information Agency. While in that position, he travelled to Europe, promoting Lyndon Johnson's "bridge building" between the United States and the Communist bloc of eastern Europe. He went out of his way to assure Communist leaders that the United States government had placed its permanent seal of approval on Europe's Communist regimes. To an audience in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, Rowan said that Americans were acutely aware of revolutionary changes sweeping the world. He elaborated: "We emphasize that we believe in change because we were born of it, we have lived by it, we prospered and grew great by it. So the status quo has never been our god and we ask no one else to bow down before it."

In 1965, Rowan resigned his directorship and became a columnist for the *Chicago Daily News* and Publishers Newspaper Syndicate. He is also a regular contributor to *Reader's Digest* magazine and a radio and television commentator for the Westinghouse Broadcasting System.

Throughout his several careers, Rowan has demonstrated that he is a liberal and has been recognized as such by his peers. He has received the Sidney Hillman award for news reporting, the Contributions to American Democracy award from Roosevelt University, the Golden Ruler award from the Philadelphia, Fellowship Commission, the Liberty Bell award from Howard University, the Communications Award in Human Relations from the Anti-Defamation League, and the National Brotherhood award from the National Conference of Christians and Jews. These tributes are almost invariably reserved for those who are actively promoting leftist-liberal causes.

When the Kennedy Dynasty discovered the value of Negroes' votes and began to place Negroes in high government positions, Rowan was one of the show pieces. In 1962, an application for membership to the famous Cosmos Club of Washington, D.C. was submitted on behalf of Rowan. The application was rejected. Within a few days, leading figures in the Kennedy Administration—many of them longtime members of the Cosmos Club—suddenly became color conscious and resigned their membership.

Alexander Jones, executive editor of the *Syracuse Herald-American*, rushed to the defense of the Cosmos Club officers: "I say this incident is a planned political effort in which the Kennedy forces are trying to make Negro capital, using Rowan as a sort of Freedom Rider in the National Capital on the club front.

"I have been a member of the fine old Cosmos Club for more than 20 years and I believe I can speak with some slight knowledge of how it operates.

"I say that there are people who think Carl Rowan is a bumptious, self-enamored and tasteless fellow.

"And that estimate completely discounts the color of his skin. He could be platinum blond and the people I am thinking about would still turn thumbs down on him.

"Many men have been blackballed in application for membership by the Cosmos Club committee, as they have in most private clubs.

"The only one I have ever heard of who ever made a public issue of it is this same Carl Rowan, who is giving every indication of becoming a professional racist."

Rowan has the normal prejudices of a modern liberal. He detests political conservatives and anti-Communist investigations. He is a staunch admirer of the United Nations and its Red hierarchy. He fancies himself an expert on foreign affairs but in reality he is no more than a parroting apologist for the appeasement-toward-Communism policy that has prevailed for so long in the White House and the State Department.

In 1966, Rowan was convinced, or at least let his readers think he was convinced, that the Soviet Union's leaders were trying very hard to effect a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam War.

Rowan has long championed the idea that the United States should make friendly overtures to Red China—something which would have been done a long time ago, he contends, if only the "purges and inquisitions of the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy" had not had a stifling effect on public debate of U.S. policy toward Red China. (When and where this alleged stifling took place, Rowan has never mentioned.)

One curious facet of Rowan's work remains unexplained. On radio and television and in his writings, he is a persistent and dedicated defender of the Central Intelligence Agency—so much so that it is not unreasonable to suspect that he is or has been a CIA agent.

THE VALUE REVOLUTION

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important tasks facing both the individual citizen and all levels of government is coming to grips with the problem of student unrest and campus disorder. We must go far beyond merely reacting to the outward manifestation of this problem, that is, with restoring order to a riot situation and punishing those who destroy property. It is more important that we understand the fundamental questions these students are asking about our value system and the direction in which our country is heading.

I have recently read an article by Stewart Udall, former Secretary of the Interior, which I think really gets to the heart of the transition we are in and to the underlying issues of the campus tur-

moil. Because I agree with Mr. Udall's perception of this value revolution and the need for channeling this concern in a constructive way, I insert Mr. Udall's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1969]

THE VALUE REVOLUTION

(By Stewart L. Udall)

There is a deepening awareness that today's domestic turbulence is in reality a fundamental questioning of the value system of American society.

The protest of the blacks against the personal affronts and indignities of daily life is also a more general protest against the false and frequently inhuman values of our total social system. The widespread student antagonism toward the standards of "the establishment" represents an even broader disagreement with conventional values.

SOCIAL RENEWAL

I believe this pervasive and pointed questioning of values may bring about a shift in those ideas and attitudes that ultimately shape the nation. In fact, we may already be engaged in the most vital sorting out of values since 1776. Even our search for the roots of failure at the time of the Depression was more a questioning of the workability of the economic system than a radical search for the elements of thorough-going social renewal.

Our contemporary turmoil concerns human relationships: between the privileged and the impoverished, between black and white, between parents and children.

If we honestly believe, as I do, that the present young generation is not only the best educated, but also the most aware and idealistic in our history, we must be responsive to its causes and complaints. The anger of the young blacks against the built-in inequalities and hypocrisies of "the system" legitimately challenges the moral basis of the old order.

If a large proportion of the superior university graduates turn their backs on corporate careerism, if many of our most creative minds are turned off by conventional opportunities, we should question the incentives and concepts that make the system go. For there is no doubt that the desire to be merely affluent is yielding to the impulse to live in an environment that is life-giving and creative.

If most of our cities and countrysides are increasingly unclean and ugly we should begin to reconsider the policies that have made them a disordered mess. If technology is to continue its thrust, then it must be influenced by social considerations and aspirations—in short, technology must be civilized.

The thing that appalls the new generation the most, I believe, is the waste endemic in American life: the waste of young talent; the waste of the contributions the unmelted minorities could make if we gave them a chance; the waste of the beauty and bounty of a magnificent continent. The student protest against the Vietnam policy was and is a moralistic protest against waste.

EXCESSES OF WAR

With the benefit of hindsight we now realize it is a judgment wiser than Washington's—a judgment that the lives and wealth expended were excessive and misdirected, and thus demeaned us before mankind.

We will always need in this country all the idealism we can get, particularly from our youth, for the idealist is more sensitive to crucial moral issues, more attuned to the nonmaterialistic opportunities. Who, indeed will pierce our old frauds and follies unless fresh minds question the habits and attitudes of the past?

The value revolution is upon us. It may transform our lives. Those preoccupied with the selfish scramble for easy wealth, un-

merited advantage and personal ease should become accustomed to the well-aimed arrows of those who have contempt for these aspects of American life.

The value doubters will continue to scorn our efforts to define the national well-being solely by Gross National Product, freight-car loadings, auto production, or the sufficiency of military preparedness. They want to assess (and they are entitled to raise the issue) what that product is, what the freight cars contain, what the relevance of individual wheels is to our mass transportation needs, how humanism fits into what can never again be a simple logistical measure of preparedness.

The time has come to recognize the worth of the value revolution and to encourage it toward constructive channels. It can have a profound and beneficial influence on our future if it causes us to renew our lives, revise our institutions, and reassess our directions and purposes.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY MEMBERS SPEAK TO NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON and myself had the pleasure of speaking this morning to the 52d anniversary convention of the National Coal Association. Our respective speeches follow:

NEEDED: A PEACE TREATY FOR THE ENERGY COMMUNITY

(Remarks by the Honorable JOHN B. ANDERSON, Member, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Before the National Coal Association, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969)

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, I hope it isn't too early in the day to speak to you about a serious subject.

I refer to the increasing public opposition, not a little of it wholly unreasoning, to the construction of all electric power plants. The fact that the preponderance of this opposition has of late been concentrated on nuclear power plants should not be of comfort to you. There are those who have made efforts to trade upon the visceral public anxieties associated with the atom, and to a certain extent they have succeeded. But their temporary success, if you can call it that, has had cancerous effects. Unless these efforts are stopped, objective dialogue will give way to unrestrained charge and countercharge, with effects that are inimical to all in the power business. Portraying nuclear plants as bad and electric utility executives as irresponsible individuals intent upon destroying the wonders of nature impairs public confidence in the motivation and integrity of these men in a way that is harmful to more than nuclear power.

As a result, coal and other fossil-fueled plants, hydroelectric projects and pumped storage facilities also have encountered significant and growing public opposition. I regret to say that the situation will probably continue to deteriorate before it begins to improve.

It seems that what should be a genuine, legitimate and quite understandable concern about the effects on the environment of large power plants has been transformed in many instances into an insistence on pristine purity that refuse to recognize the need

to meet two goals—namely, the goal of clean air and water and natural beauty, and the goal of abundant, economical, and reliable electric power. Some balance and some perspective must be given to meeting these goals. We cannot afford recurrences of the Great Northeast Blackout, or a multiplication of the so-called "brown-outs" which have been recurring with increased frequency in recent years. My purpose this morning is to try to give some perspective to these considerations.

THE IMPACT OF ATTACK

The effort needed to overcome the damage being done by irresponsible attacks on the power industry has yet to be appreciated. These attacks tend to destroy years of planning that have been directed to working out suitable arrangements to provide much needed electric power generating and transmission facilities. The attack itself may be initiated on nuclear issues. However, many in reality constitute attacks on power generating stations of any kind. Nuclear power has often provided a convenient way of launching them. But in the long run the coal industry cannot hope to benefit from them.

A factor too often overlooked is the lead time and the planning that must be done to provide power generating capacity, especially during these times of rapidly mounting demand. Significant disruption of these efforts could well consume a major portion of a decade to recover from them. The resulting electric power shortages could be of sustained duration and would have many serious implications for the community. Free, frank and open discussion we must have. But we cannot allow the irresponsible actions of a few individuals to interfere with soundly conceived plans to meet the energy needs of this Nation.

ELECTRIC POWER GROWTH

The demands for energy in this country are growing at a tremendous rate. The Nation will need half again as much energy annually by 1980 as it did in 1965 and almost two and one-half times the 1965 level by the year 2000. Energy in abundance is needed to sustain economic growth and raise the standard of living.

Electrical power usage will represent an increasingly larger share of the total energy demand. In 1965, about 22% of the total energy used in the U.S. was electrical. By 1980, this is expected to increase to about 29% and by 2000 to 52%. The total electric generating capacity in the U.S. is expected to increase about five fold between now and the end of this century. These statistics clearly illustrate the high degree of dependence being placed on electrical power in this country.

An important problem in meeting these power needs is to find suitable sites for locating power generating stations. With increasing frequency, "don't put it here" is becoming the public's reaction to particular sites selected by the utilities. A concern for the environment has contributed to this reaction. An important factor is the increasing competition for potential steam power plant sites. This results from limitations in the availability of suitable land; it also results from the fact that the features which make a site attractive for a power plant also makes it attractive for many industries and other uses.

The siting problem is one that concerns not only the state and federal regulatory agencies with long-standing responsibilities in electric power generation and distribution, but also agencies with environmental and other public interest responsibilities. In carrying out these responsibilities account must be taken of considerations relating to such things as public safety, the quality of air and water, and the protection of scenic and recreation areas.

To resolve these complicated issues re-

quires more knowledge and understanding than we have had. An important first step toward such understanding is the inter-agency effort which led to the report titled "Considerations Affecting Steam Power Plant Site Selection," which was published about six months ago by the Office of Science and Technology. This report assembles in summary fashion our present knowledge of the public interest considerations that should play a role in planning the power plants of the future. The report recognizes that our knowledge is incomplete and in some areas is non-existent. But it has served the important purpose of highlighting these areas and in focusing attention on the need for further meaningful efforts. The report contains no policy pronouncements but it has succeeded in stimulating discussion of the need for additional surveys, research and other actions by the industry and Government to protect the public interest.

For example, *Electrical World*, the industry trade magazine, recently summarized the reasons why the problem of plant siting promises to become more critical in the years ahead. First, the expanding population with its increasing industrial and recreational needs is preempting land areas suitable for siting. Second, the geometric expansion of power generation, involving single units in the 1,000-MW range, greatly escalates the physical requirements—particularly the water requirements—for sites. Third, society's increasing sensitivity to environmental values is already greatly reducing the availability of sites. This trade journal went on to observe that "Unless some thoughtful, constructive approach is worked out, this problem of plant siting will go from worrisome, to critical, to disastrous in the years ahead." I thoroughly concur in that observation.

THERMAL EFFECTS

One of the environmental considerations treated by the siting report was thermal effects. Steam electric power plants, whether fossil-fired or nuclear, release substantial quantities of heat to the environment. Although attempts have been made to magnify the difference that exist between the present light water nuclear and fossil plants, the fact remains that this difference that does exist is only one of degree and both types of plants must accommodate to the thermal effects problem.

The number of people suffering misapprehensions about thermal pollution, so-called, and the extent of their misapprehensions never ceases to amaze me. It is not at all uncommon to see laymen equate thermal discharges with "thermal pollution." Ipso facto, waste heat in their minds means thermal pollution. In turn, they automatically equate thermal discharges with fishkills. In fact, the rejection of heat to an adjacent stream, river or sea does not necessarily mean that damage to fish or to the ecology will result. If the total flow of a stream or the total volume of a lake is adequate to absorb the heat discharge without violation of established water quality standards, then proper plant design can prevent thermal effects problems in the immediate vicinity of the plant site. For example, temperature at which the cooling water is returned to the adjacent body of water can be reduced by increasing the flow rate through the plant condenser, by hold-up ponds, or by improved mixing methods. Provision can also be made for rapidly dispersing this heated water when it is returned.

LEGISLATION ON WATER POLLUTION

Before moving on, one parenthetical note is in order. As you know, a number of laws have been passed on the Federal level in recent years to prevent and control water pollution including thermal effects. Additional legislation is now pending which would significantly affect nuclear power plants and, at least in the larger sizes, most fossil fired plants. I noted that one of the coal industry trade associations expressed opposition to

the measure during recent hearings. The Joint Committee early in the session announced its support of the bill, and in fact the House members of the committee actively supported it on the floor when the legislation was recently considered in the House of Representatives.

The Senate companion to this bill has not yet been reported by the subcommittee within the Public Works Committee presently considering it. However, several weeks ago a draft copy of the bill as it had been revised up until then was made available to interested persons. In the ears of many of us the legislation as it was then proposed had a number of objectionable features. As far as I am concerned, and I know my views are shared by the other members of the Joint Committee, all bets are off as to our support of the bill unless the controls that are imposed on the electric utility industry go no further than are necessary to accomplish the ends that all of us have in mind. If in our efforts to curb and cure pollution we go beyond what is reasonable and necessary, I'm afraid there are going to be a lot of people flicking their light switches to "on" and finding themselves still in the dark. I certainly hope that the subcommittee involved will consider this matter very carefully. Based on information received in the last few days, I now have reason to believe that it will.

AIR POLLUTION

I now want to turn to another area where power plants have environmental effects. I refer to the problem of air pollution, an area identified for immediate priority attention by the Environmental Quality Council recently established by President Nixon.

According to a National Academy of Science report the generation of electricity contributes 12.5% of total atmospheric pollutants. The pollutants of major concern from power plants are fly-ash, smoke, and soot, and the gaseous oxides of sulfur, carbon and nitrogen. These pollutants are annoying, can cause property damage, and can have adverse public health consequences.

The utilities are assisting in the clean air campaign through increased usage of fuel of low-sulfur content. Moreover, strides are being made in developing equipment to remove or reduce the air pollutants generated by the combustion of coal and oil. However, even greater strides could be made through increased industrial and Federal research and development assistance. The Joint Committee's authorization report to be released this week will call attention to this need.

This audience does not need to be told of the difficulties involved in controlling the various pollutants from power plants. You know them and also know the efforts being made to control them—their prospects, problems, and costs.

You know that the City of New York in its Air Pollution Control Code has established standards which restrict the sulfur content of fuel oil to not more than 1% sulfur by weight, and require a gradually tightening limit upon the sulfur content in both solid fuels and residual fuel oils. As regulations like these become more widespread, as they require more stringent control of air quality, the costs of installing, operating and maintaining pollution control equipment will rise. These rising costs and the need for clear air provide strong incentives for more intensive research and development efforts on such equipment. Until satisfactory removal processes are developed, the principal methods available to minimize air pollution effects by electric power plants using fossil fuel will continue to be the judicious selection of the plant site, restrictions on fuel sulfur content, and building high stacks.

RADIOACTIVE RELEASE FROM NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

Let me turn now to the matter of radioactive releases from nuclear power plants, a subject as misunderstood as the question of thermal effects—if not more so.

During operation, nuclear power plants are permitted to release, under well controlled and carefully monitored conditions, very small quantities of radioactivity. Experience to date with licensed operating power reactors shows that radioactivity has been a small percentage of releases that may be permitted under AEC regulations. These AEC limits are based on guides developed by the Federal Radiation Council and approved by the President for the use of Federal agents. In evaluating the acceptable risk from radiation exposures, the Council uses the best technical expertise in the field, and takes into account the recommendations of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, and the International Commission on Radiological Protection.

The control of radioactive waste produced at nuclear power plants will continue to be entirely manageable, as it now is, even though nuclear power production is estimated to grow many fold in the next decade. Fifty billion kilowatt hours of operation have been accumulated to date in commercial reactors without the accidental release of radioactive materials above the annual permissible levels of normal operation.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The AEC and the nuclear industry have long conducted a comprehensive program of research and development on environmental and safety aspects of nuclear power. Nuclear technology has been unusual with respect to the efforts that are going into providing for public safety. Because of this, the safety record of the nuclear power industry has been an outstanding one.

The concern for public safety was perhaps best expressed by Chairman Chet Hollifield of the Joint Committee when he said:

"The atomic energy program is unique in that for the first time a detailed regulatory system was imposed by the government before the experience of any serious accidents prompted a demand for such regulation."

In addition to its safety research and development programs, the AEC has continually carried out extensive investigations in the field of geology, seismology, hydrology, and meteorology. Substantial information has been developed on the movement of water in rivers through studies directed toward understanding the transport of heat and radioactive materials in water systems. Model studies made to simulate various stream environments are directly applicable to the problem of dispersing waste heat, whatever its source. Biological studies of the effect on the ecology of radioactive material that might be present in waste water from nuclear plants are very similar to the types of studies that examine the effects of waste heat upon marine life and vegetation.

A point I must register here is that the entire power industry, not just the nuclear segment, benefits from such research programs. The need is that more be done along these lines, that the efforts of all be joined, in a complementary and mutually supporting manner, to grapple with the problems that confront us. There is just too much to be done to allow our energies to be dissipated in self-defeating efforts which deprecate the contribution that each segment of the power industry can make.

AESTHETIC CONSIDERATION

Another important consideration affecting electric power plants is the effect they have on scenic and recreational aspects of the environment. Some may take a casual view of these concerns, but those who have encountered this kind of opposition will not take it so lightly thereafter.

As with other environmental considerations, there is no way to eliminate completely the effect that electric power plants and their associated transmission facilities have on the natural beauty of the environment. There is, however, much that can be

done, and much that is being done, to minimize adverse effects. Where one type of power plant lends itself to a particular setting, advantage should be taken of that fact. Again, the challenge in this area as in others is to reach a reasonable balance among alternate power sources, recognizing the prevailing technological and economic considerations. Based on progress made thus far, it can be expected that reasonable solutions will be found with respect to the aesthetic effects of power plants and their associated transmission lines and facilities.

THE NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACHES

The electric power industry has shown a willingness to take steps to preserve the beauty of the countryside, but needs encouragement, support, and the constructive contribution of all involved. I hope and trust that those who want the benefits of electric power, but not the inconveniences that go with its production, will realize that they must develop a more balanced point of view. Such a balanced posture would contribute materially to resolving the problems to which I have alluded.

In this connection, the authorization report which the Joint Committee will be releasing in a day or so will provide very constructive support for strengthened efforts on power plant siting. I personally endorse the support thus provided and want to underscore its importance.

As I have indicated, current conflicts between production and distribution of electricity and protection of the environment—regardless of the fuel employed—are but a prelude to larger long-term problems. The Joint Committee believes, and I trust the entire industry believes, the problem of plant siting shows signs of passing into the critical stage, and that a pressing need exists for a long-term policy approach that will assure the availability of generation plant sites in the decades ahead. Therefore, we have urged that the Nation's electric utilities and appropriate agencies of government at all levels join forces to establish realistic, long-range plans for the selection and utilization of sites for large generating facilities so as to best meet the public's twin demand for electric power and environmental protection.

I hope the National Coal Association will support this call for concerted action. A half century ago, procedures were initiated for rational, regional development of the power potential of our nation's rivers. We believe that efforts must now be directed toward applying similar comprehensive planning principles to systematic solution of siting difficulties associated with the burgeoning number of steam electric generating stations. Reliance on ad hoc, plant-by-plant arrangements has already proved inadequate; a bold new approach is required—supported by all involved in meeting the total energy problems and protecting the environment.

CONCLUSION

From my own extensive experience in following basic energy problems, and from my more recent involvement in developing the policies that guide our atomic energy programs, I feel I must comment on the role that each of us is called to play in meeting our nation's needs. All of us who have looked in depth at these needs and problems have concluded that greater efforts are called for—greater research and development programs, and greater emphasis and action on coordinated planning efforts to achieve optimum solutions.

My experience with the Joint Committee and my discussions with many groups responsible for meeting energy needs have convinced me of their determination to proceed in a constructive manner along these lines. They intend to direct their resources more vigorously in support of needed research and development, and more actively in coordinated planning efforts. There is also a

strengthened resolve to see that problems are openly discussed and brought to the attention of those with responsibility for solutions.

It is of great concern to see these purposes subverted; to see resources dissipated in negative effort which tear down the positive endeavors of others. Those involved in these negative efforts seem not to understand that they are unwittingly working against their own best interests.

It is essential that leadership or organizations like this carefully assess their own efforts and those of others to assure that such efforts are directed along the constructive lines I have described. Let me make it clear that I urge this of all groups—and I mean all groups—whose business is energy. Should efforts be found that are not oriented along constructive lines, they should be uprooted and reoriented accordingly.

This nation cannot endure internecine conflict among those entrusted with responsibility for meeting our energy needs. The entire energy community is well aware of the sums of money and efforts being spent by some in efforts whose singular purpose is to oppose competing energy sources, while problems in their own backyard are begging solution for want of such resources—financial, technical and managerial.

You in the coal industry are called to end any such misdirected efforts as may be found in your midst. They are unworthy of an industry which has contributed so much to our national strength, and whose contributions in years ahead will be so important to this nation's welfare. You are further called to make common cause with all engaged in the massive effort needed to meet our energy need and protect our environment. I am confident that the coal industry will not fail this challenge.

ENERGY: TODAY AND TOMORROW

Remarks of Representative CRAIG HOSMER to the National Coal Association, Washington, D.C., June 16)

There are only about four developments in the nuclear area this year that may be of interest to you. First, there is the fact that hardly anybody is buying nuclear reactors any more. But I don't want to talk about that.

Then there are: (1) the development of a national ecological syndrome, (2) the problem of disposition of the uranium enrichment plants, and (3) the probable emergence of a new competing energy source. I shall speak to these in that order.

ECOLOGIFYMANIA

First, ecologifymania. Quite properly Americans have become concerned over their steadily deteriorating environment. Far less attention has been paid to the contaminating consequences of industrialization than is necessary. Far fewer funds have been expended than are needed to accommodate these developments to the reasonable preservation and conservation of our country.

But that does not mean, as some would have us believe, sending the world back to whence it came to be refurbished into its original pristine condition.

Just as the birth of even one more person requires an accommodation with nature to provide ground on which to place his feet—and thereby some ecological consequence, however slight—so, also, is there some similar consequence each time man takes a further step from his original cave. That is the absolutely inevitable and the absolutely inescapable cost of progress.

It does not mean, however, that the price of progress need necessarily be a drab, noxious garbage pit of a world. Measures can be taken to prevent this. It is simply a matter of deciding what changes in our environment are tolerable and a willingness to pay the cost of avoiding the intolerable.

We can thank the conservationists and others who have raised the environmental

and esthetics issue, but also we must see that these issues are made clear to a confused public. Specifically, in the case of electric power, demand for which doubles every nine or ten years, we must make clear that the choice is not "conservation or kilowatts"—we must have both in reasonable amounts. The real issue is this: "How much conservation is fitting, and how much more are we willing to pay for our kilowatts to get it?"

Take the late, lamented Bolsa Island Nuclear Desalting Plant as an example. Ocean water temperature in a limited area around the island would have been raised. Sea growth on which sea life feeds would have been killed. But the sponsors of the project already had located other plant life in the warmer waters of lower California readily transplantable to Bolsa Island as replacement. In this case some change in the ecology would have been involved, but the promoters were willing to pay the cost of minimizing it. However, we still don't know if the conservationists would have accepted even that minimal change as a reasonable cost for new supplies of fresh water and electric power.

And, although the conventional fuels people may take some temporary delight in watching the nuclear people squirm under the pressure of the so-called thermal pollution issue, it will catch up with them, too.

Some smart ecologist will calculate that conventional plants are, say, 40% efficient energy converters and new nuclear plants 35% efficient. Then he will calculate that, respectively, 60% and 65% of the unconverted BTU's go some place. In the case of nuclear plants the whole 65% goes into cooling water. With conventional plants, 10% goes up the stack and 50% into the cooling water. Then, with these figures, our ecologist will piper his followers against the conventional people on two fronts: water pollution and air pollution.

Gentlemen, we're in hot water together and I suggest that we cooperate.

DIFFUSION PLANTS

Next, let's take a look at the three uranium enrichment plants, that vast, 2½ billion-dollar complex of gaseous diffusion technology at Oak Ridge, Paducah and Portsmouth, Ohio which enriches uranium for the world's nuclear reactors.

These plants were sized and built in the late 1940s and the early 1950s, when it was believed that vast quantities of highly enriched uranium would be needed for defense purposes. Subsequent development of the H-Bomb so reduced these requirements that today only about 15% of diffusion plant capacity is required for military needs. What remains is available for supplying slightly enriched uranium to foreign and domestic utilities for civilian power reactors.

Although today the enrichment complex operates only at around 2/5th capacity, the projected growth of nuclear power is such that even with a planned \$800 million improvement and upgrading program, the present complex will be at full capacity by 1980. After that, several new billion-dollar enrichment plants will be needed to keep up with utility demands.

We have long heard complaints—and not just from the conventional fuels people—that government should not be operating these plants primarily for the benefit of the electric utility industry. And, certainly, the taxpayers should not and will not foot the bill for the vast new capital investment in improvements and expansion that will have to be made.

With this in mind, the Atomic Energy Commission has declassified almost all data regarding the gaseous diffusion process and the operation of the plants. It has suggested a spectrum of seven alternatives for their future management, ranging from continued AEC operation to sale of the plants outright to three competing operators.

The first alternative is the same situation we have now and is neither philosophically nor economically available. The last alternative seems to me to be politically unfeasible. I just can't see the U.S. Senate or the House, either, going for legislation which would inspire massive charges of "federal giveaway." The Dixon-Yates controversy is too fresh in my memory.

Somewhere in the middle of the spectrum of alternatives lies the government owned corporation formula—a structure providing access to the private money market for operations and expansion, somewhat along the pattern of TVA. Soon, when the Joint Committee begins hearings on the future of the diffusion plants, I will concentrate my questioning on the government corporation idea, since I believe it to be the alternative that is both economically and politically feasible.

The hearings will go into many very basic questions which must be explored. To state just a few: How shall the price for enrichment services be fixed? Who should determine the tails assay of the depleted feed material? What about the national security? Who should do how much R&D on new diffusion and centrifuge enrichment technologies, and who will pay for it? How will our complex maze of enriched uranium agreements with other countries be honored?

The questions will have to be divided into four different categories. One category will be permanently reserved to the government to resolve as a function of state. Answers to another should be included in the enabling legislation and the corporate charter. Decision making regarding the remaining categories ought to be allocated, as appropriate, between the corporate board of directors and its general manager, with suitable guidelines for proper resolution being provided.

This job will have to be done with considerable care and wisdom. The nuclear power industry from the mines to the ultimate consumers has a great stake in how well the problem of the future uranium enrichment is solved, as do nuclear power's competitors.

This mention of competition amongst energy suppliers leads me to my final topic, which, under the circumstances, I shall discuss in some detail.

GREAT NEW ENERGY SOURCE

Recently a technical paper has come into my hands which indicates a great new energy source may soon be brought into existence to compete with conventional fuels like oil, gas, and atomic energy.

This paper emanated from a laboratory hastily established by refugee scientists in a squash court beneath the football stands at the University of West Virginia. It reveals that the actual existence has at last been confirmed of a substance known as coal (that's spelled c-o-a-l).

This was sobering news to me, and I am sure others who have regarded this possibility as no more than a rumor, deviously designed to confuse the Bureau of Mines, constrain the utility industry, and drive down the cost of nuclear kilowatts.

Previously, coal was thought to be only a legend of the Carboniferous Age, when savages used certain fossilized plant remains as jewels and to blacken their faces during pagan ceremonies.

PEACEFUL USES

This very learned and highly technical paper suggests that this exotic substance, heretofore only predicted in the Periodic Table of the Compounds, may someday even be used in reactors for the generation of electricity.

What a great thing it would be for America if we could come up with a new energy source capable of competing with the atom. A thought like that staggers the imagination!

First there was fission. Then there was fusion. Now, looming on the technical horizon

is the exciting new concept of oxidation.

Today, at what I shall boldly call the dawn of the Coal Age, we must surely expect the onset of the same hopes, fears and expectations that characterized the dawn of the Atomic Age. We are challenged to unlock the power of coal to make its incalculable energy available for the benefit of all mankind.

Some day, every family may even have a small coal reactor in its backyard, generating electricity which is too cheap to meter.

Other potential peaceful applications are seemingly endless: coal powered automobiles, coal propulsion for ships and aircraft, coalbalt cancer cures, and coal propelled spacecraft lifting astronauts to the planets and beyond.

MILITARY APPLICATIONS

Military applications of coal will, of course, be highly classified. But you may be certain that America does not intend to be second in the coal bomb race, and that coal deterrence will become the keystone of United States military strategy.

We will build a sophisticated arsenal of A-Bombs—Anthracite Bombs—and Bituminous Bombs. Clear-cut coal superiority will assure this nation that no potential aggressor will ever become emboldened to attack us.

And we will build great national coal laboratories at such places as Los Coalamos, N. M., Carbonne, Ill., and Coke Ridge, Tenn.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

It goes almost without saying that our national guilt complex, caused by subjecting the world to the unthinkable horrors of coal war, will demand that we develop manifold peaceful uses of coal as quickly as possible, money being no object.

And I think we can do so. If its development is handled right, coal can become the greatest power source since atomic energy. But it should be crystal clear to all that such a critical undertaking as this cannot be left to the whims of a fledgling industry. It obviously requires the steady, bureaucratic hand of government to assure that everything is done properly and that no one rushes ahead precipitously.

This monumental effort may take 20 or 30 or even 50 years and billions and billions of dollars for research, development and, of course, demonstration. Since a small and inexperienced coal industry could not possibly finance rapid and massive development of coal's peaceful uses, government must subsidize it. To implement this I propose the following:

First, creation of a Coal Energy Commission, headed by five wise and articulate men, whose job it will be to subsidize development of coal technology, provide public liability insurance against its hazards, and travel around making speeches about it.¹

Second, creation in the Congress of a powerful and prestigious Joint Committee on Coal, which will be kept fully and currently informed on the subject, and whose job it will be to harass the Commission, to pontificate, to ram coal bills through Congress, and to travel around making speeches about it.

As an adjunct, we also must initiate a Coal-For-Peace Program and establish an International Coal Energy Agency to help promote coal on a world-wide basis and to prevent its surreptitious diversion from peaceful to military uses.

Once these steps are taken we will be ready to start spending the taxpayer's money, hopefully at a rate of \$2-to-\$3 billion a year.

¹The Chairman of this Commission should be some laureate known and respected world-wide as "Mr. Coal"—someone of impeccable qualifications such as Tony Boyle or Brice O'Brien or even Ralph Nader.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION

We will begin, pursuant to the venerable doctrine of *caveat emptor*, by building first generation coal reactors so heavily subsidized that no sensible utility can afford not to buy one.

Then we will build second generation, unsubsidized coal reactors which utilities will be willing to buy because they have become status symbols and because their ownership evidences a utility's allegiance to flag, country and conservation.

When coal is burned in a reactor, some scientists predict it will bring into being a very valuable by-product known as fly-ash. We must learn to recycle fly-ash in coal reactors.

There is even the impressive possibility of third generation breeder reactors, which will breed more fly-ash than they consume, thereby assuring the world of limitless energy for all time to come.

If coal people but have the courage and wisdom of those who founded our atomic age and made it great, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve nor foreign foe we need ever fear. For the real secret of success for the Coal Age is to be learned from the Atomic Age. In a word, it is: Promote.

The Commission and the Joint Committee should deluge the nation with messages such as: "Coal Powers America's Future"—"Coal for Peace and Plenty"—"Keep Cool and Clean with Coal"—"Enrich Thermally with Coal"—and so on.

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

But make no mistake. The path to coal glory will not be easy. The atomic energy people will fight back in many crafty, subtle ways.

They will be aided and abetted by others staunchly opposed to coal for philosophical reasons, and kooks incapable of viewing coal in terms other than those of mushroom clouds belching from prurient seas of ugly coal reactors, totally lacking redeeming social value.

They will get Congressmen from uranium states to introduce legislation to investigate the slag heaps. Moral issues will be raised about Radon's daughters being down in the mines with the dirty old coal miners.

The Coal Energy Commission's jurisdiction will be challenged by the Interior Department; the Justice Department will investigate the infant coal industry's vertical, horizontal and slantwise integration.

PUBLIC SAFETY

But the most dangerous attacks will focus on coal reactor safety, coal's unknown genetic consequences and coal's dangers to the environment.

Maximum incredible fear and alarm will be generated in the populace over the hazardous waste product from coal reactors. Coal's foes will not hesitate to flail the industry with such terror-invoking phrases as carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide.

And everywhere people will be asking, What if a coal reactor's oxygen supply got out of control? Will it melt down, all the way through the earth, and come out in China? Will massive quantities of deadly, toxic gases be released on billions of people?

How heavily, will they ask, can human wisdom, care and engineering be relied upon to hold this peril under control? They will say that if the Lord wanted coal reactors on the face of the earth, he would have made coal grow on trees.

PREDICTION FOR THE FUTURE

Let me venture a prediction. One day in the not-too-distant future, a very strange thing will happen.

A small, elderly woman will return home from her Coalinga, California, Sierra Club meeting. She will smile at her African violets, kick off her tennis shoes and prepare to belt

down her usual frozen daiquiri luncheon. As she activates the electric blender, the entire nation will plunge into darkness. The last final overload on the generating capacity will have occurred.

At that precise moment, three thousand miles away across an entire continent, in the hearing room of the Joint Committee on Coal, the nuclear people will have just completed their emotion-charged testimony once again demanding an end to coal subsidies.

The lights in the hearing room will flicker, then dim, and finally the lights go out. And sitting there in the darkness, with only the gentle sobbing of the chairman and ranking minority member to break the silence, coal's proponents and coal's opponents will contemplate the tragic series of events which led to this catastrophe.

Slowly the realization will come that they were so busy fighting each other that they forgot their prime obligation to the American people—which was to provide energy in ample quantities at the lowest possible cost.

The American people didn't care whether their electricity was nuclear kilowatts or the exciting new coal kilowatts.

But the public listened when the nuclear people accused the coal people of polluting the skies; and they listened when the coal people accused the nuclear people of polluting the waters. They listened when the preservationists sought to stem the black tide of pollution and raised the battle-cry: "Electric power, no—flower power, si!"

The people got mad. They picketed and they protested and they demonstrated. They intervened at public hearings. They flooded the mail with conservationist ads clipped from the newspapers. They read books about "Careless Coal." The public became so enraged that they passed a constitutional amendment guaranteeing every American's fundamental and inalienable right to safe, healthful, productive and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings.

No one could build a power plant any more. And soon there just weren't enough kilowatts to go around.

On that future day of which I speak, and in that hearing room of the Joint Committee on Coal, and in that darkness the atomic people and the coal people at last recognize the error of their ways. They determine to abandon their collision course. They coalesce into a coalition and pledge forevermore to work together in the public interest.

Thus will America emerge from her Dark Age.

And if all this has any moral, in just plain, salty everyday, down-to-earth language, the moral would be:

*Post hoc ergo propter hoc—vis unitas for-gior.*²

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION TO A TAXPAYER SUPPORTING A DEPENDENT WHO IS MENTALLY RETARDED

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents called my attention to a problem faced by millions of American parents. His 26-year-old, mentally retarded, son earns about \$5 a week in a sheltered workshop. The father must, of course, provide his

² Don't let them kid you, fellows—stick together and we'll whip them.

son's food, lodging, medical, clothing, and other expenses. But at the same time, he must save for his son's support after his own death or retirement. In order to ease the burden on families and enhance the future security of the mentally retarded, I am introducing legislation to extend an additional \$600 income tax exemption to any taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded.

In a special message to Congress in October 1961, President Kennedy estimated that 126,000 children are born each year who will be mentally retarded at birth or later in life. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, about 3 percent of our population—approximately 6 million Americans—are mentally retarded—120,000 of them in Maryland. On the basis of Treasury estimates, Maryland families with retarded dependents under this legislation would save approximately \$12 million annually.

My bill states that mental retardation exists when a doctor certifies that an individual has a medically demonstrable severe mental defect or infirmity that prevents him from undertaking mental activity that is considered normal for his age group, or that prevents him from engaging in normal remunerative employment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of this legislation during the present session of Congress.

WITHHOLDING CITY EARNINGS TAXES FROM FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which calls for the regular withholding of city earnings taxes from the pay of Federal employees.

The regular withholding of taxes by an employer from employee payrolls was initiated as a service to both citizens and government bodies. It was reasoned that such a system would make it easier for a family to budget its income and, at the same time, eliminate the costly burden of collection and provide for more efficient fiscal planning on the part of the taxing body.

Enactment of this legislation would enable Federal agencies to the extent practicable and economically justifiable to give cities the kind of cooperation now afforded States in collection of their income taxes from Federal employees.

The proposed withholding system is peculiarly important to cities because of the low rate of local income taxes, which generally do not exceed 2 percent. The liability of one taxpayer is, therefore, generally so small that the filing of individual returns, tax enforcement, and collection procedures associated with higher rate State and Federal income

taxes are uneconomical. Thus, fair and productive municipal income taxes must rely largely on withholding.

Because of the peculiar situation in which Federal employees find themselves, they are generally required to file individual returns which most other taxpayers are not compelled to do. Too frequently, they find themselves assessed interest and penalties for late filing. In some cases, they face embarrassment for having failed to report, and they become the victims of collection proceedings.

Under these circumstances, equity in administration, as well as revenue considerations, would seem to demand that the Federal Government be required to withhold just as other employers do. This would be fair to the locality, would be fair to other employees subject to withholding, and it would be fair to Federal employees who now must pay their local income taxes quarterly or annually rather than through very small amounts withheld from their pay.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, 151 House Members were surprised and disappointed recently when the youth camp safety survey bill failed to pass under suspension of the rules. We are confident that this important bill will be approved when submitted again to the House under its regular procedures.

As sponsor of the original youth camp safety survey bill I was especially surprised that the issue in the floor discussion was economy. This bill, like my version, was designed as a very modest proposal whose very essence was economy of both funds and Federal involvement.

The original youth camp safety legislation asked much more than a survey because the sponsors felt the problems of youth camp safety were well-established. But a cautious report on that first bill by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that more information was needed. Instead of a Federal program to set safety standards where few now exist, we accepted the HEW plan to study further the state of State, local, and private regulation of camping safety.

Facing such a survey were these facts: Nineteen States have absolutely no regulations on camp safety.

Thirty-three States have no licensing requirements for camp operators.

Twenty-nine States require no annual inspection of camp facilities.

Only four of the 21 States which do inspect annually require that safety factors be considered in the inspection.

The additional information which this youth camp safety survey bill proposes to collect will give us more insights into the state of safety which affects the millions of children who camp each year.

I am confident that a majority of this House will see that \$175,000 is a reasonable amount to obtain this information and that this bill will be passed when it is considered again soon.

I include below a story from the Long Island Press from June 2, 1969, the date the House failed to pass this bill under suspension. "Is Your Child's Summer Camp Safe?" raises questions which we must reconsider soon.

I also include a letter from the American Camping Association, the largest group representing private camps in this country, which expresses the Association's endorsement of the bill to survey our Nation's youth camps and assess their health and safety standards.

The material follows:

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press,
June 2, 1969]

IS YOUR CHILD'S SUMMER CAMP SAFE?
(By Richard H. Stewart)

WASHINGTON.—In the summer of 1967 a flat bed truck with 62 children and eight camp counselors somersaulted on a high-speed freeway in California.

Four children and one counselor were killed in the crash. Fifteen others were seriously injured.

The driver was 20 years old. The speedometer needle in the wrecked truck was fixed at 58 miles per hour.

California, like 45 other states in the nation, has no regulations regarding the condition of camp vehicles or the qualifications for those who drive them.

In 1965 a group of boys and their counselor from a camp in New York traveled to the Montreal River in Toronto, Canada, and, despite warnings, put their canoes into dangerous rapids. Two of the canoes overturned and some boys were injured, but not seriously.

Several days later the same group arrived in Maine at the Penobscot River's west branch, a dangerous churning span of water used by a paper company to shoot logs downstream.

Residents of the area considered the river too dangerous to venture out on, but the camp counselor led his charges into the white water.

One boy, David Kurman, 15, of Westport, Conn., a strong swimmer, was drowned. His body was recovered three and a half days later.

New York is among 40 states that do not require any specific training for camp counselors handling aquatic activity.

This summer an estimated 8 million (nobody knows the exact number) children will be sent off to about 10,600 summer camps (that figure also is uncertain).

Parents of these children will know precious little about the camps. Some will have been influenced by flashy brochures that are in reality meaningless. Some will have actually visited the camps involved but without any of the basic ideas of what to look for or how to judge the camp.

In truth, a one- or two-day visit will give them little insight into the most important factor in a summer camp, the quality of its director and staff.

Statistics compiled by investigators of summer camp operations point up how hazardous the regulations are:

Only 21 states require annual inspections, and in all but four of these they are conducted by health agencies and do not cover safety factors.

46 states have no age requirements for camp counselors.

19 states have no regulations at all for camps.

48 states have no minimum age for the camp director, and only 17 require that the camp operator be licensed.

States do not require that a doctor be on call and 37 do not even require that there be a health supervisor on the staff.

The only semblance of national standards for camps comes from the American Camping Association, a non-profit organization which allows camps which meet its standards to advertise that they are ACA members.

It conducts inspections of applying camps and visits them periodically thereafter, but has no way of enforcing its rules except by withdrawing its seal of approval from the camp's advertising.

Less than one third of the nation's camps are accredited by the ACA.

Ernest F. Schmidt, executive director of the ACA, told a congressional committee last year:

"We know that some camps are not safe. There are many reasons for this: lack of equipment, lack of experience, lack of money, lack of proper facilities or equipment, lack of foresight, sometimes just lack of judgment."

Senator Abraham Ribicoff has taken the lead in trying to promote national standards for camp operations through legislation he has filed since 1966 but which has not yet reached the floor of Congress.

Ribicoff's bill would require the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to make a study to establish a national standard for the states and encourage their implementation by the federal government paying one half of the cost of the state's cost up to \$50,000 per state.

Introducing the bill in the Senate again this year, Ribicoff said, "One out of every eight camps visited by representatives of the ACA in 1967 failed to meet ACA standards. And it is generally recognized these are some of the best camps in the nation."

"The bill is aimed at fly-by-night operations and those camps that are unaffiliated and unaccredited by responsible camping organizations . . . those that fail to provide a safe environment do not belong in the business."

AMERICAN CAMPING
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Martinsville, Ind., March 11, 1969.

HON. BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROSENTHAL: I know that you will be pleased to learn that at the meeting of the National Board of Directors of the American Camping Association in Atlanta in February, Bill No. H.R. 763 was discussed.

I have been requested by our Board to offer you the full cooperation of this Association in the passage of important legislation.

I have instructed our National Executive Director, Ernest F. Schmidt, to offer his assistance and to keep in touch with you, and in having our National Headquarters write to all of our forty Sections and Seven Regions, stating our National Board's reaffirmation of support for the Bill by asking that letters to this effect be written by the Sections and Regions to their respective legislators.

May I thank you for your continued interest in safety for American youth and for the opportunity that is being given the American Camping Association to help in this effort.

Sincerely,

FRANK M. WASHBURN,
National President.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: GRAPE
BOYCOTT-BREAKERS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it upsets me to see the power of the Department of Defense used to break a labor boycott. Yet, that seems to be happening in California's grape strike.

Two articles from recent issues of the Los Angeles Times show an interesting picture of the grape boycott's effect after 2 years, and how military purchases of grapes have zoomed since the boycott's start.

As Times labor writer Harry Bernstein points out, grape sales have dropped off 6.5 percent from their 1966 level at the same time that the Defense Department upped its consumption of grapes from 7.5 million pounds during 1966-67 to a planned purchase of over 16 million pounds this year.

For me, the implication here is clear—and disgraceful. Without the rapid increases in Defense grape buying, it is probable that the grape workers would have found the producers much more willing to sit down and discuss the problems which caused the strike and boycott. Yet, as long as the Government, that is, the Defense Department, can take up any slack caused by the boycott, there is just no reason for grape producers to need to end the strike.

Such a policy stemming from the Government is deplorable. No matter how much the Defense Department claims that the jump in grape purchases was not related to the boycott, I remain unconvinced.

I insert two articles from the Los Angeles Times in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 6, 1969]
FARM UNION DISCLOSES SOARING GRAPE PURCHASES FOR VIETNAM

(By Harry Bernstein)

Military and civilian consumption of California table grapes in South Vietnam is soaring. It was reported Thursday by the AFL-CIO United Farm Workers' Union.

Government officials in Washington, D.C., denied union charges that the increase in grape purchases was designed to help growers in the grape strike-boycott, but confirmed the figures in a Defense Department study.

South Vietnam was the 25th largest importer of U.S. fresh grapes before the strike-boycott began two years ago. At that time, South Vietnamese civilians imported about 350,000 pounds of grapes a year.

Department of Commerce figures for the last fiscal year, however, show that South Vietnam civilian purchases of grapes have gone to 2.8 million pounds and that country is now the world's third largest importer of grapes.

The U.S. military purchases of California grapes has gone up even faster.

The Department of Defense says it is now shipping eight times more grapes to U.S. troops in Vietnam than in any previous year.

The U.S. military in Vietnam distributed 468,000 pounds of grapes in 1967 compared to 2 million pounds in the first half of this year, with an estimated 4 million pounds estimated for the year as a whole in Vietnam.

Overall, the Defense Department purchased 7.5 million pounds of grapes in 1966-67 compared to 16 million pounds planned for purchase this year.

So far this year, 8 million pounds have been bought for the U.S. Armed Forces.

The AFL-CIO charges the military has been "buying up dumped California grapes as a market of last resort for the struck grape growers."

The Department of Defense insists it has not taken sides in the grape dispute and that purchases of grapes have been increased only because "troop acceptance" of grapes has increased and that there are fewer supplies than usual of other fresh fruits.

The union began its strike two years ago against California grape growers when the growers refused to bargain with the union or to hold secret-ballot elections to decide whether farm workers wanted a union at all. Growers insisted their workers wanted no part of the union, but now they have agreed to back federal legislation permitting union representation elections, provided the law would prohibit boycotts and strikes at harvest time.

When the strike alone did not bring any action from the growers, the unions started their worldwide boycott.

The boycott won new support here Thursday from a delegation of 31 political, labor, legal and church leaders from Canada who predicted that their country this summer will halt most of its California grape purchases.

The delegation stopped here en route to Delano and the Coachella Valley to join farm worker picket lines.

Dennis McDermott, general vice president of the Canadian Labor Congress and Canadian director of the United Auto Workers told a press conference:

"Canada normally buys over 15% of California grapes. In the past few days, the three largest grocery chains in Canada agreed not to buy California grapes, including Dominion, Ltd., with 200 stores in Ontario; Loblaw's, Ltd., with 259 stores, and Stienberg's, with 58 stores."

The Canadians were termed "either complete hypocrites or a band of innocents" by Michael Bozick, president of the Desert Grape Growers League in Indio.

He said Canadian pickers earn between \$1 and \$1.20 an hour compared to nearly double that for California grape pickers, and said that if the Canadians look carefully they will see that "our workers are healthy, happy residents of our community . . ."

In another development, the Labor Department announced in Washington that it will change its previous policies and will now let California officials determine when a farm labor dispute exists.

Until now, federal officials made such determinations, and last year certified that 45 farm labor disputes did exist.

This meant that the state employment department could not send farm workers to firms certified as having a labor dispute.

California officials found that less than a dozen labor disputes existed, but federal certification took precedence.

The new decision was criticized by Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) who told Secretary of Labor George Shultz that it marked a "retreat of the federal government in the field of farm labor relations."

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 9, 1969]
SALES OF GRAPES OFF ONLY 6.5 PERCENT DESPITE BOYCOTT—GROWERS, UNION LEADERS DIFFER ON INTERPRETATION OF LATEST STATE FIGURES

(By Harry Bernstein)

California grape growers sold 527,900 tons of table grapes in 1968 despite the most massive boycott ever conducted against a product in a labor dispute.

The sales were down only about 6.5% from 1966—the most comparable crop year, according to experts.

Growers and union leaders are disputing the meaning of the new figures put out by the California Department of Agriculture as grape growers begin harvesting the first of the state's 1969 crop in Coachella Valley.

Growers say the boycott has had relatively little impact, other than to cause some disruption of the market, which forces them to sell grapes in different parts of the country when the boycott is partly effective in the usual big-city areas.

The AFL-CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee says the boycott has had a major impact on California table grape growers and that the strike-boycott will be even more effective on this year's crop.

FIGURES INTERPRETED DIFFERENTLY

The same figures are available to both sides but are being interpreted differently.

There is no argument that the boycott has had some effect, but the question still unresolved is whether it has achieved the kind of impact that might be expected from a campaign waged in almost every major U.S. city and in dozens of foreign countries.

The boycott began two years ago when grape growers in the Delano area refused to recognize the farm workers' union, headed by Cesar Chavez, as bargaining agent for their field employees.

Management said its workers did not want a union, but it refused a union proposal to let the workers decide by secret-ballot elections.

When a strike failed to halt the grape harvest, the boycott began.

Both sides agree that the fairest comparison of grape sales comes from figures for 1966 and 1968, because 1967 was an "off year" for a variety of reasons including weather and marketing conditions.

COMPARATIVE FIGURES CITED

In 1966, there were 564,200 tons of fresh grapes sold at an average of \$84 a ton for a total of \$47.4 million.

In 1968, there were 527,900 tons of fresh grapes sold at an average of \$81.90 a ton for a total of \$43.2 million.

This represents a drop in gross income of \$4.2 million, which the union says was caused primarily by the boycott, and the growers say it was typical of the fluctuations in any variable food crop.

The simple figure of \$4.2 million does not represent the only effect of the boycott, the AFL-CIO contends.

Wages and other labor costs were up substantially—some estimates say about 25%—and normally this would have pushed grape prices upward. Yet, the union notes, grape prices went down despite the rising labor costs.

Also, the price of grapes or other products might normally be expected to rise as the supply drops. The supply of fresh grapes dropped by about 6.5% from 1966 to 1968, but the prices also dropped.

This, too, could be attributed to the boycott effects, as the union claims. The growers, however, discount such figuring.

There is also a long-range change that seems to be taking place in California's table grape industry which might be caused in part by the boycott.

In 1966, the total table grape-bearing acreage was 82,000. It had dropped to 78,100 by last year. And the Department of Agriculture is predicting that a total of only 74,500 acres will bear table grapes this year.

Some experts say there are nonboycott factors that are causing a drop in table grape acreage (wine grape acreage is up from 1966 to 1968).

But others, including some growers, say that while they may have been thinking about cutting down their grape acreage, the

boycott was enough to make the decision final.

And the union contends that the cutbacks in acreage are due primarily to the effect of the boycotts.

Before the strike-boycott began, the growers and their political allies were strongly opposed to any federal legislation that would set up election machinery to let farm workers vote on whether they want a union.

Agriculture is totally unlike other industries, the growers argued, and they opposed all attempts to give farm workers the kind of labor laws, including union representation elections, available to most other workers.

Since the boycott, however, growers in California have changed their position, and are now backing legislation that would let farm workers vote for or against a union.

They hedge their move by calling for laws that would also prohibit boycotts or harvest-time strikes, and Sen. George Murphy (R-Calif.) has introduced legislation to achieve this. It has been denounced as unfair by the unions.

Chavez says the grower-proposed farm labor law is worse than the present "laws of the jungle, which provide neither grower nor worker any protections."

But he contends that the growers' decision to seek some kind of legislation was prompted by the effectiveness of the boycott and strike, and not "by their sudden recognition that farm workers should have the same rights as other workers."

Michael Bozick, president of the Desert Grape Growers League, said growers "will continue already extensive efforts to solve the problems this boycott has created—not here in California grape fields but in such cities as Toronto, where housewives are being denied by unions and their rabble of extremist supporters the right of freedom to choose for themselves what they can or cannot buy."

(Bozick was responding to a delegation of Canadian labor, church, legal and government officials who came here last Thursday to pledge support for the table grape boycott.)

A MAN ON THE MOON—A PERCEPTIVE COMMENTARY

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as we verge on the eve of a landing on the moon, I thought the House would be amused and perhaps edified to read the following whimsy written by my good friend Ed DeCourcy of the Newport, N.H., Argus-Champion. As Members will see, it is whimsy with a bite. The ancestors of Mr. DeCourcy's moon man had a place to go—the earth—when things went bad on the moon and life could not be supported. We would not be so fortunate, the moon and apparently all the other planets being uninhabitable by man. Let us then pay attention and, reading beyond the whimsy of Mr. DeCourcy's fable, respond with vision to the urgent message which underlies it:

[From the Newport (N.H.) Argus-Champion, June 5, 1969]

THE SPECTATOR

(by Edward DeCourcy)

MOON LANDING SITE No. 2, July 20, 1969.—Astronaut Neil Armstrong reported a strange

interview from here this afternoon. As he stepped down the ladder from his LM and put his left foot into the soft lunar dust, he was greeted by a man with no space equipment whatever.

"Good morning, my name is Adamson."

"Good morning, Mr. Adamson, my name is Armstrong."

"So you finally came back."

"I don't understand."

"Well, I don't mean you, exactly. I mean that your people finally decided to come back."

"Sorry, Mr. Adamson, I still don't understand."

"Didn't you just fly in from Earth, up there?"

"Yes, we did. We are the crew of Apollo 11, and as you can see from the sign on the Lem, we are from the United States."

"Never heard of the United States, but we used to have a legend here about a guy named Apollo, who was supposed to be god of sunlight, but I never put much stock in that."

"I'm sorry, Mr. Adamson, but I'm confused. Where are you from and how did you get here?"

"Those are silly questions, Mr. Armstrong. I'm from here, and if I may say it, I got here the same way any baby gets where he gets. I was born here."

"Well, Mr. Adamson, what do you do here?"

"Not much, really. My family is sort of keeper of the archives. That doesn't mean much, because there aren't any archives. But my family seems to have taken on the chore of keeping the history of our people by word of mouth."

"None of this makes much sense, Mr. Adamson."

"Maybe it will, Mr. Armstrong, if I tell you how I happen to be called Adamson. You see, my ancestor, away, way back, was the first astronaut."

"Oh, that's exciting. We thought the first astronaut was Yuri Gagarin, and that the first American astronaut was Alan Shepard."

"Never heard of them, Mr. Armstrong."

"Well, they never got beyond Earth orbit."

"Oh, you mean they were astronauts who took off from Earth?"

"Well, of course, Mr. Adamson, where else?"

"Well, Mr. Armstrong, my ancestor took off from here."

"You mean from the moon?"

"Certainly. That's the climax of the history my family preserves. We know that the moon's satellite, Earth, could be reached, and all through the history of mankind there had been a yearning to get there, but it wasn't until my ancestor's time that our scientists had developed the technology to get there."

"Mr. Adamson, there's been a lot of subversive rumor in recent years about flying saucers, and all that sort of bunk, but no creature has ever been known to emerge from one."

"Mr. Armstrong, that's preposterous. How do you suppose you got to Earth?"

"Well, if I may say it, Mr. Adamson, I got there the same way you told me you got here."

"Well, yes, I suppose that's right, but just how do you suppose your ancestors got there?"

"Golly, Mr. Adamson, I've got to leave in an hour and a half and I haven't got time to get into Darwinism with you."

"Forget Darwin, Mr. Armstrong. Your ancestors traveled to Earth from here. We had a mighty good thing going here, but we blew it. Our technology was so good it could produce anything, and all our people got filthy rich. The trouble was there was no place to throw the trash, and we never could get along with the people over on the Dark Side. We destroyed the atmosphere with

fumes, and the water with sewage and industrial waste. Then our chemists and biologists at Dugway Lake developed poison gas and powerful germs. It was at that time that my ancestor made the trip to our satellite, Earth. Lots of others followed him, because life here was getting pretty grim, and the future looked dimmer. Meanwhile, our medical science had nearly conquered death, but was unable to slow down birth, and the Moon was horribly crowded. So we began wars with the people from the Dark Side. Then some earthatic flipped the switch, released that gas and those germs and set off a bunch of nuclear missiles. My family made it to the Cave of Cheese, but nobody else did, so now we're the only ones here."

"By the way, Mr. Adamson, what was the name of your ancestor who was the first astronaut?"

"Adam, naturally."

RELAXATION OF LOAN TERMS TO MAINE SUGAR INDUSTRIES, INC.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention, through an article by Donald R. Larabee in the Bangor Daily News on May 29, 1969, that Maine Sugar Industries, Inc., has asked the Commerce Department for a reduction of some \$1,185,000 in debt service over the next 2 years on Maine Sugar Industries, \$8,745,300 debt to the Economic Development Administration. The Commerce Department, according to the article, has offered some relaxation in its loan terms if Maine Sugar Industries officials will agree to open their books and records to Economic Development Administration inspectors and agree to cooperate with a consultant to be picked by the agency. This offer is said to be made in order to give Maine Sugar Industries officials a chance to put the company on a "sound and continuing basis."

I have no objection to the Commerce Department's reported offer if it represents nothing more than an attempt to insure repayment of its loan, although I would most certainly object if there is any plan to advance additional funds. At the same time I am reminded that this is one more sorry chapter in the history of the ill-advised Economic Development Administration involvement in this project.

I publicly expressed my doubts years ago about the wisdom of locating a beet sugar factory in Maine and raised questions about the desirability of using Government funds to finance it since it would tend to cause unemployment in the long established sugar industry in New England. And when the outlook for the beet sugar operation at Maine Sugar Industries was dubious and management proposed to add machinery and equipment for refining raw cane sugar, I strongly objected to use of Government funds since it was not only unwise but appeared to be in direct conflict with

the terms of section 702 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 which provides:

No financial assistance under this Act shall be extended to any project when the result would be to increase the production of goods, materials, or commodities, or the availability of services or facilities, when there is not sufficient demand for such goods, material, commodities, services, or facilities, to employ the efficient capacity of existing competitive commercial or industrial enterprises.

It now appears that my judgment was correct and that Federal financial assistance to this project was not "preceded by and consistent with sound, long range economic planning," one of the conditions set forth in the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

However regrettable the present plight of Maine Sugar Industries may be, I hope that the Economic Development Administration can learn a lesson from this experience and use better judgment in the future not only in connection with Maine Sugar Industries, but also with respect to any similar ventures. To assist the Economic Development Administration in this regard, I introduced on April 3, 1969, H.R. 9958, a bill to amend section 702 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act to provide for public notice and public hearings prior to the granting of financial assistance under the act in the amount of \$100,000 or more. The opportunity for interested persons to present their views may help the Economic Development Administration to avoid repetition of these past mistakes.

The article from the Bangor Daily News to which I referred follows along with a subsequent article by Donald R. Larrabee of June 4, 1969. I present these for consideration of my colleagues:

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News,
May 29, 1969]

**GOVERNMENT OFFERS TO EASE LOAN TERMS
FOR VAHLSING**

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—The Commerce Department has offered to ease debt service on some \$8,745,300 in government loans to Maine Sugar Industries Inc. if the Vahlsing firm will open its books to federal auditors, it was learned Tuesday.

The proposal was outlined to members of the Maine congressional delegation during the day by Assistant Commerce Secretary Robert A. Podesta, who said the government is "concerned" whether the Aroostook County Sugar Beet Project can succeed.

MSI Board Chairman Fred H. Vahlsing, Jr. has appealed to the Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration (EDA) in recent days for a \$1,185,000 reduction in debt service in the next two years to help the sugar beet operation over a serious financial crisis stemming from adverse crop conditions in 1968.

Podesta told the delegation the government is sympathetic with Vahlsing's problem and wants to do what it can to continue the beet industry's job-generating stimulus to the Aroostook economy. To accomplish this, the commerce official offered Vahlsing an interim financing deferral arrangement while MSI officials attempt to place the company on a "sound and continuing basis."

But Podesta said EDA's loan terms will be relaxed only if Vahlsing agrees to cooperate with a "consultant" picked by the agency and permits inspectors to interview com-

pany officials, examine records and other data to evaluate the project.

Also, Podesta said, Vahlsing must cooperate with Commerce Department auditors who want to appraise and audit the "construction of the project."

Vahlsing was not available for comment Tuesday evening at his Robbinsville, N.J. headquarters.

It was learned that Vahlsing has been objecting to an audit on grounds it would unfairly reveal trade secrets. The company official is said to be suspicious of a Louisiana firm hired as a subcontractor last February, when EDA engaged Thomas H. Miner and Associates of Chicago, to make a complete inspection and appraisal of MSI's assets.

Assistant Secretary Podesta reportedly has offered to assign the audit to another firm to satisfy Vahlsing's objections.

The extent of MSI's difficulties with the government is spelled out in a letter which Podesta wrote to Vahlsing and all members of the Maine Congressional delegation last Friday. A copy was sent to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The Podesta letter said the government is "very concerned with the failure of MSI to make timely on its obligations in accordance with the terms of the loan agreements and related notes."

Podesta said EDA has been unable to obtain "satisfactory information on the status and prospects" of Maine Sugar Industries.

He added that periodic balance sheets and operating statements have not been submitted to EDA as provided in the loan agreements.

The commerce official said EDA is "extremely reluctant" to extend any further help or "concessions" to MSI until it has obtained "hard information on the long-range prospects of the operator."

COMPLETES REVIEW

Podesta said EDA has completed a preliminary review of the status and prospects of loans made by EDA and its predecessor agency, the Area Redevelopment Administration. These include a loan of \$6,495,000 for the initial sugar beet refinery operation in 1965 and a second loan of \$2,250,300 for installing cane sugar processing equipment a year later.

In addition, the government has guaranteed loans of at least \$4 million to the Aroostook operation.

Podesta said the Commerce Department feels that the beet crop and related sugar production have fallen far short of the amounts projected for each year. Podesta said the experience to date is "not reassuring" that the project can succeed.

He said that while EDA wants to help Maine farmers, it can't achieve the objectives of the economic development program "if we proceed as we have in the past with makeshift expedients and no long-range plans."

WOULD RESCHEDULE

It was in this context that Podesta said EDA is prepared to reschedule the loan payments due in April through November of this year on the two notes now held by EDA.

This, he said, would permit MSI to proceed with day-to-day operating arrangements and allow time for in-depth consideration of a "long-range solution to the overall problem."

If the Vahlsing Company agrees to the required audits, Podesta said, EDA will try to complete its review in about 60 days. He concluded the letter by stressing that the offer "in no way constitutes approval or disapproval" of the actions involving funds in the future.

It is understood that Podesta asked Rep. William D. Hathaway, D-Me., who represents the Aroostook area, to arrange the delegation meeting. Hathaway, in turn, asked to hold the meeting in the office of Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, R-Me., Sen. Edmund

Muskie and Rep. Peter N. Kyros, D-Me. attended.

Podesta's purpose apparently was to prevail on the delegation to intervene with Vahlsing, so that the audit could proceed and the Maine company could get the financing deferrals to stay in business.

NEEDS EASING

With the planting season approaching in Maine, Vahlsing told the Commerce Department recently that it was "absolutely urgent" to obtain an easing of the government's debt service.

Maine was given a sugar beet allocation by the Agriculture Department four years ago and was originally committed to grow some 33,000 acres of beets each year. It has never achieved this figure and Vahlsing has estimated that only 13,000 acres would be productive this year. But he has proposed shipping into Maine some 12,000 acres from his New York State operation to maintain steady activity in the Aroostook processing operation.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News,
June 4, 1969]

**VAHLSING AGREES TO LET AUDITORS EXAMINE
BOOKS**

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—Maine Sugar Industries chairman Fred H. Vahlsing Jr., apparently has paved the way for an eight-months moratorium on government loan re-payments by agreeing to cooperate fully with commerce department auditors and an outside consulting firm.

It was learned that Vahlsing has written to assistant commerce secretary Robert Podesta accepting the conditional offer of the economic development administration (EDA) to postpone payments on two notes totaling \$8,745,300 until December.

The special arrangement will be settled in precise terms next Monday when Vahlsing meets here with commerce department and auditors and officials of a nationally-known consulting firm which has been hired to appraise the Aroostook County Sugar Beet Operation.

Vahlsing told Podesta he will cooperate with the auditors and would meet the conditions set forth by the commerce department official last week.

Podesta made it clear that the payments on the EDA loans cannot be relaxed unless the government can examine books and records sufficiently to value the project.

Vahlsing did not meet his principal and interest payment to EDA in April. He explained to commerce officials that a bad crop of sugar beets last year and poor prices for Aroostook potatoes has created a financial crisis which could affect the planting of a 1969 crop.

In suggesting a willingness to defer principal and interest payments until Dec. 1, Podesta said he hoped the company could get into better financial shape for a long-term solution to its problems with the fledgling beet sugar industry in Maine.

"We desperately hope that they can succeed," Podesta told a reporter. "We're not trying to make it difficult for them. If this doesn't work out, the farmers will lose, the stock-holders will lose and nobody will win. They need all the sympathetic consideration they can get."

At next Monday's meeting, the government hopes to come to final agreements with Vahlsing about the kinds of information that should be made available to the auditors and inspectors.

Vahlsing also is asking the EDA for a \$1,185,000 reduction in debt service on the government loans during the next two years. The commerce department has not yet ruled on this request.

BOOTH FISHERIES—AN EXAMPLE FOR FOOD PROCESSING PLANTS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who care about the Nation's health are constantly reminded of the necessity to maintain high sanitation standards in the manufacture and processing of food. In fact, only last month the Food and Drug Administration put into effect new regulations setting minimum standards for all food processing plants in the country.

I personally do not like to see need for regulations to do that which is right and ought to be done voluntarily. It should be done voluntarily. Therefore, it was a great source of satisfaction for me to learn that Booth Fisheries went voluntarily far beyond those sanitation standards required by regulations and laws when building a new facility at Portsmouth, N.H.

As a result of the wisdom and foresight used by Booth executives in building this plant, it has been cited by Modern Manufacturing magazine as one of the "10 top plants of 1969."

Congratulations are in order to Booth Fisheries and all of its employees on this high honor. I am proud to have them in my congressional district. The article from Modern Manufacturing magazine which tells the story of this ultraclean facility follows:

A CLEAN DESIGN FOR AN ULTRACLEAN FISH PROCESSOR: BOOTH FISHERIES, PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

"CITATION

"Constant, careful, plant-wide sanitation is the hallmark of this modern facility, which brings new luster to an age-old industry. Booth Fisheries exudes cleanliness, from its fiberglass floors to its built-in, hygienic wash system. The clean lines of the handsome concrete exterior further reinforce this pervasive image."

An aura of antiseptic cleanliness gives plant-wide sparkle to the handsome new Booth Fisheries facility at Portsmouth, N.H. The sanitation efforts of Booth's engineers and executives are grounded far more deeply in necessity than in esthetics, however. For centuries mankind has been aware of the rapid deterioration rate of dead fish. Offensive odors and easy contamination are constant hazards. So it is not surprising that this new frozen-fish processing plant is among the most sophisticated.

Booth's recently completed 130,000-sq. ft. processing and packaging plant is much more than an efficient ice-house. Its exterior, double-tee wall panels and windowless facade would make it an outstanding building for any manufacturing enterprise. Its office area, a neat, compact 12,000-sq. ft. complex, affords quick access to the production floor and projects an attractive image to visitors and customers. The 40 x 40-ft. plant-area bays and uniform 20-ft. clearance height give ample elbow room and offer broad flexibility for future modification. Yet the key to Booth's excellence lies with its unique approach to on-line hygiene and built-in cleaning equipment.

NEW DIMENSIONS IN SANITATION

Plant planners have installed a high-pressure central cleaning system as part of what Booth calls its "dynamic sanitation pro-

gram." Every cleaning solution is metered automatically at a central point, located at the rear of the plant, far from the processing areas.

Here, the system's convenience is clearly demonstrated. Since detergent mixing and sanitizing of materials are carefully excluded from fish handling locations, the splashing and mulling characteristic of manual mixing is eliminated as a possible source of contamination. At the mixing point there is complete control over each potentially troublesome variable.

The controls and changes centered in the plant's stainless steel mixing reservoir include 1) careful proportioning of the detergent, 2) accurate setting of solution temperature, 3) determination of the correct cleaning solution for usage in terms of high-pressure, low volume application character and, 4) addition of such water conditioning as is needed.

The detergent proportioning is accomplished by an automated and accurate measurement of liquid detergent and water at a pre-set ratio. This assures an exact detergent concentration at all times. The equipment applies this control by means of any electronic anticipator circuit which slows the rate as the solution approaches its pre-determined concentration. In so doing, it eliminates any wasteful overages.

A temperature compensator maintains heat uniformly throughout the entire application. Water entering the system is pre-heated to 180° by a subsidiary boiler unit. A separate pump, equipped with a special metering control, adds water conditioner to the solution at a carefully established ratio.

This ratio can be adjusted according to the measured level of water hardness. The controls provided by this high-pressure form of mechanical cleaning offer a reasonable assurance of uniformity in sanitizing. The results obtained are virtually impossible to match in a manually controlled system.

VERSATILE, EFFECTIVE CLEANING

The cleaning process at Booth represents the utmost in overall flexibility. The system has been designed to include 16 drop stations within the plant. At each of these points, the necessary solution is delivered with sufficient impact (500 psi) to provide a fully adequate level of cleaning by an operator using a spray nozzle. The network of drop stations are so located as to insure full coverage in all process, storage and maintenance areas.

A separate, centralized system is provided for application of disinfectant. Special piping, parallel to the detergent piping arrangement, carries this element to the various drop stations.

A high degree of efficiency characterizes the entire sanitary set-up at Booth. For example, cleaning solution is instantly available at any time and at any place within the complex. This means that cleaning can be matched at once to lulls in production, or can be put in service during work breaks.

Moreover, the sheer force of impact of the detergent provides swift mechanical action. Supervisory people find it easy to plan and schedule cleaning crew activities. Training is shorter for these crews too, and there is a dramatic reduction in water usage, thanks to its well planned application.

STRONG SUPPORTING FEATURES

Of course, there's a lot more to this sleek new Booth facility than the ease with which it can be kept sanitary. Other impressive features include:

A dry bulk handling system with a 400,000-lb. capacity accurately juggles batter and breading ingredients among storage bins. The two substances are weighed and moved to production points by a pneumatic conveyor system. Automatic signaling, when the ingredient level drops, actuates the conveyor.

The straight-line production arrangement helps uniformity and quality. Frozen fish blocks are sawed into sticks in two passes.

battered and breaded, the sticks move directly to a 415° oven that hardens their outer coatings without fully defrosting them.

In-line freezers, 60-ft. long, are part of the overall straight-line plan. The three giant units works at a low -40° with auxiliary humidity control.

Quality control includes 15 separate production checkpoints. There are four automatic weighing stops along the production line. Freezer and deep fryer temperatures are checked continuously and a battery of metal detectors function at all times. Cooking oils are constantly filtered to eliminate even the finest particles and fat coagulants. The laboratory tests includes taste, the ultimate quality measure in the food industry.

Built-in sanitation independently backs up the dynamic detergent solution arrangement. For example, there is sealed, fiberglass flooring in all production areas. And white, acrylic finished, aluminum interior plant walls for ease of maintenance and a high standard of cleanliness.

OPERATIONS IMPACT

At Booth's new, super-sanitary facility, the cleanliness program is an engineering problem. But the payoffs to operations are the real key to excellence.

Quality Control can confine its activities to actual product content. Washing down as needed assures the absolute minimum of contamination.

Employee morale and output have shown sharp increases at the new Booth plant, where even hand hygiene is an important part of the production effort.

Keen competition and tight governmental regulations demand that Booth production people uniformly maintain high standards. The many strategically placed drop stations for cleaning nozzles mean instant response to wash down needs, anywhere, any time. And Booth's own sanitary standards are higher than those of any local, state, or federal agency.

OUR CRAZY, COSTLY LIFE WITH OIL QUOTAS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1969, I spoke on the floor of the House about the need to overhaul the present oil import program.

One month later, I introduced a bill that would phase out this program over a 10-year period. I was joined in this effort by 53 of my colleagues in the House from both sides of the aisle and from many areas of the country.

I might add that since that time I have also introduced legislation aimed at another inequity in the oil industry, namely the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance.

Therefore, I was most interested to read an article by Allan T. Demaree that appeared in the June 1969, edition of Fortune magazine on the subject of the oil import program. I recommend it to all my colleagues, and for this reason include it in the RECORD at this time:

OUR CRAZY, COSTLY LIFE WITH OIL QUOTAS
(By Allan T. Demaree)

The quota system that chokes off the free flow of oil into the U.S. costs the nation billions and shelters gross inefficiencies in the domestic crude-oil producing industry. Imposed in the name of national security just

a decade ago, it has become the object of mounting discontent. It has given government officials the power arbitrarily to parcel out enormous fortunes to individual companies. It has been administered with ever increasing ineptitude, bringing about the most heavy-handed bureaucratic meddling in the marketplace. And it has caused huge domestic industries, regions of the country, and even nations to pit themselves against one another in an unseemly battle for political favor in Washington. All in all, the quota on oil imports has proved to be one of the most ill-conceived and ill-executed federal regulatory schemes since the abortive flight of the NRA's Blue Eagle.

Once above earnest scrutiny in Congress, the oil quota is now being subjected to searing criticism there. Democratic Senators William Proxmire of Wisconsin, Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts, Edmund Muskie of Maine, all from consumer states, have repeatedly lambasted it in recent months. "The system reeks and is ripe for change," Senator John Pastore, a Rhode Island Democrat, proclaimed on the Senate floor. "The industry should know that this is a time of consumer revolt." A small army of economists paraded before Senator Philip A. Hart's antitrust and monopoly subcommittee a few weeks ago, denouncing current policies as expensive, wasteful, and administered on dubious principles. And on the other side of the Capitol, Chairman Wilbur Mills and his powerful Ways and Means Committee have been giving the oil industry added jitters by questioning the 27½ percent depletion allowance, a provision that, like the quota, has been supported on grounds of national security.

Not even the oil industry is satisfied with the way the quota system is run. Charging that the government has favored a few companies at the expense of most, the American Petroleum Institute urged President Nixon to undertake the first serious review of the quota system in seven years, a task Nixon has delegated to a Cabinet committee headed by Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz, former dean of the University of Chicago Business School. What the committee recommends after studying the turbulent history of oil quotas will undoubtedly prompt some changes. The decision to impose quotas was founded on an astonishing dearth of clearheaded analysis, and the system has since drifted through a series of compromises that have satisfied no one. This experience should make government officials chary of extending similar protection to the swelling number of industries that have beaten paths to Capitol Hill and the White House in recent years. These quota seekers range from the giant steel companies to the American Beekeeping Federation, which argues that without a protected market for honey, the U.S. will surely lose bees essential for pollinating crops, from alfalfa to garlic.

A \$4-BILLION PRICE TAG

By erecting quota barriers, the government limits the amount of foreign oil that is brought into the U.S., currently to about 21 percent of domestic consumption. This has saved most of the U.S. market for domestic crude-oil producers, and has helped to maintain the wellhead price of U.S. crude at about \$3 a barrel, more than twice the price of crude in the Middle East. Even after adding on shipping charges and import duties, Middle Eastern and Venezuelan crude has been landed on the east coast in recent years for \$1.25 to \$1.40 less per barrel than crude produced in Texas and Louisiana.

The cost to consumers of this restrictive import policy is impossible to determine exactly; but reasonable estimates put the price tag at about \$4 billion a year—more than the combined budgets of the six New England states. The restrictions on foreign crude result in higher gasoline and heating-

oil prices. They also increase costs to industries that use oil for fuel and raw materials. This fact has hardly escaped the notice of petrochemical producers, who constitute one of the largest manufacturing industries in the nation. They complain vociferously that they cannot continue selling in world markets while using raw materials that cost more than those available to their foreign competitors.

Moreover, the gap between domestic and world crude prices has been getting wider, increasing the cost of import restrictions. Only seven years ago the difference in price between domestic and foreign oil on the east coast was about \$1 a barrel. But domestic crude-oil producers, walled off from competition by the quota barriers, have been jacking up their prices recently (15 cents a barrel since January). This has occurred even as the world price of oil has been declining because of robust competition and the development of huge tankers that have cut transportation costs in half during the past ten years. The decline in the delivered price of foreign oil was interrupted in 1967 by the Arab-Israeli war, but resumed last year.

Import quotas shore up the system of state regulation that has been keeping domestic crude prices high for years (see "U.S. Oil: A Giant Caught in Its Own Web," *FORUM*, April, 1965). The big producing states, Texas and Louisiana, which account for more than half the nation's output, hold production down to the amount the market will absorb at high prices. Simultaneously, this state system, called market-demand prorationing, favors inefficient producers over efficient ones. The states allow hundreds of thousands of so-called "stripper wells" to produce freely, pumping out an average of 3.6 barrels a day, while they cut back the flow from efficient wells that could produce far more at lower costs. Henry Steele, an economist at the University of Houston, estimates that if market-demand prorationing had been abolished in 1965, production costs would have fallen 46 percent in Texas and 38 percent in Louisiana. The free flow of cheap foreign crude into the U.S. would, of course, undermine these state-run cartels. It would force inefficient producers out of the industry by lowering the price of crude.

I GOT BY WITHOUT A SCANDAL

The oil industry's stake in the quota system is prodigious. By fiat, the government divides, mainly among U.S. refiners, the foreign oil that is allowed to enter the country. The Interior Department's Oil Import Administration dispenses import allocations, or "tickets" as they are known in the industry; a ticket to import one forty-two-gallon barrel of crude oil into the east coast has a value of about \$1.25, the approximate difference between domestic and world prices. The value of the tickets being handed out right now comes to nearly \$1 million a day. Some companies have received as much as \$35 million in tickets in a single year. The tickets awarded Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) since the beginning of controls are conservatively valued at \$305 million; Gulf Oil, \$290 million; Standard Oil of California, \$265 million.

Needless to say, decisions on how the tickets are to be split up—who will be allowed a share, who won't, and in what proportion—bear heavily on the profits of individual companies. During the Kennedy-Johnson years, Stewart Udall, the then Secretary of the Interior, had much to do with the way these valuable licenses were passed around, and his decisions were subject to impassioned polemics. "A small decision meant a lot of money," he recalled recently. "It was a minor miracle that I got by without any major scandal."

While the benefits of tickets given to industrial giants like Jersey, Gulf, and Social seem breathtakingly large, little refiners gain relatively more than big ones. The gov-

ernment has built a small-business subsidy into its allocation system. While Jersey was granted one barrel of foreign oil for every twenty barrels of domestic oil it processed last year, scores of small refiners in the country were given a barrel of foreign crude for every five of domestic. This subsidy has undoubtedly kept many a marginal refiner in business.

All refiners receive tickets whether or not they process foreign crude. Many inland refiners can't use imported crude because the transportation costs are prohibitive. So they trade their tickets to the great coastal refiners in return for domestic crude and, in effect, pocket the \$1.25 differential. A robust trade in tickets has grown up. For many of the smaller inland refiners, ticket swapping may well be the most lucrative transaction of the year.

The oil industry and its regulators argue heatedly that this system is essential to the national security. Indeed, a forceful case can be made for the proposition that the U.S. must maintain a strong crude-oil producing industry lest it become overly dependent on foreign sources for the great bulk of its supply. Much of the world's crude is produced in unfriendly or unstable countries, such as the Middle Eastern states that embargoed supplies to the West for twelve weeks in 1967. If the U.S. were to become overly dependent on foreign sources, there would be no guarantee that sheiks, shahs, and South American politicians wouldn't try to wield their power over this vital strategic commodity to influence our foreign policy.

Domestic crude-oil producers seized upon this argument not in a moment of international crisis, but when they were hurting economically. By 1948 the development of low-cost sources in the Middle East and Venezuela had transformed the U.S. from a net exporter to a net importer of oil. Ten years later foreign crude had captured 18 percent of the U.S. market. Domestic producers were both injured and insulted when a few refiners landed Middle Eastern oil in Texas ports, and others had the temerity to ship Venezuelan crude past Louisiana's oil wells and up the Mississippi.

The surge of imports shoved U.S. crude out of its accustomed markets. The Texas Railroad Commission, which controls production in that state, shut regulated wells down to eight producing days a month in 1958. "The torrent of foreign oil," declared Commission Chairman Ernest O. Thompson, "robs Texas of her oil market," costing the state nearly \$1 million a day. To the argument that the U.S. mustn't become dependent on foreign oil, domestic producers added a corollary: If producers are to have sufficient incentive to explore for future supplies in the U.S., they must be guaranteed a fair share of the American market at prices they consider adequate.

So persuasive were these arguments that President Eisenhower twice tried to curtail imports on a voluntary basis. When that failed, he acted on producers' pleas for mandatory quotas in 1959. As his aide Sherman Adams recalls in his memoirs, Eisenhower's action "was primarily an economic decision brought on by an economic emergency." It was executed by presidential proclamation on the basis of national security, the only grounds then available under international trade agreements for the unilateral imposition of quotas. To this day oil remains the only commodity in which the U.S. restricts imports for reasons of national security.

HOW MUCH IS TOO MUCH?

While something can be said for the national security argument, many questions about it have gone unanswered. What is "overdependence on foreign oil"—the current level of 21 percent, or 11 percent, or 31 percent? A quarter of all imported crude comes via underground pipeline from Can-

ada. While tickets are not needed to import Canadian oil, the amount imported is limited by bilateral agreement and deducted from the total allowed under the quota. Is this crude less secure than that shipped to east-coast refineries from the Gulf of Mexico by tankers, which are vulnerable to submarine attack? Are we willing to build an antiballistic-missile system with the cooperation of our neighbor to the north, but unwilling to depend on it for oil?

Two-fifths of our crude imports come from Venezuela, which is as close to Philadelphia Harbor by tanker as Texas City, Texas. This leaves less than a fifth of our crude imports—and less than 3 percent of the total U.S. crude requirement—coming from the volatile Middle East. Would a cautious increase in this amount involve grave danger to the national security?

The very nature of modern war mocks a policy of oil isolationism. Nuclear attack would almost certainly destroy more American refining capacity than production, leaving the U.S. with more crude than it could process. In limited wars like Korea and Vietnam, on the other hand, the U.S. has relied to an increasing extent on foreign oil because the supply lines are shorter and the price is lower. More than three-quarters of the oil used in Vietnam last year came from foreign sources, much of it from the Middle East.

Other questions have barely been broached in government circles. Is subsidizing the domestic crude-oil industry—with all its state-supported inefficiencies—the cheapest way to meet our national security goals? If the U.S. were willing to pay the price—if, for example, crude went to \$5 a barrel—many other domestic fuels would come on the market. A price high enough would prompt companies to synthesize liquid fuels from coal and produce oil from the vast shale deposits of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, where estimated reserves total two trillion barrels—enough for four hundred years at current rates of consumption.

In fact, many alternatives exist that may be cheaper than today's subsidies. The U.S. could diversify foreign sources to limit risk. Or stockpile oil in storage tanks or underground. Or pay companies to explore for oil on federal lands and hold these reserves for an emergency. While none of these alternatives wins huzzahs from the oil industry, all deserve more serious examination than they have received in the past. Otherwise, the U.S. will continue buying insurance at high premiums.

The need for probing the alternatives is dramatized by two comparisons. First, quotas are defended on the grounds that they encourage oil companies to explore in the U.S. Yet total industry expenditures for oil exploration and development in this country amount to less than \$3.3 billion a year. This is well below the \$4-billion cost of the quotas and the inefficiencies they protect. Moreover, the quota system is not the only subsidy to the industry rationalized on the basis that it encourages exploration. The depletion allowance and the right to expense intangible drilling costs are estimated to reduce the domestic industry's tax bill by more than \$1 billion a year.

As one might expect, oil executives argue that an end to quotas would severely blunt their incentive to search for oil in the U.S., where production costs are higher than elsewhere in the world. Says Richard C. McCurdy, the president of Shell Oil, "We'd stop exploring. We'd slowly liquidate our U.S. production." Both Jersey Standard and Atlantic Richfield say they probably would not have looked for the titanic reserves on the North Slope of Alaska if they had anticipated selling that oil at \$2 a barrel rather than \$3.

Yet no one can say for sure whether incentive would really be dulled if import

controls were relaxed and market-demand prorationing died a timely death. In fact, it can be argued that incentive might ultimately be strengthened because efficient producers could pump more oil at lesser unit costs. This would make low-cost, high-production reservoirs, such as those in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska, more profitable to search out and develop. Large amounts of U.S. production probably could compete profitably with foreign oil today if only the incubus of regulation were lifted. Exactly how much is not known. Oil companies jealously guard information on their production costs, yet this information is essential if policy makers are to judge how much protection American oil needs. Amazingly, the government has never pressed the industry for this critical data.

The high costs of current policies are also pointed up by comparing them with the expense of storing oil for emergencies. A recent study by M. A. Adelman, an economist at M.I.T., shows that Europe could purchase and store 2.2 billion barrels of oil, a six-month supply, for a total annual expenditure of \$770 million. Even if the costs in the U.S. turned out to be four times higher than Adelman's estimates for Europe, they would be far less than the price of current protectionist policies.

During the Suez crisis of 1967—the only time that foreign supplies have been disrupted since the imposition of quotas—U.S. domestic production was increased by more than 100 million barrels. The increase was not to meet U.S. emergency needs, but to supply Europe. This oil cost the U.S. over \$300 a barrel when the expense of maintaining quotas for the past decade is figured in. If the U.S. is maintaining expensive, spare producing capacity to supply Europe, a fair question to ask is whether the Europeans, who buy cheap oil from the Mideast day in and day out, shouldn't pay for a bit of their own security.

A NIMBUS OF AUTHORITY

The original government report recommending import restrictions ignored many important questions. It was thrown together in eight weeks by a White House-appointed task force made up of an oilman, a coal executive, an investment banker, and a judge. Although the report revealed nothing more sensitive than its own lack of erudition, it was kept under security wraps for six years, acquiring a nimbus of security with age like a Chinese grandfather. Three years later a Cabinet committee rejected out of hand alternative proposals for assuring a safe supply. For the government to contract out the search for reserves was dismissed in a sentence as both "contrary to the 'principles of free enterprise' and 'costly,' although no effort was made to assess the expense. The costs of the present system were not seriously considered until 1962, when a committee appointed by President Kennedy put the price at about \$3.5 billion a year, and urged that controls be liberalized to permit "a modest increase" in imports. Kennedy ignored the recommendation, however, and instead tacked the quota lid down still tighter.

During the Kennedy years, federal oil policy was directed from the White House. When Lyndon Johnson took office, he sensed that oil decisions could prove embarrassing to a President from Texas. So he made a point of delegating authority to Interior Secretary Udall, although Udall allows that "in one or two instances people in the White House tried to get a heavy oar into oil matters." Nixon has snatched oil policy back to the presidential bosom. Last February, Michael L. Haider, chairman of Jersey Standard and of the American Petroleum Institute, met with presidential counselor Arthur Burns to urge the review of import controls that has since been undertaken.

The choice of a chairman for this sensitive,

Cabinet-level study proved an *Alphonse et Gaston* affair. Robert Ellsworth, a key White House aide before being named Ambassador to NATO, advised Nixon to pick Burns; but Burns attached a covering note to Ellsworth's memo pleading that he was too busy. Nixon's choice of Shultz, a widely respected economist, came as a surprise. The President explained it by saying that the Labor Department had "no direct involvement in the issues to be weighed," so Shultz could remain detached. Until the study is completed this fall no major moves in oil policy are expected.

SQUABBLING OVER THE SPOILS

Founded on a questionable rationale and ensnared in confusion about its goals, the oil quota system has proved unusually susceptible to the buffeting of pressure groups. Because the stakes are so high, great corporations, politically powerful regional interests, and major oil-exporting countries squabble fiercely over the benefits oil quotas bestow.

Venezuela, which earns 92 percent of its foreign exchange from oil exports, stands vigil lest the slightest change in U.S. policy decrease its markets. So concerned was former President Romulo Betancourt, in fact, that when John Kennedy installed a "hot line" to South American capitals in 1962, Betancourt was the first to call Washington, audibly agitated over rumors that Kennedy was going to reduce quotas. And when Secretary Udall allowed Phillips Petroleum to switch its purchase of about \$40 million worth of oil from Venezuelan to other sources, Venezuelan officials marched on Washington in a fury. As a result, the White House and State Department pressured Udall into reversing his decision, after a dispute that left President Johnson and his Interior Secretary at swords' points in the waning days of their Administration.

Oil policy was also a sensitive issue when Canada's Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau paid his first visit to President Nixon last March. Canadian oil is officially exempt from import restrictions on grounds that it is exported overland into the northern tier states of the Midwest, and is therefore considered a safe source of supply. Still, the U.S. engages in the questionable practice of negotiating secret agreements with Ottawa to limit the amount of oil Canada may export to this country—not for security reasons but make sure that Canadian production doesn't disrupt the cozy U.S. market. In the latest agreement, which was flushed out of secrecy in recent lawsuit, a promise was wrung from Canada to "exert every effort" not to displace U.S. production, not to supply refiners who were "unduly expanding their market area," and not to send oil to Chicago before 1970. In other words, not to compete too hard. Much to the exasperation of U.S. producers, however, the Canadians have repeatedly exceeded the limits set by the agreements, and Trudeau is now seeking a still bigger share of the high-price market.

Perhaps the most ridiculous bargain ever struck in the name of national security is an agreement the U.S. negotiated in 1961 giving Mexico an "overland exemption" similar to Canada's. Since there is no pipeline between Mexico and the U.S., the state-owned oil company, Petroleos Mexicanos, ships 30,000 barrels of oil a day by tanker into Brownsville, Texas. From there the oil is pumped into tank trucks, driven over the Gateway Bridge into Mexico, and then U-turned back into the U.S.—all to qualify as a quota-exempt "overland" import. Branded "el loophole" by indignant Texas oilmen, this little charade has cost the companies importing the oil nearly \$15 million in extra loading and transportation charges.

A SERIES OF "SPECIAL DEALS"

Whenever the government creates valuable assets, like import tickets, and awards them

arbitrarily to a limited number of people with special interests, like refiners, contention is inevitable. Companies originally excluded from the club of ticket holders, including Du Pont, Union Carbide, Kodak, and other giants of the petrochemical industry, have successfully battled their way in over the shrill cries of refiners, who were forced to give up some of their own tickets to make room. At the same time, oil executives have finagled with the ingenuity of wily tax lawyers to win larger cuts of the pie. In 1965, Phillips Petroleum won the right to establish a \$45-million petrochemical plant in Puerto Rico, process exclusively foreign oil, and then ship 24,800 barrels a day of gasoline "by-product" to the east coast, where it competes with fuels made from high-priced domestic crude. The right to ship this gasoline has been estimated to be worth about \$11 million a year. Competitors were outraged because the amount of the shipments was deducted from the total amount of foreign oil they shared.

To many oil executives, this marked the beginning of a series of "special deals" in which Udall recommended, and President Johnson approved, the exclusive grant of profit-making opportunities to a few select companies at the expense of others. Udall justified the Phillips deal not on national security grounds, but on the theory that a special import allocation was needed to induce job-creating investment in Puerto Rico, where unemployment was running at 11 percent. In return for the allocation and liberal tax concessions from the Puerto Rican Government, Phillips promised to reinvest \$55 million in satellite plants, which would use the petrochemicals Phillips produced as feedstocks.

The grant to Phillips encouraged others to apply for similar arrangements. Typically, these deals have combined three factors: a company eager to import cheap oil, a geographical region that would benefit from the company's investment, and a crevice in the quota barrier. After Phillips, Udall awarded Sun Oil, Union Carbide, and Commonwealth Oil Refining valuable rights to process exclusively foreign oil in Puerto Rico and ship products to the mainland. By that time the Virgin Islands were crying for "parity with Puerto Rico." Hess Oil & Chemical won tickets to ship to the U.S. mainland gasoline and heating oil produced from foreign crude at its refinery on St. Croix. (Udall had difficulty justifying the special deal for Hess since employment in the Virgin Islands was so high that workers were being imported from the British West Indies.) The Sun, Commonwealth, and Hess shipments, which will total 54,500 barrels of oil products a day by 1972, are deducted from the amount of oil other companies may import. The effect is to slash the benefits of many for the sake of a few. (Carbide ships only petrochemical products to the mainland; these are exempt from quota restrictions and aren't deducted from other companies' allocations.)

THE BATTLE OF MACHIASPORT

Similar applications began pouring in from every company and region that could conjure up a rationale—Guam, Hawaii, Savannah, Georgia, and Machiasport, Maine. The application by Armand Hammer, the septuagenarian chairman of Occidental Petroleum, to process 300,000 barrels a day of Libyan and Venezuelan crude at Machiasport became a *cause célèbre* in the oil industry. It was overwhelmingly opposed by the major oil companies, which feared a further nibbling away of their tickets, and unanimously supported by New England politicians, who saw the promise of lower oil prices for their constituents. Battled to a stalemate in the closing days of the Johnson Administration, Occidental's plan now hangs in limbo.

The special deals underscore the government's awesome power to distribute exclusive franchises without detailed justification.

While quota application for others were approved, Udall brushed aside a request by Texaco to build a refinery in Puerto Rico, where it is the leading gasoline marketer. He offered no official explanation, allowing the company's application to perish without taking action on it. When Udall approved the Hess application in the Virgin Islands, he simultaneously turned down a request from Coastal States Gas Producing, saying only that his "firm and final" decision was to permit no other refineries on the islands in order "to protect and conserve the incomparable reefs and beaches."

Although it deals with fabulous sums of money, the Interior Department has adopted few of the procedural safeguards common to other regulatory agencies. It issues no formal opinions to explain its decisions. It has held fifteen hearings on various aspects of the program, but has never followed one of these with a report of findings. Unlike the award of oil leases or contracts, the special deals have never been opened up to competitive bidding by Interior, which has preferred to negotiate the terms privately. (It once proposed a plan to auction off quotas, which would have let the Treasury, rather than refiners, collect the price differential between foreign and domestic crude; the scheme was quietly scuttled when it met nearly universal opposition from the industry.)

Companies dissatisfied with their lot under the quota system may plead their cases to an Oil Import Appeals Board, on which sit three officials, one each from the departments of Interior, Commerce, and Defense. Under its rules, the board dispenses or adjusts allocations to companies that are "in special circumstances" or are suffering "exceptional hardship." These ill-defined criteria have led to some questionable awards.

Udall's own decisions have been highly unpredictable. In the case of Phillips, Hess, and others, Udall made decisions beneficial to the companies, then changed the oil-import regulations to validate his actions. These ex post facto turns in policy have made it difficult for oil companies to plan. An application by Mobil to import oil into Puerto Rico was rejected a few years before the Phillips application was approved, without the slightest indication then that any change in policy would later be considered. As Jersey Standard Chairman Haider puts it with soft-spoken confidence: "We're flexible. We can play the game any way you want—if somebody will just tell us what the rules are."

A PECULIAR WAY TO REGULATE

When vast sums are involved, such irregular procedures undermine the sense of fair play that is an essential attribute of any regulatory agency. Tongues clucked in the oil industry, and suspicion pervaded the capital, when well-connected Washington lawyers and influential politicians were associated with one request for special privilege after another. Oscar Chapman, a prominent Democrat, Secretary of Interior under Truman, and now a Washington lawyer, was instrumental in putting together the Puerto Rican deal. First he drummed up oil-company interest in the project, then he approached Interior Department officials confidentially in 1962, and finally he represented Phillips as counsel when the company requested an import allocation two years later. Puerto Rico was represented by Arnold, Fortas & Porter, the firm co-founded by President Johnson's close confidant, Abe Fortas, who had been intimately connected with the island's affairs since World War II. David T. Willentz, a director of Hess Oil and Chairman Leon Hess's father-in-law, was a powerful figure in New Jersey Democratic politics. The Hess quota application was stoutly supported by such congressional oligarchs as Representative Michael Kirwan, an Ohio Democrat, who for years headed the House Interior appropriations subcommittee, with power over the Interior Department's purse, and Repre-

sentative Wayne Aspinall, a Colorado Democrat, who chairs the House Interior Committee, which holds sway over the department's legislation.

Not even Udall's harshest critics in the oil industry accuse him of personal dishonesty, and most believe that he was earnestly trying to bend oil-import controls to serve his vision of the national good. The companies did "pay" for their special privileges in varying degree. Hess agreed to pay \$2,700,000 a year (50 cents for each barrel of oil products it shipped to the States) to a conservation fund on the Virgin Islands. Sun agreed to pay about \$1 million (or 10 cents a barrel) into a similar fund in Puerto Rico. And Occidental held out a promise to contribute more than \$7 million a year to such a fund for New England. But to grant special privileges in return for charitable contributions seems a peculiar way to regulate.

With one mystifying amendment after another, the import regulations became so complex that Senator Proxmire charged it would take a "Ph.D. in chemistry and a Philadelphia lawyer to begin to comprehend them." When petrochemical producers were admitted into the ranks of ticket holders, the Oil Import Administration unwittingly worded the necessary amendments so that some refiners that also produced petrochemicals were allowed to "double dip" into the import pool. In an oilman's game of now-you-see-it, now-you-don't, these refiners claimed one set of tickets based on their refining operations, then picked up another batch based on their petrochemical operations—even though the same oil was used for both.

No sooner had this situation been corrected than Udall found himself bogged down in a \$1,500,000 misunderstanding about what was and what wasn't a petrochemical. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) was producing large quantities of aromatic chemicals for use in its unleaded gasoline, and these technically qualified as petrochemicals under Interior regulations. It came as a surprise to Udall, however, when the company claimed and received tickets worth more than \$1,500,000, cutting heavily into the foreign oil he had intended to provide chemical companies as low-cost feedstock. Pronouncing himself "appalled" at this turn of events, and declaring himself "not very happy" with his staff (who had sent him a memo on the situation that had mysteriously been lost), Udall revoked the company's tickets without notice or hearing. Standard of Indiana was "shocked at the arbitrary action" and filed suit, the Justice Department refused to defend Udall, and the embarrassed Secretary was forced to return the tickets—and put his staff to work rewriting the regulations once again.

THEY WINCE AT COMPETITIVE BLOODLETTERING

One outgrowth of the Standard of Indiana debacle was that Interior for the first time began auditing refiners' claims for tickets. One of the first audits concluded that Standard of Indiana claimed to have converted more oil to petrochemicals than it actually had, thereby earning extra tickets worth about \$600,000. But the company is fighting Interior's efforts to recoup, arguing that it had really claimed too little, not too much. Subsequently, Interior spot-checked thirty-seven requests for new quotas, discovered "many discrepancies," and threw out six of the applications. The fact that audits had never previously been conducted can be laid in part to congressional parsimony. The Oil Import Administration has only five professional people. They were forced to make some of the spot checks over a holiday weekend.

As import control became more and more confused, so did their objective. The Oil Import Appeals Board wince at the sight of free competitive bloodletting. It awarded

tickets to two small refiners that had been shut down for years, hoping the handouts would help them pay off creditors and reopen their plants. Another company bought an abandoned refinery from Mobil in Wyoming and encountered unexpectedly high costs rehabilitating it. "Moved by the plight of this small company," as it said, the board doled out tickets to that refiner, too.

Several of Udall's actions involving Commonwealth Oil of Puerto Rico provide a graphic illustration of market meddling. In 1966, Commonwealth discovered a loophole in the regulations that allowed it to ship products from its refinery in Puerto Rico to the West Coast. Commonwealth won Udall's tacit approval and subsequently negotiated a forty-six-month contract to supply a cut-rate marketer in San Francisco with up to 10,000 barrels of gasoline daily. Major refiners in California screamed foul, charging that Commonwealth's gasoline had a competitive advantage and that the shipments had the effect of cutting back their own import allocations. They enlisted the aid of former Senator Thomas Kuchel, then the Republican whip, and other politicians to bring an end to the shipments. Yielding to political pressure, Udall reversed his position, closed the West Coast loophole, and gave Commonwealth permission to ship to the east coast instead. The move cut the San Francisco marketer off from supplies.

Another of Udall's actions was tantamount to pressuring a company to buy from a particular supplier as a condition for obtaining a federal grant—an especially pernicious kind of government pressure. Commonwealth Oil was seeking the right to increase shipments from its refinery to east coast markets, claiming that it should have parity with the new Phillips plant, which Interior had allowed to ship 24,800 barrels daily. Then Union Carbide applied for permission to expand its petrochemical facilities on the island. With this Udall saw a chance to provide Commonwealth with a market—without allowing the company to increase its shipments to the mainland, which would surely have raised fresh complaints from competitors there. So, as a condition of approving Carbide's request, Udall bargained Carbide into agreeing to purchase half its feedstocks in Puerto Rico from Commonwealth. Commonwealth subsequently dropped its demand to ship more products to the east coast. "We twisted a lot of arms," Udall concedes.

Udall's rejection of Texaco's request to build a refinery in Puerto Rico, which has never been officially explained, also relates to Commonwealth Oil. As the biggest gasoline marketer on the island, Texaco bought a substantial amount of its supplies from Commonwealth's refinery. If Texaco were allowed to build its own refinery, Udall knew that Commonwealth would have to search for new customers, and would surely seek the right to ship more gasoline to the east coast—once again rolling the industry. Udall's desire to avoid such upsetting complications was a central reason for allowing the Texaco application to die.

A FAR LESS COSTLY WAY

The U.S. today finds itself saddled with an expensive, muddled, and unseemly system of import restrictions because it has ignored the dictates of rational economic policy making. The government has not determined how large a reserve of oil the U.S. would need in the event of a foreseeable emergency. Nor has it tried to adopt the least costly method of providing such a reserve. It has preferred to rely on senseless protectionism—a policy it must now abandon.

No doubt exists that the U.S. can provide for its emergency needs at less cost than under the current system. Since the government has never taken the trouble to weigh the alternatives, the methods—or combination of methods—that make the most sense are not

yet clear. The studies conducted by Adelman of M.I.T. surely indicate that the storage of oil for emergencies may prove a feasible course of action. But the most important consideration is that all courses be examined with an open mind.

The cost and the maladministration of the quota system have raised cries for its abolition. Much can be said for that direct solution. But it may be that some form of import restrictions, less onerous than those now in effect, has a place in a rational oil policy. If so, those restrictions must be adopted on the rational grounds that they enhance U.S. security at a tolerable cost—not because they prop up the domestic industry in its present inefficient form. The government must quit mixing defense considerations with protectionism, as it has done so dramatically, and shamefully, in its efforts to keep Canadian oil out. At the very least, the U.S. should permit the free movement of oil from Canada, a country with which we enjoy uniquely close relations. The government should also put pressure on the states to abandon those regulatory practices that stifle efficiency. The time has come to allow a fresh breath of competition to blow through the industry.

THE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR: A LIFETIME FIXTURE

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I present to my colleagues a report entitled "The Academic Administrator: A Lifetime Fixture," by Gian C. Sud, associate professor at Western Michigan University. It is presented as another view on what can be done to bring stability to our campuses. The report follows:

THE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR: A LIFETIME FIXTURE

One of the most pressing problems in higher education today is the question of governance in the modern university. It requires a healthy state of faculty-administration relationship as well as rapport between faculty and administration on one hand and students on the other. Unfortunately, all is not too well on many campuses. The need for an overhaul of present policies governing the administrative personnel of the universities is very clearly manifested by the reported resignations this fall of at least a dozen university presidents from their respective posts across the nation.

A feeling of being "on the outside" seems to be rather prevalent among the students and some members of the faculties, who refer to "they" to denote the administration and "we" for themselves even during everyday conversations. In other words, rather rigid lines seem to have been drawn between the three essential groups on a campus—the administration, the faculty, and the students. This is partially because most of the administrators have been with the institutions for a long time and feel that they have more claim to the institution than the students and the incoming new faculty members. Even though administrators encourage faculty participation in university committees and councils, the faculty is left with the distinct feeling that their role is advisory at best. And when it counts, papa knows best. The lack of faculty attachment to their institutions may well have left a vacuum and a communication gap between the students on the one hand and administrators on the other. In other words, it is the failure of the university ad-

ministrations and faculties that has, at least partially, been responsible for the so-called student unrest.

The president of today, or any other administrator of a university for that matter, must possess considerable executive talents, in addition to being a leader in his academic field. He must understand the intricacies of present-day finance, the committee system and public relations. He must provide vigorous leadership, and he must take counsel of his faculty and open effective lines of communication with his student body. Above all, the president of today must be a chief executive with a totally new approach to governance.

The days, when the presidency or deanship was a lifelong position, must be for the record books now. In this new generation and era, any of these positions should not last the working life of any one man. Accordingly, the term of service of the president and his administrative team must be limited and specifically defined.

Senator Eugene McCarthy,¹ in demanding the replacement of J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the F.B.I., brought attention to a new thought. He said that an agency "in a democracy should not be kept under the control largely of one man to a point where it develops to a kind of fief." He went on to say that, in our democracy, circumstances produced necessity for limiting the term of officials. The military Generals, Governors, and even the Presidents have a restricted length of time to serve their respective offices. In addition to other factors, this steady rotation of men and women occupying high offices of administrative and executive nature has brought about the utilization of ideas and services of more people. It has further prevented what may be called stagnation of thought and policy. This has been true in the sciences, where the great advantage of the American Scientific System is the extreme mobility of men and ideas.

In universities and colleges where, by their very nature, the ideas and policies are at a constant melting point, it is hard to conceive why their presidencies, deanships and other administrative positions are based on what seems to be lifelong appointments. In view of the changed nature of these institutions, I should think that restricting the tenure of office of the administrators to specific terms may be a step in the right direction. Why should the president or dean of a university not step down and go back to his teaching and research after, for example, ten years? This is long enough time for the individual to have brought forth and executed new ideas. After such time, new faces should be brought into these positions who have fresh ideas and fresh approaches to their jobs. In many institutions the administrative officials stick to their positions unreasonably long.

It is interesting to note that many presidents, or deans for that matter, who have been in their respective positions for probably as many as 20 years, as if the positions were for their lifetime, will strongly propose a 'rotation system.' They will urge for rotation of members on committees, for rotation of departmental chairmen, and for rotation of personnel handling minor administrative assignments. They are, with conviction, the most vehement proponents of the theory that rotation of personnel will prevent ideas from becoming stagnant. They would like to bring new faces, new personnel and new ideas to various jobs. Why then, should the presidency or the deanships not have new people with new ideas at frequent intervals? A limit on the length of service by one man in one position is common not only in the government but also in business and

¹ McCarthy, Senator Eugene, "Issues and Answers, ABC-TV," April 21, 1968.

industry where healthy corporations have found it to be of utmost advantage.

The approach of limiting the tenure of service of high administrative officials in colleges and universities will undoubtedly pose problems. The problems would be varied and diverse, and it is not possible to anticipate or list them here. However, it seems to me that the problems will not be of the magnitude or nature which could not be overcome easily with proper planning and careful thought.

Let me discuss an example here. Let us suppose that the term of the president of a university was limited to ten years. The governing body of this particular institution could initially appoint the person to two five-year terms. The contract should specifically state that the individual will have the option to retain his position for the second five-year term, or to decline it, at the end of the first term. However, the governing board shall not have the authority to dismiss this individual at the end of the first term if he chooses to serve a second term.

Now, when the president (in this example), after having chosen to serve the second term, is in the ninth year of service, the governing board should designate the new president. The new president can then be on the job for one year, simultaneously with the out-going individual, which is more or less similar to the system followed in the Presidency of the U.S.A. It is evident that such a system will insure a continuity of work as well as smooth takeover by the President-designate without a significant additional cost to the institution. In order to extend this approach of limiting the tenure of service for the administrative officials, the governing boards of universities should have written by-laws specifically stating that the incoming president shall have the right to appoint all new administrative officials of his own choosing, including the vice-presidents, the deans, and associate deans, etc. This will parallel the system of appointment of the U.S. Cabinet. Of course, it will be entirely up to the new president to retain any or all of the out-going officials at his own discretion. To make this system effective and advantageous, the governing boards should permit the out-going officials, who normally would be faculty members with tenure in the departments of their respective interests, to retain salaries at the level of their administrative position. Calculations based on the above principle in any given institution revealed that the additional cost to be so incurred will be minimal. Of course, there is one assumption in it that most of the administrative appointments were made from among those professors who held academic ranks. They were well-known men in their respective fields, each drawing a relatively high salary.

Thus, their appointments to administrative posts had not resulted in substantially extra expenditure over and above their professional salaries. The proposal has the additional advantage that, when the administrative officials return to teaching and research, they will bring invaluable experience to their departments. Earlier, I had assumed that administrative appointments were made from among the most competent. It follows, therefore, that their return to teaching and research, after serving administrative duties, would not be hampered by a lag in their keeping up with their respective subject matters. Undoubtedly, these men will keep up with their fields while serving in administrative positions.

I believe that the above proposal merits consideration. Its contribution to the entire academic process in bringing a greater amount of faculty and student attachment to their institution seems obvious. It will not only develop a greater sense of be-

longing and consequent responsiveness on the part of the faculty, but will also alleviate some of the problems that the present-day academic administrators face. It will indeed modernize the governance in the contemporary university.

MORE SUPPORT FOR ROTC

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, while attacks continue, and even increase, on compuses throughout the Nation against the ROTC, more rebuttals are being presented both in the press and in the colleges and universities themselves in support of this very fine program.

Mr. J. T. Rutherford, a friend and former colleague in this body who is now serving as executive director of the Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States, has brought to my attention an article written by Felix R. McKnight, editor of the Dallas Times Herald, in the Sunday edition of June 8, entitled "ROTC Has Its Rights, Too." I compliment Mr. McKnight and his very distinguished newspaper for taking an affirmative stand on this disturbing issue.

As a product of the ROTC program at Texas A. & M. University, I take pleasure in inserting Mr. McKnight's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend the attention of my colleagues to it. The article follows:

ROTC HAS ITS RIGHTS, TOO

(By Felix R. McKnight)

Six nights ago, about midnight, an explosion wired for murder, destruction and fear stunned the University of Michigan campus. It was the latest, most violent, most appalling move by anarchists who seek to destroy the college ROTC programs.

Terrorists strapped explosives to the gasoline tank of an official car assigned to Army ROTC Commandant Col. H. K. Reynolds. It was parked in the ROTC building drive.

The eruption demolished the car, blew out 40 windows and gouged a huge hole in the building. The intended human victim had left the car; was not injured.

Bomb squads of the FBI quickly sealed off the campus area; started an investigation.

The purists who abhor the thought of war's violence; the militants who burn draft cards and Selective Service facilities in protest against military participation reached the height of campus madness.

Madness President Nixon warned about in his South Dakota commencement address . . . "self-righteous moral arrogance."

The Michigan episode is the ugliest in the organized assault on ROTC. Buildings have been burned, ROTC students threatened, programs harassed and picketed by militants. Now the murder plots.

What is ROTC? What is this all about?

The Reserve Officer Training Corps, many years old, is the reservoir that has produced the military leadership necessary to preserve the security of this nation. War is a cruel, indefensible fact of life. These men, like ROTC Ike Eisenhower before them, hate war and fight in the cause of peace and preservation of the free life.

Who else, if you please, is available to knock off the Hitlers and other tyrants who would stifle free men?

They train for service in all branches of the military. In graduating classes around the nation this week, the Army branch alone will receive 760 new officers from the U.S. Military Academy, 8,500 from Officer Candidate Schools and 16,500 from college ROTC programs.

The furore over ROTC on college campuses centers not just around the militant dissenters. Their faculty friends are insisting that ROTC be stripped of academic credits—or even banned.

But, as one columnist noted, they would seek academic respectability for Eldridge Cleaver or separatist studies. By their own free reasoning a college student should be permitted to take ROTC courses and training if he so elects. And he further notes:

"If the student desires to drill with a master sergeant, or to otherwise satisfy ROTC training requirements, what business is it of the busybodies on campus, who prate about academic freedom—while designing a curriculum geared to their own neurotic lust?"

Very recently Roger T. Kelly, assistant secretary of defense for manpower, forthrightly said that campus demonstrations will not, in any sense, weaken the ROTC programs.

It is up to the institutions, by voluntary contract, whether ROTC programs are continued, Kelly conceded, but if it is discontinued the universities will be making a tragic mistake.

"It is unconscionable to me," Kelly said, "that a university would cruelly deny rights and opportunities to a group of responsible students to placate the noisy demands of a small and radical group. . . . The colleges themselves, would be the big losers. They would lose the opportunity to provide some of our nation's future leaders."

Yet, the clamor from the new left has erased academic ROTC credits from such institutions as Harvard, Princeton, Pittsburgh, Stanford, Pennsylvania, Dartmouth, Boston, Fordham, Yale, etc.

The program, now being degraded by the current flock of anti-war dissenters, looked pretty good in saving our national hide after Pearl Harbor and Korea. It would have been disaster and total subjugation without them.

Not all blacks join their militant brothers in this protest. In 14 predominantly Negro colleges, there are 6,635 enrolled in ROTC courses—and a total of 9,500 enrolled in senior ROTC courses around the country.

Black or white, the individual should have the right to ROTC training if he so desires. And 200,000 of them on 350 American college campuses made that free choice in 1969.

President Nixon said Wednesday at the Air Force Academy commencement that "it is open season on the armed forces" and he warned the new isolationists:

"The adversaries of the world are not in conflict because they are armed. They are armed because they are in conflict and have not learned peaceful ways to resolve their conflicting national interests . . ."

CUMBERLAND SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. John D. Sharp, a fine young man from Maryland, was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CUMBERLAND SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

A 19-year-old helicopter gunner from Cumberland is the latest Maryland serviceman to be killed in Vietnam, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

He was Army Spec. 4 John D. Sharp, son of Mr. and Mrs. John E. Sharp, of 730 Gephart drive, Cumberland.

Specialist Sharp was killed June 6 when his helicopter exploded after being shot down by enemy fire. A member of the First Air Cavalry Division, he had been stationed at An Loc in South Vietnam.

Specialist Sharp, whose 20th birthday would have been June 18, enlisted in the Army in September, 1967.

He received basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., and helicopter training at Fort Rucker, Ala., before being sent to Vietnam last September.

A native of Cumberland, he graduated from SS. Peter and Paul Elementary School and Allegany High School. He also attended Allegany Community College for one semester before going into the Army.

In addition to his parents, his survivors include two sisters, Mrs. Ronald Glicksman and Mrs. Fred Wartzack, both of Cumberland, and his paternal grandmother, Mrs. Okie Sharp, of Gaithersburg, Md.

CONGRESSMAN McCLORY REPORTS RECORD QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a practice which I established when I first came to the House of Representatives in 1963, I mailed questionnaires to my Illinois constituents on subjects of particular interest to the Congress and to the Nation.

A total of 137,892 questionnaires were mailed, destined for every postal patron in the 12th District, comprising Lake and McHenry Counties and Hanover and Barrington Townships in Cook County, Ill. At the time the results were tabulated several days ago, a total of 24,847 questionnaires had been answered and returned to my office. This is a greater than 18-percent response and represents the greatest participation in my experience of polling my constituents. According to market survey experts, this is an extremely high percentage.

The poll is particularly valuable to me on the issue of the proposed anti-ballistic-missile defense system. Whereas my mail has been almost entirely against any such system, the questionnaire survey indicates that my 12th district constituents favor the modified ABM system, as recommended by President Nixon, by a margin of better than two to one.

On the issue of electoral college reform, I have been very impressed by the fact that more than 75 percent of my constituents have expressed themselves in favor of the direct popular election of President and Vice President.

While the questionnaire results are not binding upon me, they represent a most valuable and persuasive expression of a generous cross-section of the citizens of the 12th District of Illinois—and I intend to give thoughtful consideration

and respect to their opinions as contained in the questionnaire results.

Mr. Speaker, I should add that by polling my constituents I generated more than 5,000 individual letters on the issues selected for the questionnaire, and I have tried to answer all of those letters.

Mr. Speaker, the questionnaire and the responses are indicated in the following summary:

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF 1969 OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT McCLORY

Total number of questionnaires mailed: 137,892.

Questionnaires returned: 24,847.

[Answers in percent]

1. In Vietnam, do you favor—
 - Withdrawal of U.S. forces..... 36.7
 - Holding operation by joint United States South Vietnam Forces..... 14.9
 - Increased military pressure on North Vietnam..... 44.3
 - No response..... 4.2
2. Do you favor a modified defensive ABM system as recommended by President Nixon?
 - Favored by..... 64.6
 - Opposed by..... 30.3
 - No response..... 5.1
3. Concerning the Draft Law, which is your preference:
 - The present system which permits student deferments..... 26.1
 - A lottery system with no student deferments..... 42.9
 - A volunteer Army at an estimated payroll increase of \$10 billion per year..... 27.9
 - No response..... 3.2
4. If the electoral college is changed, do you favor—
 - Substitution of election of President by direct popular vote..... 75.2
 - Apportion States electoral votes on the basis of candidates popular vote..... 14.5
 - Award electoral votes by congressional districts..... 5.6
 - No response..... 4.7
5. Should the voting age be lowered to 18?
 - Favored by..... 39.5
 - Opposed by..... 58.8
 - No response..... 1.8
6. Do you favor cancellation of Federal scholarships to college students participating in campus disorders?
 - Favored by..... 88.2
 - Opposed by..... 10.1
 - No response..... 1.7
7. Should the Federal government develop laws to help prevent strikes by Public Employees
 - Favored by..... 60.9
 - Opposed by..... 35.5
 - No response..... 3.7
8. Should the Federal government guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?
 - Favored by..... 11.9
 - Opposed by..... 84.9
 - No response..... 3.3
9. Do you favor returning a percentage of Federal income taxes to the States and local governments for use as they see fit?
 - Favored by..... 64.2
 - Opposed by..... 31.9
 - No response..... 3.8
10. Do you favor transfer of duties of the Office of Economic Opportunity to other departments?
 - Favored by..... 56.5
 - Opposed by..... 28.8
 - No response..... 14.7

Favored by..... 56.5
Opposed by..... 28.8
No response..... 14.7

11. Do you favor President Nixon's decision to remove postmasters and rural mail carriers from political control?

Favored by..... 91.4
Opposed by..... 6.2
No response..... 2.4

THE BLACK REVOLUTION AND THE ECONOMIC FUTURE OF NEGROES IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last week Dr. Andrew Brimmer, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, gave the commencement address at Tennessee A. & I. University. In his remarks Dr. Brimmer summarized for the graduating class, in cold, clear economic terms, the gains and the losses of the past decade and the outlook in the immediate future for Negroes in the United States.

This distinguished economist and educator, recognized throughout the world today for the professional competence he brings to the highest councils of our national and international monetary negotiations, can speak with some feeling about what he calls "the catalog of ills which underlie the patina of racial equality and which render the United States a racist society." An overseer at Harvard University, where he won his doctoral degree, a former Fulbright scholar, professor of economics and Assistant Secretary of Commerce, he started life as the son of Louisiana sharecroppers and is all too familiar with the corrosive burden borne by American blacks for the past 300 years. Only 42, he has long been active in fighting the injustices which plague the impoverished, black and white alike, in our society.

But in urging his young black audience to assume their rightful role in the world beyond the campus and to "see it like it is," he underscores the folly of accepting "deceptively inviting digressions which are luring some of our most promising young people with false hopes of progress through separate development along racial lines."

He reminds them that Negroes have benefited relatively more than the population as a whole from the economic expansion of the sixties, that among both whites and nonwhites the dramatic gains are going to the well educated, and that now, more than ever, their real opportunities for economic independence and personal fulfillment lie in obtaining technical competence, knowledge of the arts and humanities, and the basic skills of reading, writing, and speaking effectively.

For college faculties and administrators, Dr. Brimmer has sharp words of warning, too, pointing out that there is need for curriculum reform in even our

most prestigious institutions, but insisting that they must be realistic in terms of students' and society's needs. He cautions against letting "black studies" or "Afro-American studies" become sheltered workshops. "On the mistaken assumption that they are being relevant and responsive, many of our college faculties are creating facilities which may cripple young people—rather than strengthen their ability to compete in an economy of expanding opportunities."

Mr. Speaker, I recommend Dr. Brimmer's inciteful analysis for my colleagues' consideration and request that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY ANDREW F. BRIMMER,* JUNE 8, 1969

I was pleased and flattered to receive the invitation to address this graduating class in the 57th year of Tennessee A. and I. University. I accepted on the assumption that—despite the ferment surrounding the quest for change on the college campuses of our nation—it is not only still possible but essential to carry on the sane and unselfish discussion of the prospects for progress in American society. Since my own perspective on this society is derived primarily from the experience of an economist, I will focus on the outlook for the economy over the next decade. And since Negroes constitute the vast majority of this graduating class and of this University, I will place particular stress on the unfolding opportunities for equal participation which our expanding economy can be expected to provide.

But before turning to that task, let me hasten to carry out those duties which any commencement speaker is expected to perform: on this occasion—marking for most of you the completion of your formal educational experience and the beginning of life in the world beyond the campus—I commend all of you for your accomplishments to date. Partly because of the enormous strides in college enrollment made in recent years, we tend to forget that Negro college graduates are still much more rare than the Negro's share of our total population would suggest. We tend to forget that, among Negroes age 21 and over, less than one-in-twenty has four years or more of college education—compared with more than one-in-ten for the population as a whole. I am aware of—and I fully appreciate—the considerable sacrifices which you and your families have made along the road to this ceremony. I must also reassure you (because you obviously already know) that the world beyond the campus is not only exciting and challenging—but it desperately needs the help of all the bright minds and vigorous bodies it can get. So let me join in welcoming you to this exhilarating venture.

However, in these times of trouble in our country—and in the world at large—it would be an insult for a commencement speaker to dwell on empty generalities. Since I have come to praise you and not to insult you, I will refrain from any further obeisance to ritual or rhetoric. Instead, let me return to the central theme of these remarks.

I am certain that I do not need to remind this audience of the turmoil currently sweeping our society. I am sure that you would agree with me that we are not simply being plagued by a rash of bitter and violent disorders without cause, meaning or goals. Rather, we are witnesses to—and in many instances warriors in—a campaign aimed at a fundamental reformation of American society. Some call it a revolution.

*Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I am indebted to Mr. Henry Terrell and Miss Mary Ann Graves of the Board's staff for assistance in the preparation of these remarks.

Moreover, I know that it is not necessary for me to emphasize that at the core of the drive to reform our society (no matter what other elements may be stressed from time-to-time) is the pervasive and agonizing question of race. Thus, no matter what other adjectives we may use to characterize the vigorous quest for change, we must also describe it as a black revolution—a basic upheaval about the role of race in this country.

I could easily consume all of the allotted time by simply reciting the catalogue of ills which underlie the patina of racial equality and which render the United States a racist society. But you know this catalogue. Whatever index of social and economic conditions we choose (education, employment, housing, health, etc.) tells the same story: the legacy of racial discrimination and segregation is real, and the scars it has inflicted on all our citizens are deep and enduring. But undoubtedly the most corrosive burden has been borne by the American Negro for more than three hundred years. So, I could easily devote all of my remarks to a passionate condemnation of the conditions which foster racial strife in this country. I could easily dwell on the mosaic of urban disorganization and decay—equally inlaid with poverty, segregation and racial conflict.

If I were to adopt either course, I would certainly be in step with the typical speaker before any predominantly black audience today. However, I have chosen to travel a different route. But, so that I will not be misunderstood, let me say that it should be obvious to anyone that I am unalterably opposed to any kind of racial discrimination or segregation in whatever form it may appear. I have heard no convincing reasons as to why we must continue to suffer the steady deterioration of our cities or tolerate the persistence of poverty in the most prosperous land in the world. So I fully appreciate the need—and support strongly the efforts—to press on with these unfinished tasks.

I have chosen a somewhat different approach in these comments because I believe we should pause from time-to-time to take stock of the distance we have already covered and to survey the terrain ahead. Only by such periodic checks can we be sure to stick to our main route and avoid digressing into byways and blind passages which can lead only to disappointment and frustration. In this stock-taking, first I review the extent of economic progress the Negro has actually made in recent years. This is followed by an appraisal of the economic outlook over the next decade. Finally, I try to flag several of the deceptively inviting digressions which are luring some of our most promising young people with false hopes of progress through separate development along racial lines. My main theme can be summarized briefly:

So far in the decade of the 1960's, Negroes have benefited relatively more than the population as a whole from the vigorous expansion of the national economy. However, increased occupational mobility and significant strides in education have also played vital roles.

Reflecting these favorable trends, the income differentials between blacks and whites have narrowed appreciably in the last few years, with the greatest relative gains by Negroes being among those with the highest levels of education. Simultaneously, however, within the Negro community, two different classes are becoming increasingly evident as the best prepared are moving ahead rapidly while the least prepared are lagging behind.

Looking ahead over the next decade, the Negro community as a whole can be expected to improve its economic position to a greater extent than the population generally. Again, while expansion of the national economy is expected to be the main spring of this improvement, continued ad-

vances in education will also play a major part.

Unfortunately, at exactly the time when education and technical competence are becoming increasingly critical for Negroes—as for other Americans—the notion is spreading that black students need not concern themselves with most of the content of a traditional college curriculum. Instead, it is being held—in even some of the very best institutions—that the most relevant educational experiences for black students are those which will equip them to return to the urban ghettos and work exclusively for the improvement of the black community. In my judgment, it is a serious error for college faculties to allow such notions to go unchallenged. But, what is even more tragic, on numerous campuses Negro students—mainly in response to their own demands—are being permitted—and in some cases encouraged—to enroll in sheltered workshops in the guise of "black studies" and "Afro-American" programs. Thus, on the mistaken assumption that they are being relevant and responsive, many of our college faculties are creating facilities which may cripple young people rather than strengthen their ability to compete in an economy of expanding opportunities.

RECENT ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY

During the decade of the 1960's, Negroes have made sizable economic gains—although they still lag well behind the population as a whole. This progress is evident whether defined in terms of employment, changing occupational characteristics, education or income.

For example, between 1960 and 1967, non-white employment (more than 90 per cent of which is made up of Negroes) rose more rapidly than in the country at large. In 1960, nonwhites held 7 million (or 10.5 per cent) of the more than 66 million civilian jobs then in existence. By 1967, total civilian employment exceeded 74 million, and non-white employment had risen to 8 million. Thus, while total employment increased by 11½ per cent, that for nonwhites rose by 14 per cent. Over these seven years, the rise in the number of jobs held by nonwhites accounted for 12.6 per cent of the expansion in total employment.

The occupational distribution of employed Negroes has also changed somewhat during the current decade. Their gains have been particularly striking in professional and technical fields, in clerical work, in semi-skilled factory jobs, and in nonhousehold service tasks. Skilled craftsmen occupations among nonwhites have also risen somewhat faster than their total employment. In contrast, the number of nonwhites engaged as managers, officials and proprietors have expanded more slowly than total nonwhite employment. To a considerable extent, the occupational upgrading among nonwhites has paralleled an absolute decline in their employment as private household workers, as farmers and farm workers, and as nonfarm laborers. In general—and what is much more important—in those occupations where total employment is growing most rapidly, the rate of growth of nonwhite employment has been even faster; and in those occupations where total employment is declining, nonwhites are showing an even swifter decline.

Nevertheless, nonwhites are still heavily concentrated in low-skilled, low-paying occupations. To some extent, this partly reflects educational deficiencies and the absence of skills of a sizable proportion of the Negro population. On the other hand, it is also partly due to racial discrimination and limited access to job opportunities. This is clearly indicated by a recent estimate prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) of what the occupational structure for white and nonwhite men would be if "...

at each given education level Negroes had the same opportunity for employment as white workers." If this greater occupational equality were to exist, the largest relative percentage gains for nonwhites would occur among craftsmen (the proportion of which would just about double) and among managers and proprietors (where a three-fold increase might be registered). The relative proportion of service workers would be cut by one-half, and the percentage of nonfarm laborers would decline by two-thirds. Little change would be expected to occur in the proportion of nonwhite men employed in professional and technical occupations.

TRENDS IN PERSONAL INCOME

Reflecting these favorable trends and occupations, the personal income of nonwhites has risen substantially in both absolute and relative terms. In 1959, the median income of nonwhite families was \$2,917; by 1967, this had risen to \$5,141—a gain of 76 percent. For all families, median income climbed from \$5,417 in 1959 to \$7,974 in 1967, an increase of 47 percent. For white families, the corresponding figures were \$5,643 in 1959 and \$8,274 in 1967, also a rise of 47 percent. Over these years, the ratio of nonwhite to white median family income rose from 52 percent to 62 percent with a particularly sharp rise occurring after 1965 (when the ratio was 55 percent).

In fact, the last few years have brought noticeable improvement in the income position of Negroes looked at apart from other nonwhites. For example, in 1965 the median family income of Negroes stood at 54 percent of that for white families. By 1967, the median family income of Negroes amounted to \$4,939, and that for white families was \$8,318. Thus, the ratio had risen to 59 percent. So, in three years, Negroes had managed to narrow the gap by 5 percentage points—or by roughly 11 percent.

The improvement in income was spread rather evenly throughout all regions of the country. The narrowest gap between white and Negro family incomes was found in the North Central region. In these states median income for Negroes in 1967 amounted to \$6,540, compared with \$8,414 for whites—a ratio of 78 percent; in 1965 the ratio was 74 percent. In the South, the median income for white families in 1967 stood at \$7,448 and that for Negroes at \$3,992—for a Negro-white ratio of 54 percent, compared with 49 percent in 1965. In passing, it might be noted that not only do median incomes of both white and Negro families in the South lag behind the incomes of both groups, respectively, in the rest of the nation, but the greatest disparity between Negro and white family income among regions is also found in the South.

Undoubtedly, one of the prime factors underlying the improvement in the income position of the Negro community in the nation as a whole is the continued progress being made in education. For example, in 1967 the median years of school completed by nonwhite men (who were 18 years of age and over and who were in the labor force) stood at 10.2 years; for white men the corresponding number was 12.3 years, a difference of 1.9 years. However, in 1957, the median years of schooling for nonwhite men were 8.0 years, and for white men the figure was 11.5 years, a gap of 3.5 years. In fact, by 1962, the gap was still 3.1 years, so progress has been particularly rapid within the current decade when the differential has been cut by almost one-half. Among nonwhite women, educational progress has been even more marked. In 1967, the median years of school completed by nonwhite women in the labor force were 11.5 years, compared with 12.4 years for white women—a difference of only 0.9 year. In 1957, the corresponding figures were 8.9 years for nonwhite females and 12.2 years

for white females, a gap of 2.3 years. In 1962, the measures stood at 10.5 years for nonwhite women and at 12.3 years for white women, a difference of 1.8 years. Thus, within this decade the educational attainment of nonwhite women has converged even more sharply than that of nonwhite men on their respective counterparts. In citing these trends, I am not implying that the quality of the education obtained by whites and nonwhites is equally good. We know that the

opposite is generally true. Nevertheless, improvements in education have made a difference in the relative income gains won by nonwhites.

Just how much difference improvements in education can make can be traced in the changes in the median incomes of Negro and white men, classified by years of schooling completed, who were living in large cities in 1959 and 1967. The figures (from the Bureau of the Census) are as follows:

Years of schooling	Median income: Negro men			Median income: White men		
	1959	1967	Percentage increase	1959	1967	Percentage increase
Elementary: 8 years or less.....	\$3,428	\$4,215	23	\$5,139	\$6,454	10
High school:						
1 to 3 years.....	4,059	5,086	25	5,788	7,495	17
4 years.....	4,323	5,642	31	6,265	8,188	20
College:						
1 year or more.....	5,022	7,025	40	7,686	10,499	20
4 years or more.....	(1)	7,556	(1)	8,486	11,536	21

¹ Not available

Several conclusions can be drawn from these data. Between 1959 and 1967, the higher the level of education, the more rapid was the rise in median income for both Negro and white men. However, the relative increases for Negroes were 1½ to 2 times as large as those achieved by white men. In 1959, Negro men with 8 years or less of schooling had a median income equal to about 70 per cent of that for Negro men who had 1 year or more of college; by 1967, the ratio had fallen to 60 per cent. For white men in the same circumstances, the income ratio declined from 67 per cent to 61 per cent. In 1967, men with only an elementary school education had median incomes just over half those earned by those in their respective races who had completed 4 years or more of college. During the decade of the 1960's, white men with high school educations pulled away somewhat, in relative income terms, from those who went only to grade school, and they just about maintained unchanged the gap between themselves and white men who went to college. Among Negro men, those with high school educations also pulled away, in relative income terms, from Negro men who went only to elementary school; however, the gap between their incomes and the incomes of Negro men who went to college widened further, as the ratio declined from 86 per cent to 80 per cent.

Thus, in general, these data clearly demonstrate that income for whites and Negroes has been rising most rapidly for those with college educations. Among Negroes, the gains—in both absolute and relative terms—have been the greatest at the highest levels of education.

In fact, there appears to have emerged a general tendency for income differentials within the Negro community to widen in recent years. In contrast, within the white community, income differentials seem to have remained unchanged or narrowed slightly. These tendencies can be traced in the Bureau of the Census data showing the percentage share of aggregate income received by each fifth of families, ranked by income and by the color of the family head. The figures for selected years are as follows:

Families	1959	1962	1965	1967
White (percent):				
Lowest fifth.....	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.8
2d fifth.....	12.6	12.4	12.5	12.5
Middle fifth.....	17.8	17.6	17.5	17.5
4th fifth.....	23.4	23.5	23.4	23.5
Highest fifth.....	40.8	41.1	40.8	40.7
Top 5 percent.....	16.1	16.0	15.5	14.9

Families	1959	1962	1965	1967
Nonwhite (percent):				
Lowest fifth.....	3.9	4.2	4.6	4.4
2d fifth.....	9.6	10.4	10.7	10.4
Middle fifth.....	16.5	16.6	16.5	16.4
4th fifth.....	25.1	24.4	24.7	24.1
Highest fifth.....	44.9	44.2	43.5	44.7
Top 5 percent.....	16.4	16.3	15.5	17.5

In examining these data, the first thing to note is that the distribution of income is by no means equal in either the white or nonwhite community. If it were, each fifth of the families would receive 20 per cent of the aggregate income in each year. In reality, however, only those families around and just above the middle of the distribution come close to receiving approximately this proportion of the total income. The families constituting the lowest fifth receive between 4 per cent and 6 per cent of the income, while those in the highest fifth receive over 40 per cent of the total. This general pattern of income distribution holds for both white and nonwhite families.

But looking beyond these overall characteristics, it will also be observed that, within the nonwhite community, the distribution of income is considerably more unequal. Among nonwhites, from the lowest through the middle fifth, for each of the years shown, the proportion of aggregate money income received by the families in each category is below that for the white community. The opposite is true for nonwhite families above the middle fifth; their share is greater than that received by white families in the same category. The same tendency is evident when the top 5 per cent of the families with the highest incomes in both groups are compared.

Moreover, in the last few years, incomes within the nonwhite community have apparently become even more unequally distributed. The shares of income received by those households at or below the middle fifth of families have been eroded slightly, while the shares received by the highest fifth and by the top 5 per cent have edged up somewhat. In the white community, the opposite tendencies are evident.

Again, these figures seem to underline a conviction held by an increasing number of observers: a basic schism has developed in the black community, and it may be widening year-by-year. Whatever explanation one may offer to explain it, in my opinion, the differential impact of educational progress within the Negro community must be accorded considerable weight.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK FOR THE AMERICAN NEGRO

At this point, we can take up the second task sketched above: an assessment of the economic prospects for the American Negro over the next decade. In trying to look ahead, however, I must emphasize that I fully recognize the hazards of attempting to forecast economic activity. To make such a forecast is not my principal objective. Rather, my chief purpose is to appraise the implications for Negroes of a number of economic trends which are already clearly visible. For example, we have a good indication of the most likely trends in population and labor force participation over the next decade. Moreover, given a few reasonable assumptions about the overall rate of economic growth, we can be fairly certain of the trends in the level and occupational distribution of employment, and the level and distribution of personal income between the white and black communities.

POPULATION TRENDS

Our firmest estimates are for the population. The Negro will continue to be a larger proportion of the population, recaching a total of approximately 32.5 million in 1980. This would represent an increase of 10.5 million, or 48 per cent, from 1968. The total population has been projected by the Bureau of the Census at about 243 million in 1980, a gain of 45 million, or 23 per cent over 1968. Thus, the Negro population is expected to account for nearly one-quarter of the net increase in the Nation's population during the period 1968-1980, lifting the Negro proportion from 11 per cent of the total in 1968 to 13.4 per cent in 1980. These projections assume lower fertility than currently. However, the rate of decrease in fertility is expected to occur mainly among the white population. The result is a divergence in the rate of population growth for the two groups.

OUTLOOK FOR THE LABOR FORCE

For the present discussion, the proportion of the population which is working or seeking work holds the most interest. During the next decade, the labor force participation rate for nonwhites is expected to remain essentially unchanged at approximately 60 per cent. On this assumption, about 12.2 million nonwhites would be in the labor force in 1980, compared with 9.1 million in 1968. This represents an expansion of roughly one-third, compared with about one-quarter between 1956 and 1968. Since the total labor force in 1980 might be in the neighborhood of 101 million, nonwhites would constitute 12 per cent of the work force by the end of the next decade compared with 11.0 per cent in 1968.

This large growth in the total labor force and the even faster increase for Negroes will be accompanied by several dramatic changes in composition. For instance, over 23.7 million members of the labor force are expected to be under 25 years of age in 1980, a significantly higher proportion than in 1968. Thus, although more and more young people will undoubtedly want to work in order to continue in school in the next decade, the influx into the full-time work force of teen-agers clearly will be substantial. Moreover, an increasing proportion of these teen-agers will be nonwhites. This prospect will pose a continuous challenge to the Nation to provide appropriate employment opportunities at decent wages. But it will also put a heavy burden on Negro youths to acquire marketable skills. As we know, the impact of unemployment among teen-agers—and especially among nonwhite teen-agers—has been particularly severe. For example, while the unemployment rate of the total labor force was down to 3.6 per cent in 1968, it was still 12.6 per cent for all teen-agers and 24.9 per cent for nonwhite youth. There will also be sharp increases in the number of adult women in the labor force. By 1980, it is

estimated that there will be about 7 million more women working or looking for work than in 1968, a large proportion of whom will be searching for full-time work.

TRENDS IN OUTPUT AND INCOME, 1968-1980

By 1980 the United States will have a \$1.4 trillion economy if it grows in real terms at an average annual rate of 4 per cent. This would represent an increase of 50 per cent in the real output of goods and services in the 1970's. Expressed in per capita terms, Gross National Product (GNP) would be about \$5,650 in 1980 against \$4,274 last year—thus, rising by about one-third during this period.

For our purpose we would like to know what the growth of output implies for Negroes. However, we have no direct way to identify their share of GNP. On the other hand, we do have a fairly good measure of aggregate money income earned by Negroes as defined by the Bureau of the Census. This series does distinguish between income recipients according to color. In 1967, aggregate money income as measured by this series amounted to \$487 billion. Of this amount, \$451 billion was earned by the white population, and \$35.7 billion was received by nonwhites, representing 7.3 per cent of the total. In 1956 the income of the nonwhite population amounted to \$14 billion or 5.7 per cent of the total. During recent years the share of aggregate money income received by nonwhites has been increasing. If we assume that the same annual increase in the proportion received by nonwhites during the period 1956-1967 continues during the next decade, nonwhites would receive about 8.8 per cent of aggregate money income in 1980. If present overall trends continue, aggregate money income might amount to \$843 billion in 1980, expressed in 1968 prices. The division might be \$769 billion accruing to the white population and \$74 billion accruing to nonwhites.

Thus, during the 1970's, sizable gains will undoubtedly be registered in the aggregate money income of nonwhites as well as for whites. But the relative improvement for nonwhites would probably be substantially greater. This can be seen most clearly when the income figures are expressed in per capita terms. In 1967 aggregate money income per head was \$2,460; it was \$2,590 for whites and \$1,510 for nonwhites. By 1980 the total may rise to \$3,465 per capita. The corresponding figures for whites and nonwhites may be about \$3,648 and \$2,277, respectively. Consequently, for whites aggregate money income might increase by 40 per cent; but for nonwhites, the gain in per capita terms might be as much as 50 per cent.

OCCUPATIONAL CHANGES AND THE DEMAND FOR SKILLS

Behind this outlook for employment and income are significant prospective changes in the economy's demand for skills. These forthcoming changes will have serious implications for Negroes. For example, if nonwhite continue to gain in the 1970's at the pace recorded during the last decade, their occupational distribution in 1980 will be substantially different from what it is today. While nonwhites might constitute about 12 per cent of the total labor force in 1980, they may hold over 10 per cent of the professional and technical jobs compared with just under 6 per cent in 1967. They may have also raised their share of the managerial, official and proprietary occupations from 2.8 per cent in 1967 to nearly 4 per cent in 1980. Sizable gains probably would also have been recorded in the clerical, sales and craftsmen occupations. They might continue to provide about the same proportion of farm workers and laborers, while a noticeable decline may have occurred in the proportion of service jobs held by them.

These changes would also have a striking impact on the distribution of occupations within the nonwhite community. For instance, professional and technical workers in 1975 might constitute about 12 per cent of

the nonwhite labor force compared with 7.4 per cent in 1967. The ratio probably will have risen further by 1980. While this proportion in 1975 would still be below the 15 per cent expected for whites in the same year, the relative shift is unmistakable. The managerial group might account for about 3 per cent of the nonwhite labor force in 1975 compared with 2.6 per cent in 1967. Here also the percentage can be expected to climb further by 1980. A substantially higher proportion of the nonwhite labor force probably also would be employed in the clerical and sales fields. As already indicated, most of the relative shift will be away from the blue-collar and unskilled occupations. The expected decline among nonfarm laborers is especially striking where the percentage of the nonwhite labor force so engaged may shrink from 11 per cent in 1967 to less than 10 per cent by 1975—and to an even smaller proportion by 1980.

Associated with—and partly responsible for—these improvements in the occupational distribution of the nonwhite population is the expectation of substantial further progress in their educational achievement. If the trend of the increase in the median years of schooling for both whites and nonwhites recorded during the period 1952 to 1967 continues during the decade of the 1970's, the gap between the two will have been narrowed considerably. On this assumption, by 1980, nonwhite women on the average may have completed about 12.1 years of schooling compared with 12.6 years for white women. This would mean that the educational differential would have shrunk from 0.9 years in 1967 to only 0.5 years in favor of white women. Among nonwhite men, the median years of schooling may have risen to 11.4 years by 1980, compared with 12.8 years for white men, further narrowing the gap to about 1.4 years compared with a gap of 1.9 years in 1967. Moreover, substantial improvement can also be expected in the quality of education received by Negroes over the next decade.

COLLEGE EDUCATION AND THE ECONOMIC PROGRESS OF THE BLACK COMMUNITY

Sadly, however, as I observed at the outset, just at the time when the outlook for greater participation by Negroes in the national economy is improving considerably, a number of digressions are appearing which may lead astray some of our most promising young people.

We can encounter on an increasing number of college campuses a myopic view which holds that black students really do not need to concern themselves with a good part of the curriculum offered by a typical undergraduate college. Instead, it is being argued by many students and faculty members that courses and programs should be recast to concentrate on subjects such as urban problems, the eradication of racism, the enhancement of the blackman's cultural image, and the widening of knowledge of his heritage among members of a predominantly white society. Parallel to—and reinforcing—this view is a spreading tendency among many black students to isolate themselves into separate enclaves and to minimize contact with whites. In my personal judgment, these developments are not only short-sighted; they are inimical both to Negro students themselves and to the Negro community at large.

In expressing this criticism, I am not unaware of the need for a thorough reform of much of the curriculum offered by even our best institutions. Through serving on several college governing boards and advisory committees, I see a good deal of campus life.¹

¹ My present service includes: Overseer, Harvard University (Massachusetts); Trustee, Tuskegee Institute (Alabama); Carlton College (Minnesota); and Howard University (Washington, D.C.); Member, Advisory Committee, Graduate School of Business, Atlanta University (Georgia).

I have spent a fair proportion of my professional life in college teaching; ² and—through lectures and seminars—I still participate frequently in the intellectual environment of the campus. Through numerous discussions with students, faculty members, and college administrators, I am convinced that in most institutions numerous courses and programs are seriously out-of-date. But I am also convinced that in most colleges and universities—undoubtedly spurred to a considerable degree by persistent pressure for change on the part of students and junior faculty members—the process of modernization is underway, and it can be expected to accelerate.

What concerns me most are the consequences which some of the campus innovations imply for black students and for the Negro community as a whole. In particular, I am greatly disturbed by the proliferation of programs variously described as "black studies" or "Afro-American studies" and by the growing tendency of numerous Negro students to concentrate in such areas or to substitute such courses for more traditional subjects in undergraduate programs (especially in the social sciences and humanities). So far only a few colleges apparently have established degree programs in these fields, but a sizable number of institutions do accept them as appropriate for minors or secondary concentration.

In my personal judgment, Negro students should be extremely cautious about devoting their college careers to a concentration on "black studies" or "Afro-American studies." I can well understand the bitterness and frustration they may feel about the lack of awareness of the major contributions which black people have made not only to American society but in the world at large. I can also appreciate their eagerness to equip themselves to work effectively in the improvement of the urban environment in which most of them will live once they leave college. Nonetheless, they should have no illusions about the extent to which they are likely to acquire in "black studies" programs the mental discipline, technical skills, and rigorous training in problem-solving that they will so desperately need in their future careers.

Rather black students—along with all other students—must accept the fact that there is no real alternative to thorough grounding in the technical underpinnings of the subject they may choose as a major. And whatever may be their field of concentration, they really must learn to read and to write and to speak effectively—and they just have to achieve some degree of understanding in mathematics and the other so-called hard sciences. In addition, they certainly will need some acquaintance with the social sciences—especially with the subject matter of economics, sociology and political science.

Unfortunately, one encounters far too few faculty members on college campuses these days who are willing to face black students and insist that they take a meaningful and realistic view of the requirements of a college education. Instead, more and more of the key faculty members in many institutions—and often they are among the most sensitive and responsive—seem to be accepting (in some cases completely and in others with only slight modifications) whatever "demands" for program and other changes black students may propose. Rarely does one see faculty members (in whose hands a college curriculum must rest) coming forth to tell black students that some of their proposals and views are simply nonsense—as some of them certainly are! One gets the distinct impression that, on the predominantly white college campus, faculty and

administrators are showing considerable panic in their relations with black students. In the typical case, there are few—if any—Negroes on the campus with college or professional training who can offer advice and counsel, and thus provide a somewhat more considered perspective on the environment of the American Negro today and the outlook for the years ahead.

Thus, many college faculties, perhaps unconsciously, are accepting the untested views of numerous black students (only occasionally tempered by the benefit of an off-campus review) about the character and content of a college education that has meaning for American Negroes. In the process, they may be helping to create a series of sheltered workshops in which black students languish during a considerable part of their college careers and then leave the campus ill-equipped to perform in a world which is placing an increasingly heavy premium on technical skills and a vigorous intellect. Thus, on the mistaken assumption that they are being relevant and responsive, many of our college faculties are creating facilities which may cripple young people—rather than strengthen their ability to compete in an economy of expanding opportunities.

In my opinion, if they really want to be helpful to many young people who truly need their assistance and guidance, colleges should devote themselves to attracting more students from low income areas—both urban and rural—a step which will clearly require a considerable expansion in their scholarships and other forms of financial assistance. And once they are on campus, they should be provided with special counseling and other remedial assistance to enable them to overcome the handicaps imposed by inferior high schools and to master even the toughest parts of the college curriculum. Moreover, under no circumstances should the colleges provide them with college-supported segregated housing either on or off campus—as unfortunately some institutions are currently doing. After all, the opportunity to broaden one's own horizon is one of the chief benefits of a college experience.

I have concentrated in this part of these remarks on the problems arising on the predominantly white campuses—because there the issues are most acute. But they also exist on predominantly black campuses as well. We hear from time-to-time about the resentment and rejection many black students on such campuses have shown toward the few white students who have enrolled in recent years. I find such practices especially dismaying; one would have thought that people who have suffered themselves from the corrosive effects of racial discrimination and segregation would be the last to inflict such pain on others.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In my judgment, the foregoing analysis strongly suggests that, if the rate of improvement registered during the last decade continues the Negro in the 1970's will strengthen substantially his relative position in the American economy. His employment will be much stronger, and his real income will be considerably higher. The opportunities to share as a full participant in an expanding economy also will have widened noticeably.

On the other hand, these possible gains are by no means assured. Thus, a far greater effort—on the part of Negroes as well as on the part of government and the private sector generally—will be required if the promises are to be fulfilled. For Negroes, and especially for Negro youth, this greater effort must be concentrated on the improvement of technical competence, the acquisition of marketable skills and the enhancement of their ability to compete in an economy of expanding opportunity.

PERSPECTIVE ON THE MILITARY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 topic in Congress these days is that of the military's role in Government and priority-setting.

It is my belief that only through wide dissemination of the many analyses and critiques of the Military Establishment, and of their implications for decision-making, can we here in Congress receive a broad enough picture of the overall problem.

To accomplish this availability of information, from time to time, I have been inserting in the RECORD articles, statements, and editorials which I feel have relevance in this area, and should be read by other Members.

Today, I wish to place four more articles into the RECORD. Under unanimous consent I submit these materials for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Monthly, June 1969]
DEFENSE—OR OFFENSE? WASHINGTON'S WHISPERED ISSUE: OUR FIRST-STRIKE CAPABILITY

(By Morton M. Kondracke)

Although these sentiments have been diagnosed as "criminally insane" by Nobel-Prize-winner George Wald in a now-famous speech, they are in fact part of United States strategic nuclear policy. While almost everyone assumes that our policy is to deter war, official doctrine contains another goal: if there is a war, to win it, even if everybody is dead. The Pentagon, of course, has a less disturbing way of expressing it. Its language says that, if deterrence fails, the nation's goal is "to insure that the United States and its allies emerge with relative advantage irrespective of the circumstances of initiation, response and termination."

To deter war, the United States depends on what the Pentagon calls "assured-destruction" capability, that is, "the unmistakable ability to inflict an unacceptable degree of damage upon any aggressor—even after a surprise attack on the United States." Legitimate questions are being asked in the antiballistic missile debate about how much assured destruction is enough. No one but certifiable unilateral disarmers (of which, despite House Minority Leader Gerald Ford, there are none in the ABM debate) would argue against the idea that "assured-destruction capability" is a capacity well worth retaining for the sake of deterrence.

But war-winning is another matter. It has not been publicly debated yet, but it should be. Our methods of war-winning, in Pentagonese, are called by the defensive-sounding (therefore harmless-sounding) name, "damage limitation." In the wonderful world of war-gaming, however, defensive-sounding programs are actually some of the most dangerous and provocative, not to mention expensive. For example, in the name of "damage limitation," we retain the option—senseless though it might be to exercise it now—of launching a pre-emptive, "counterforce" nuclear attack against the Soviet Union or China. If we ever used the option, the United States would be starting nuclear war, but we'd call it "damage limitation" because we would be cutting down on the number of enemy weapons that could damage us in return. If we tried to exercise the option against the Soviets, we would suffer

² I have taught at Harvard, Michigan State, and the University of Pennsylvania.

"unacceptable damage" ourselves (about 80 million deaths). Nonetheless, the option is there and we have "damage-limiting" weapons on the drawing boards which look suspiciously (if to Americans, then certainly to Russians) like the means to making the option more attractive. These go by the names MIRV, AMSA, SRAM, SCAD and Safeguard.

Perhaps striking first is an option we don't want to have. Perhaps war-winning is not a game we want to play. If not—or even if so—it is a matter that ought to be debated, but this is as close as it's recently come:

Senator Stuart Symington (D-Mo.): ". . . You and I have talked about this many times. . . . It seems for various reasons we do not want to establish what could be the greatest deterrence of all. If the Soviets knew that if they went after our missile bases we in turn would go after their cities, that would be a far greater deterrence than anything brought up at these meeting to date. . . ."

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird: "I am a little concerned over that proposal. . . . But you know what we are talking about, Senator. I'm sure you understand."

Symington: "And you know what I am talking about, Mr. Secretary." (Laughter.)

What Secretary Laird and Senator Symington were talking about in this mystifying little exchange during the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's ABM hearings was United States strategic targeting doctrine. Most people assume, thanks to the latter-day Robert S. McNamara, that, as Symington suggested, U.S. missiles are targeted on Soviet cities as a means of deterring war—i.e., of letting the Soviets know that if they try a surprise first strike we will inflict "unacceptable damage" on them in return. In fact, this is not the whole truth.

PLAYING THE GAME

There was, in 1962, another Robert S. McNamara, who made a University of Michigan commencement speech in which he said that "the principal military objective, in the event of general nuclear war, should be the destruction of the enemy's military forces, not his civilian population." McNamara said that, instead of inflicting "maximum damage" on an enemy, it would be better to "bring the conflict to an end favorable to us and to minimize [i.e., limit] damage on ourselves. . . ." Its proponents advertised this as a "city-sparing" strategy; in other words, as a humane way of waging nuclear war. In fact, it implied that the United States regarded nuclear war as a "winnable" proposition.

By the necessary rules of the game McNamara was proposing, the side with missiles left over when the other side was out would "win." The advantage, clearly, was on the side that struck first. McNamara began spreading the word that the U.S. had so many more missiles than the Soviets that it had a long head start for any such "game." (Although the "missile gap" of the 1960 campaign had been a phony, the U.S. went on building up its arsenal as if it had been real.) It so happened, also, that McNamara's speech came two weeks after a magazine article appeared quoting President John F. Kennedy as saying that "in some circumstances, we might have to take the initiative" in using nuclear weapons.

In furtherance of McNamara's "city-sparing" strategy, U.S. targeting doctrine was arranged in such a way that U.S. missiles were aimed at Soviet rockets, not at Soviet cities. This "counter-force" targeting doctrine was applauded by General Curtis E. LeMay (who was Air Force Chief of Staff at the time), but others at the Pentagon—particularly the Navy—were aghast. The targeting doctrine implied that the United States would have to strike first. If the Soviets fired first, their missiles would no longer be there to be hit in a U.S. retaliatory strike.

Though he presumably didn't know the secret details of U.S. targeting, Nikita Khrushchev understood well enough what McNamara was proposing in his speech, and he condemned it as "a camouflage for nuclear war." The Soviet leader said he would never subscribe to "rules" for nuclear war (under which, not incidentally, he would have lost). He accused the U.S. of "preparing for a new world war" and of "feverishly stockpiling nuclear weapons." He took out ads in several North American newspapers. More realistically, he began to harden (protect) Soviet missiles so they could survive a U.S. surprise attack. McNamara's speech was delivered on June 16. By October 23, the Soviet Union had introduced intermediate-range missiles into Cuba. It is widely accepted, by President Nixon among others, that the United States emerged successfully from the Cuban missile crisis because of our overwhelming nuclear superiority. There are more than a few people in Washington around at the time, who believe that the U.S. never would have got into the crisis in the first place had it not been for McNamara's rattling our rocket superiority and implying that the United States intended to use it in a realistic war game.

Much has changed since 1962. Nowadays, not entirely to the liking of the hawks in Congress or the Joint Chiefs of Staff, primary emphasis in U.S. strategic planning is on assured destruction (deterrence) instead of damage limitation (war-winning). But one thing that has not changed is U.S. targeting doctrine. Our missiles are still aimed at Soviet missiles as well as at Soviet cities. This is our option for waging pre-emptive war. Its existence was discussed in closed hearings last year before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, which published a heavily-censored version of the testimony during the Presidential campaign last fall. Most newspapers carried accounts of the subcommittee's report, which held that the Soviets were making dangerous strides in nuclear technology. But the hearings themselves are fascinating reading, despite the gauntlet of "[deleted]" in the transcript. As to targeting, here are some excerpts.

General Earle G. Wheeler (chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff): "Speaking for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we have always held to the view that we must attack those forces of the Soviet Union which are able to inflict destruction on ourselves and our allies."

James T. Kendall (chief subcommittee counsel): "What you are saying is that our war plans do allocate weapons for damage-limiting or counter-force?"

Wheeler: "They certainly do. . . . We can do certain things that are significant in the damage-limiting field. [Deleted] and we have made no change in this targeting policy."

Later in the hearings, Dr. Alain C. Enthoven, then-Assistant Secretary of Defense for systems analysis, told the subcommittee: "First, I would like to emphasize that our targeting policy, as reflected in the guidance for preparation of the targeting plan, has not changed. From 1961-62 on, the targeting plan has been based on the principle that we should have different options that target the strategic forces and cities." Nor has the policy changed with the arrival of the Nixon Administration. Following the Symington-Laird "I understand-you understand" exchange, Pentagon research chief John S. Foster said there was nothing wrong with Symington's "city-hitting" proposal for insuring deterrence. "The limitation," said Foster, "is only one of retargeting our deterrent . . . to retaliate on his cities for an attack on U.S. missiles."

There are those, it should be said, who insist that counter-force targeting does not necessarily imply that the U.S. would be the first to launch a nuclear attack. They draw up this scenario for nuclear war; the Soviets would hit first, but would limit their

attack (as in McNamara's 1962 war game) to our missile sites and other military targets. Although Enthoven testified that such an attack would kill 10 million Americans, the scenario goes that we would play the game, striking back at their unused missiles and military installations. They would hit back at ours, and so on, with no one ever getting mad enough to cheat and hit a big city. One of the creators of scenarios like this is Herman Kahn of the Hudson Institute, who told a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee this spring that "one must recognize the possibility of a controlled and limited use of these weapons, and of a need to alleviate the consequences, whether or not there is much control or limitation."

The brilliant Dr. Kahn might be termed Mr. Damage Limitation, for he has suggested numerous scenarios for limited nuclear war. One of them, admittedly extreme, is a "war of competitive mobilization" in which the U.S. might declare war but withhold its attack while it spent "hundreds of billions of dollars a year" preparing. Kahn says: "It might be possible to build almost a 'spare United States' underground in a year or two." Since the United States has a greater productive capacity than the Soviet Union, goes the plan, we could dig deeper into the ground and do it faster, thereby winning (!) the eventual nuclear war.

While Kahn acknowledges that this plan is a bit far-out, he testified in favor of closer-in damage-limiting programs, notably the anti-ballistic missile system. Someday, he said, it might be possible with lasers to deploy what amounts to an anti-ballistic bubble over the United States, capable of shooting down any incoming missiles. This would be an ultimate in damage limitation. If the United States had one and the Soviets didn't, we could launch a nuclear war with impunity and win. Of course, the Soviets might deploy an anti-laser laser, which would mean moving on to something else.

Kahn, along with other brilliant and sophisticated nuclear thinkers, scorns the idea that nuclear war is "unwinnable" or that it should be made—according to Symington's suggestion—too awful for anyone to contemplate. Kahn, borrowing from psychiatry, calls this common attitude "rejection." Incidentally, Kahn told the House subcommittee: "I think it is unpleasant to face these problems. I think it is more unpleasant to talk about them. I don't particularly encourage discussion in the general public because I think this is the kind of thing which you don't want housewives discussing, to be frank." He said Congressmen should discuss it, along with government officials and experts. Dr. Kahn's expertise notwithstanding, housewives may disagree. It is they who would do most of the dying in a nuclear war. Congressmen and the experts—especially the experts—would be protected. Should the housewives have the opportunity to see their fate debated? Quite a few would probably think so, if they knew about it.

THE QUESTIONS

If the issue were debated, the first question ought to be: do we want to retain our current targeting doctrine, which gives us the option of launching a first strike and which also makes it possible for us to contemplate "controlled" nuclear wars? A second question is: do we want to spend billions of dollars on "damage-limiting" devices which make nuclear war (theoretically, anyway) "winnable"? Maybe the answer to both questions is "yes," but there are good arguments for "no."

Nowadays, a first strike on the part of the United States would be madness. It was theoretically possible in 1962, when the U.S. had (using President Nixon's figures) a 4- or 5-to-1 superiority over the Soviet Union. (We have infinite superiority now over China—we have 4,200 warheads capable of

reaching them, they have none capable of reaching us—and don't think there aren't people around who think about using them.) But, to the great sadness of U.S. superhawks, the United States no longer enjoys the old advantage, although we retain some numerical superiority. The Soviets now have an "assured-destruction" capability against us, meaning that they could inflict "unacceptable damage" on the U.S. in retaliation. The Pentagon estimates that there would be about 100 million dead on each side, give or take 20 million. Though McNamara has been mercilessly pilloried (by LeMay and the "old" Nixon) for letting U.S. superiority slip, it really didn't happen that way.

Enthoven testified that, after the 1962 experience, the Soviets went to hardened silos and more missiles. Far from wanting to let the Soviets begin to catch up, he said, we just couldn't afford to stop them.

The upshot was summarized by Enthoven and the Preparedness Subcommittee chairman:

Senator Stennis: "As I understand it, your position is that they have developed to such an extent that we do not have the capacity to knock them out with a first strike."

Dr. Enthoven: "That is right, Mr. Chairman."

A question for the debate, then, is this: if we can't use our option to strike first, why have it? An answer might be: to fight a "controlled" nuclear war. Enthoven testified that this is not a very attractive proposition either. "If such an attack remained restricted, and if both sides withheld attacks on cities," he said, "we could significantly limit damage to our citizens by our current and programmed, strategic offensive and defensive forces and civil defense measures. However, even an attack limited to our strategic forces would probably kill more than 10 million Americans. Furthermore, we would not be able to deprive the Soviets of their residual forces. . . . It is quite uncertain, under these circumstances, how a nuclear war could be ended."

That being so, do we want to be able to fight "limited" nuclear wars? Wouldn't it be better—since the chances are that controlled war would get out of control anyway—to take Symington's suggestion and announce that we will respond to any Soviet attack with a counter-attack on cities? Such a policy—it's called "mutual unconditional deterrence"—would eliminate any thought on either side of "winning" a nuclear war. Both sides would lose everything. It would be the best incentive not to start a war. It would, in fact, make strategic nuclear weapons irrelevant and unusable; and it could provide the basis for a gradual trimming down of arsenals on both sides.

Furthermore, it would reduce the need for "damage limitation" as a goal in national strategic policy saving considerable money. All we would need in the way of strategic weaponry (research might continue, but deployment would not be necessary) would be enough to inflict unacceptable losses on an attacker. That amount would be a matter for debate, but in the past we have always built much more than we have needed—so much, in fact, that we have plenty left over for damage limitation (i.e., war-winning). This is known as overkill, and we both have plenty. Senator Albert Gore (D-Tenn.) has figured out that the United States has 48 times the number of warheads needed to destroy the 50 largest Soviet cities. The Soviets have 22 times the number needed to destroy our 50 largest cities.

Some damage-limitation weapons are bound to be deployed. We plan our deterrent needs not against what the Soviets have, or even what they are expected to have, but against a "greater-than-expected threat," which, in Enthoven's words, "assumes that the Soviets develop . . . their forces to a degree we believe is only remotely possible." As

a result, "five years later, when the forces are actually in the field, we are likely to find that the actual Soviet threat is not as great as we had predicted it would be, so we have forces left over that can be used for other missions" besides deterrence. He was talking about a damage-limitation mission. It is probably neither possible nor desirable to eliminate all damage-limiting forces. But it is wise to have enough assured destruction to cover all circumstances. Some excess is an inevitable result.

It is quite another matter to plan for damage limitation or to build it stealthily, using cover assertions that "gaps" exist in our ability to deter war. The planner who is significantly and unnecessarily boosting our damage-limiting capability is thinking about winning a nuclear war—or starting one. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, straightforward soldiers that they are, want to build more damage-limiting hardware, and they say so. They consider it unpatriotic to think that nuclear war is unthinkable.

Counsel Kendall: "Are you concerned that in some way we may now be in or approaching a stage of unconditional mutual deterrence whereby neither side would dare to use its strategic nuclear weapons under any circumstances?"

General Wheeler: "I do not think we have reached that stage, nor do I think we will necessarily reach it if we exert our brains and if we have the will not to permit it to happen. . . . I do not see this unconditional mutual deterrence. It could well be that you are going to arrive at a situation where the decision is going to be harder to make to use these forces."

Kendall: "Suppose the numbers of casualties . . . were doubled (to 160 million for the U.S., 200 million for the Soviets). . . . Obviously, you would have no country left, neither of us."

Wheeler: "Mr. Kendall, I reject the 'better Red than dead' theory—lock, stock, and barrel."

The Chiefs want to retain the option of trying to win wars and they want the equipment with which to pick up on that option. They want a large, advanced ICBM with multiple warheads. They want a new manned bomber equipped with SRAM (an air-to-ground nuclear missile) and SCAD (a bomber-carried drone plane). They want fallout shelters for the entire population and a thick, city-protecting ABM system. Total cost: classified but gigantic. Piled on, these damage-limited systems might begin to approach the kind of all-out superiority you need if you want to think about launching a pre-emptive strike or threatening one to blackmail an enemy into submission. Unfortunately for the Joint Chiefs, these programs were not approved by McNamara. Neither was the theory of "exploitable nuclear superiority," simply because it was impossible to attain—any effort we made to achieve it would be matched by the Soviets. We would both have more weapons, concluded McNamara, but each side would still be able to kill off the same number of people.

GAP VERSUS PACT

But now we are embarked on a new Administration which speaks with two voices. One voice says that we will talk with the Soviets about limiting nuclear weapons and perhaps negotiate an agreement which will "codify equality." The same soft voice says that the goal of the U.S. strategic arsenal is "sufficiency" for deterrence, not "superiority." However, another voice tells us that the Soviets are striving for a first strike capability against us with "no question about it."

The same voice says that unless we build new weapons the Soviets will be ahead "in all areas" by the mid-1970's. This latter voice, which is heard most often from the mouth of Melvin R. Laird, echoes back to the days of yore, when "missile gaps" and "bomber

gaps" were dreamed up (by Democrats, it should be noted) as opportunities to establish U.S. superiority in weapons. Laird may be right—and in the unfortunate position of the boy crying wolf the third time. But, having heard "wolf" before, suspicions among the population are natural. They should lead to vigorous debate.

If Americans are suspicious, what about the Soviets? They have seen the "gap" pattern develop before in the U.S. In 1962, it cost them dearly. They have reason to be suspicious now, too, because we are readying two programs that are at least partly damage-limiting (war-winning), though we are justifying them as maintaining assured destruction (deterrence). One such program is the Safeguard ABM system, which Laird says we need to plug a deterrent gap, but which also has a war-winning role against both China and the Soviets that could be expanded. The other program, on the verge of being deployed, is MINUTEMAN III with MIRV (for multiple independently-targeted re-entry vehicle), a system for equipping each rocket with several warheads that can be directed to different targets. MIRV is justified these days in the name of assured destruction (in a retaliatory strike, to get through Soviet ABMs). But last year, Foster testified to its original purpose: "to increase our targeting ability." Our MIRVs are highly accurate—a requirement not needed for use on cities, but necessary for destroying somebody's missiles. Or, as Foster testified last spring, "we are beginning (with MIRV) to get a rather effective damage-limiting capability."

This being so, MIRV is an even better issue than ABM around which to debate the question of war-winning. This has not yet been done. The doves on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have skipped around both MIRV and the larger question. They shouldn't: we could all get killed. If we want Adam and Eve to be Americans, we should decide it publicly.

BUSINESS EXECUTIVES MOVE FOR VIETNAM PEACE

(Statement of J. Sinclair Armstrong, on behalf of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, on the Appropriation Request for the Vietnam War before the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., June 9, 1969)

Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace is an organization of 2,500 owners and executives of American business corporations in forty-nine states who seek by open and lawful means to bring about an end to U.S. participation in the War in Vietnam.

My own credentials to address you are not impressive compared to those of any of the Military Sponsors of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace. However, I do come here with a background of service in the Naval Reserve in World War II and as Assistant Secretary of the Navy during two years of the Eisenhower Administration. I am a life member of the Navy League of the United States and a member of the Advisory Council of its New York Chapter.

My business experience has been in law and finance, and includes four years as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission (two as its Chairman), also under President Eisenhower, and ten years in my present position as an Executive Vice President of the United States Trust Company of New York (whose official views I do not purport to speak for on this occasion).

OUR POSITION AGAINST THE VIETNAM WAR

We conceive that War to be a material and moral disaster for the U.S., and our participation in it to be contrary to our country's economic and strategic interests.

From the moral point of view, the killing and wounding of hundreds of thousands of human beings in a tiny country on the other

side of the globe that could not possibly endanger the security of the U.S. weighs on our national conscience. The losses of our own precious fighting men, about 42,000 killed and 230,000 wounded so far, is a senseless and cruel drain of our nation's most valuable human resource.

In our third National Meeting, held in Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, May 6, our members voted unanimously to seek immediate withdrawal of all U.S. armed forces from Vietnam.

We have attempted to present that opinion, and an outline of a specific plan for bringing about such withdrawal, developed by our Executive Committee and National Council, with advice of our Military Sponsors, to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Presidential Assistant for National Security Affairs. We invited each of them to address our National Meeting, or to send a representative to hear our views and state the Administration's position. We have been rebuffed by them, up to now.

Accordingly, we deem it an especially valuable privilege to present this brief statement to this Committee of the Congress.

OUR MILITARY CREDENTIALS

Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace is privileged to have as expert advisers a distinguished group of retired officers of field and flag rank. Among these is one who has served with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the distinguished former Marine Corps Commandant, General David L. Shoup.

In his article, "The New American Militarism", The Atlantic Monthly, April, 1969, General Shoup said: "For years up to 1964 the chiefs of the armed services, of whom the author was one, deemed it unnecessary and unwise for U.S. forces to become involved in any ground war in Southeast Asia". That was the expressed view of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. "In 1964 there were changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in a matter of a few months the Johnson Administration, encouraged by the aggressive military, hastened into what became the quagmire of Vietnam."

President Nixon said to the graduating class at the Air Force Academy, on June 4, "On the home front you are under attack from those who question the need for a strong national defense and indeed see a danger in the power of the defenders. . . . It is open season on the armed forces".

Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace does not attack the armed forces. We favor immediate withdrawal from Vietnam in aid of U.S. strategic defense and vital national interests. We rely on traditional views of U.S. military leaders, which we deem much sounder than the present leaders' views.

THE APPROPRIATION REQUEST FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA OPERATIONS

The Budget of the U.S., FY 1970, pages 73 and 74, states \$23,025 million as recommended budget authority ("NOA") for "special Southeast Asia" and \$25,733 million (including \$336 million "economic assistance") outlays for special Southeast Asia in FY 1970, and military personnel in Southeast Asia, 639,000 in FY 1970.

Secretary of Defense Clifford's Defense Budget and Posture Statement, delivered in January to this Committee, which has not been changed by Secretary Laird so far as we know, calls for the level of operations and personnel requested in the FY 1970 Budget document, for Southeast Asia.

Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace urges this Committee to reject this request for NOA of \$23 billion and rescind obligatory authority heretofore granted to spend \$25 1/4 billion on the Vietnam War in FY 1970.

We urge this Committee to hand this request back to the Administration, and to require a new estimate based on a planned,

phased, complete withdrawal from Vietnam of all U.S. forces beginning at once.

We do not have sufficient detailed data nor any staff to estimate precisely what this reduced amount should be. In view of the diverse considerations involved in such a withdrawal and the difficulty of making a precise estimate of its cost (recalling my own experience as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management and Comptroller of the Navy), I believe that \$12.5 billion is a prudent estimate of the cost savings that could be made.

ECONOMIC FACTORS URGING IMMEDIATE TERMINATION OF THE VIETNAM WAR

The national economy is endangered by the excessive defense and space spending. Such a large proportion of our economic effort—10% of GNP—is going into non-productive activity. The effect of this is destabilizing to a free economy.

This has led, building up fast since 1964, to U.S. financial troubles. There were serious deficits brought on by the War—(unified) budget deficits of \$5.916 million in FY 1964, \$1,618 million in 1965, \$3,790 million in 1966, \$8,790 million in 1967, and the whopping deficit of \$25,187 million in FY 1968, for a cumulative five-year deficit of \$45,301 million.

In parallel with this fiscal instability, consumer prices began running up rapidly in 1964 and are still advancing at the fastest pace in American economic history (at March, 1969, 125.6 of 1957-1959 base index of 100, and an increase from 119.5 during the previous twelve months—a 5% annual rate).

With enormous U.S. military expenditures overseas and trade balances declining, accompanied by heavy loss of monetary gold, the integrity of the dollar in international finance came under a cloud for the first time.

The growing non-competitiveness of American industry led to its failure to hold even the American market. This condition must be regarded as of the gravest importance. In the 1968 Annual Report of the United States Steel Corporation is a discussion—pages 32-38—on International Competition. On page 35 a bar chart shows Steel Import Penetration of Domestic Market increasing from 7% in 1964 to 17% in 1968. The Corporation says: "Moreover, although U.S. technology and productivity are improving, in an increasing number of industries they no longer seem sufficiently superior to offset our hourly employment cost disadvantage. Further, technological gains here can soon be matched or sometimes surpassed overseas, when capital is available. In addition, plant and equipment costs are much lower abroad. Thus the U.S. has a fundamental international competitive cost disadvantage—a disadvantage likely to worsen before it wanes".

This adverse condition of American industry cannot be repaired as long as the present level of non-productive activity is sustained. The Vietnam War is an important part of that non-productive activity.

The Congress enacted a 10% surtax to reduce the deficit, and the monetary authority has brought about tight money. Interest rates have risen to historic highs. The prime corporate lending rate was 7 1/2% but many banks were quoting 8 1/2% brokers' loan rates in New York on June 6.

The unavailability of credit has curtailed vital national programs for housing, education, and the like. Wage increases to offset price increases have continued to spiral. Military spending for non-productive purposes has pumped money into the economy without accompanying consumer and capital goods.

As this has gone along, an economic instability has developed that threatens to require more controls. The Congress has already been asked by President Nixon to continue the surtax and to abandon the invest-

ment credit that serves as an inducement to industry to modernize outdated capital facilities and equipment. (Neither of these restrictive tax measures would be needed if \$12.5 billion could be taken from the Defense Budget by ending the Vietnam War.)

With the country running out of bank credit and with interest rates very high, surely the next steps will have to be direct wage and price controls and allocations of materials. There is beginning to be felt a considerable body of responsible business opinion that *unless the Vietnam War is promptly ended* and unnecessary defense spending curtailed, wages and prices will have to be frozen and vital materials allocated. This would lead to re-establishment of all the old "OPA" apparatus with which business and labor struggled, of necessity, during World War II. It would lead to a statist society. And in that statist society, where would be the economic liberties that we Americans hold dear? The freedom of competitive enterprise for business, the freedom of collective bargaining for labor, would be lost to Government controls in Washington. The economics of the situation tell us that the Vietnam War should be ended now in the vital interests of our free American society.

CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION

President Nixon also said at the Air Force Academy on June 4:

"And there can be no question that we should not spend unnecessarily for defense. How much is necessary? The President of the United States is the man charged with making that judgment".

President Nixon is right that we should not spend unnecessarily.

Unfortunately, with many of the same military and diplomatic advisers on Vietnam as President Johnson had, such as Generals Westmoreland and Wheeler, and Ambassadors Bunker and Lodge, President Nixon seems to be making very little progress, either at Paris or on the bloody battlefields.

But the President is not the only man "charged with making that judgment".

The Congress has the power "to lay and collect taxes", "to provide for the common defense", "to raise and support armies", and "to declare war" (none has been declared against Vietnam). U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, "Powers of the Congress".

The President is "Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy" and "shall from time to time give to the Congress information on the state of the union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient". Article II, Sections 2 and 3.

Constitutional responsibility for these decisions clearly falls on the Congress. They must not be taken by the President nor abandoned by the Congress.

The decisions of the Congress on whether to continue the Vietnam War—and to permit other mistaken adventures of intervention like Vietnam to be commenced by the President—will have vital implications for the future. If the Congress says "no" to these military adventures, free enterprise in a free economy will survive and prosper in America. If the Congress is acquiescent, condoning them and appropriating money for them, that free society is doomed.

So we, Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace, urge the Congress to review the Defense Posture and Budget for FY 1970 and revise the Budget so as to deny the President the appropriations with which to continue the Vietnam War. We urge this in the vital interests of the United States.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 29, 1969]

WIDE DISTRUST OF THE MILITARY

(By D. J. R. Bruckner)

Out on Main Street, President Nixon's proposal to reform the draft is popular. People believe a lottery will improve morale and discipline in the lower echelons of the mili-

tary. Now, one wonders, what will he do about the top echelons?

That something should be done is obvious. In congressional debate about the Pentagon, a factor of great significance is overlooked: If you talk to people on the streets you will find that many—and most of the young—believe the military is not capable of defending the country. One element in this growing doubt is probably the complexity of modern weapons. Many refuse to believe they will work. Others, having seen pictures of rocket shots on television, refuse to believe that any weapon could ever stop such a device.

More serious is the deep distrust of the men at the top. Most people will tell you the military has spent huge amounts in lives and money during the past 20 years with few results. There is a temptation to denounce this mentality as barbaric, but possibly the people are worried about something more than why we do not win.

Of course, everyone is angry about Vietnam and all that blood. Few relatives of soldiers doubt that their boys are the best; if they are dying and not winning, the people say, the generals are to blame.

They recall other incidents: the Bay of Pigs, which many more of the old than of the young remember as a military pipe dream foisted off on an unsuspecting President.

They distrust the Navy for exposing the Pueblo to capture and then trying to court-martial the officers while refusing to investigate the admirals. People remember these things. They know that the same service lost an unarmed plane in the same area recently; and they know that it had exposed another intelligence ship to attack in the Mediterranean in 1967.

Nuclear submarines, which we are told could wipe out an enemy from the sea even if he had first wiped us off the land, have sunk in the bottom of the ocean, or in a harbor. The Pentagon says we have the most sophisticated war machinery in the world, but everyone knows that we have lost 2,500 aircraft in Vietnam; and many recall news reports of rifles which did not work in the field.

People talk about a new supertank which has no conventional defense weapons and which will not run, and they count the crashes of the F-111 aircraft. They worry less about the doubled cost of the C-5A than about what it is and whether it will work; many know that the Cheyenne helicopter program collapsed before it got off the ground.

In New York and Cleveland, St. Louis, Minneapolis and Omaha, people will tell you—not all of them hot youths, either—that the military cannot even protect us from itself. They worry aloud about all the mystery with which the Pentagon surrounded the crash of a nuclear bomber in Spain three years ago. And the stink of 6,400 dead sheep in Utah sticks in every nostril on Main Street.

I think that most people are still ready to believe any man, especially a leader, until they have reason not to; with the military, they are disturbed with so much secrecy, and duplicity.

Partly, the popular doubt now springs from the nature of modern warfare; there are no big heroes, and the individual generals are not well known. That may be fortunate for them, for many people—and most of the young—now believe that military men rise to the top, command behind curtains for a few years, and then retire to big jobs in industries which deal in defense systems. The people may be wrong, but many of them think of generals and admirals as old men with fat fronts, fat backs, fat heads and swollen wallets—mysterious movers of a war machine so complex that it cannot work, much of it untested, parts of it unsafe.

It is the faith of the people, not the cost of weapons which is at issue now. We can argue that war is evil in any case, but we know, from the history of everybody, that a nation which feels unprotected will soon feel threatened and will probably break out into irrational violent acts.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 2, 1969]
MIRV TESTS IMPERIL ARMS CONTROL

Unlike most of the oratory which has been aimed against the proposed Safeguard missile defense system, Senate appeals for a U.S. moratorium on further testing of multiple-warhead offensive missiles make a lot of sense.

The Nixon Administration should, before it is too late, reconsider its apparent intention of testing and then deploying the so-called MIRVs without regard to the possible impact on the expected arms control talks with Moscow.

In a real sense, the MIRVs (missiles which carry several individually targeted warheads) are what the arm limitation talks are all about.

The fundamental fact is that any Soviet-American agreement to limit the number of offensive missiles on both sides must be subject to some kind of verification—otherwise there would be no safeguard against cheating.

Thanks to the capabilities of U.S. "spy" satellites, Pentagon officials are confident that any Soviet buildup in the number of offensive missiles, in violation of an agreement, could be detected. The Russians presumably have a comparable capability to monitor such activity here.

"Spy" satellites could not, however, be depended upon to detect the installation of multiple warheads—a step by which either we or the Russians could vastly increase nuclear striking power without increasing the number of missiles or launching complexes.

Neither country is likely to convert its missiles to MIRVs in the absence of tests demonstrating a capability for the separate and accurate targeting of the multiple warheads.

Such tests can be monitored.

The Soviet Union has conducted several trials of multiple-entry warheads, but has not yet demonstrated a capability for equipping each with a separate but reliable guidance system.

The United States is well ahead in this respect, but the fact that tests have not been completed indicates that the Pentagon does not yet have full confidence in the American MIRV.

Obviously, it is in our interest that an arms control agreement be reached before the Soviets demonstrate a genuine MIRV capability of their own.

However, the point being made by Sens. Edward Brooke (R-Mass.), Clifford Case (R-N.J.) and others is that the Russians are unlikely to agree to a missile freeze if we have a demonstrated MIRV capability when the talks begin and they do not.

That being the case, it makes sense to hold off on the tests—and on plans for MIRV-equipped Poseidon and Minuteman III missiles.

ALL RIGHT, YOUTH, MAKE
SOMETHING OF IT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the best written article I

have seen concerning student unrest and proper direction of their interests and actions. It appeals to the youth of our country, as well as to those of us who came up during the depression years. To me, it is most carefully thought out and revealing. The article follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal & Times Magazine, June 15, 1969]

ALL RIGHT, YOUTH, MAKE SOMETHING OF IT
(By John Ed Pearce)

I have heard and read a great deal lately from you young people, about your disillusionment with your world, your society, my generation. You complain that you have been dumped into a society of war, poverty, injustice and prejudice. We have been so materialistic, you say, so intent on "making it" that we have forgotten the real values of life—love, fairness, peace and brotherhood. As a result of our greed and timid conformity we have missed life, and in the process have left you a mess that can only be righted by destroying it and building better on the rubble.

I don't see it quite that way. Let me, as Dick Nixon says, make this clear: I offer no apologies for my generation. I am proud of it, and of what we have built on the foundation left us. I hope you will do as well. You will if you will leaven your zeal with a little humor, your egotism with a little history, and ask why your insistence on universal love seems so often to express itself in hate for those who differ with you.

The generations from which you inherit, including mine, have given you a basically sound world; imperfect, full of flaws springing from human imperfections, but strong, dynamic and exciting. For us, in many ways, these are indeed the best and worst of times. But the worst is on the surface; the best is underneath, solid and enduring.

It is strange that yours should be the most favored generation in history and yet the most self-pitying, but a sense of self-tragedy is common to the young. When I was your age, I recall, we felt rather sorry for ourselves, victimized by depression, forced to fight when we didn't want to.

But if you think we value too highly the security of material possessions, let me remind you of this: We were born in the aftermath of one great conflict, grew up in history's greatest depression, and graduated in time to fight man's grisliest war. Getting out, we had one thing uppermost in mind—we wanted better, for ourselves and for you. We got it.

You speak of poverty. But we have known it, and not just from visits to Mississippi or Harlem. We remember when the fear of hunger hung heavy in every home. We remember the eyes of the homeless, the defeated faces in the breadlines, the soup kitchens, the Okies, the shuffling beggars in the streets, the endless parade of tramps at the back door begging for work or food; men with embarrassed eyes, men once able and self-sufficient whose hunger had eaten away their pride. We remember the winter deaths in the slums and sharecroppers' shacks and mountain hollows, deaths from cold and hunger that left infant bodies too weak to stave off disease.

You are angered—and you should be—that four per cent of our people are unemployed, and a few are chronically hungry. You are incensed—and you should be—because some Negroes in the South have worms, lack medicine, live in wretched hovels and suffer malnutrition. But we remember when intestinal worms were commonplace among the people. We remember when 20 per cent of our men were jobless. And when Franklin Roosevelt cried that one third of our nation was ill-housed, ill-fed and ill-clothed, we knew he did not exaggerate. The failings of the past do not justify those of today, of course. But

a realistic comparison reveals a continuing progress that is not a symptom of a sick society.

We have been materialistic because we have seen too many people suffer too much from material want, because we remember too many starving children, because we have walked too many miles through too many cold mornings to work long hours at low pay and return home at night to parents with fear and worry in their eyes. We determined it would not happen to you, that you would have vitamins and orange juice and milk, warm clothes, a comfortable home and good schools and a running start at life.

Because of it, you are the biggest, tallest, healthiest, brightest, handsomest generation to inhabit this land, and perhaps the world. You are going to live longer, suffer sickness less often, work fewer hours, learn more, see more of the world's grandeur and have more choice of your life's undertaking than any generation before. Because we were materialistic you will have more leisure, more chance to achieve, more chance to spend the days of your years in meaningful, challenging pursuits.

You cry out against the injustices suffered by Negroes—and you should. But we remember when a Negro lynching made news only when it was public. We remember the "nigger school" down there in the poor section of town where a few black kids, ridiculed and suspect for their ambition, could get six years of slipshod schooling. We remember when "nigras" came only to the back door, stepped off the sidewalk when white ladies passed, worked for 50 cents a day, kept to their ghettos except to work in the white community.

We are now told that we should share the guilt of forebears responsible for their enslavement, and make reparations for their mistreatment. The argument is insupportable. We are no more responsible for their enslavement than for the mistreatment of Koreans by Japan. On a more realistic basis, look at what our generation has achieved in the first for equal justice: Negroes vote, hold offices from city halls to Congress, wear lab smocks and police uniforms. They share schools and colleges, parks, playgrounds, swimming pools and all other public accommodations. They are business, political and professional leaders, dominate sports and are prominent in the entertainment world. Inter-marriage is not yet common, but laws forbidding it are being struck down. Social and economic barriers are crumbling.

If your generation can make as much progress toward racial equality in the next 20 years as we have made in the past 20 you should be able to solve what we call the racial problem. But it is not a problem to be taken lightly, for it is rooted deep within both black and white and will not yield either to emotional demands or violence, neither of which touches the heart wherein the answer lies. May I also suggest that the cause of equal participation is not served by separatism on campus, segregated dormitories, or "black studies" that equip a man only to teach "black studies."

You speak with commendable concern of economic injustice. But we remember when children worked in sweatshops, when miners attempting to organize were shot down like dogs, when striking steel worker were mowed down by police. We remember the county poorhouse, the chain gang, the hell of the insane asylum. Consider how far we have come, as well as how far we have to go.

You speak of class distinction, of ethnic and religious prejudice. Like all people, we do tend to divide ourselves into classes—economic, intellectual, cultural. But the evolving picture, I believe, is more encouraging than divisive, especially in the economic sense. Pre-depression, the country was divided into a small upper class (about 10 per cent), a modest middle class (30 per cent) and a huge lower or "working" class. We still

have a relatively small upper class, but the remarkable thing about our society is the upward thrust of the lower class into what can only be termed middle class in terms of income, ownership, education, taste, leisure, etc., and the shrinking of the lower class. The middle class sprawls across the socio-economic spectrum, even as it sprawls across the fringe areas of our cities. It is a mass of home-owners instead of renters, drivers instead of walkers, of vacationers, boat-owners, stockholders who send their children to college. It is a vast stabilizing force, and it, rather than the "money elite" is the real force with which you will have to contend if you are determined to overthrow the existing order. And you will find it a tough nut to crack.

You say we are greedy, possession-mad. Let me say this for my generation: Never has a people given more generously of its blood, effort or material. We fought (not always willingly, but we fought) a far bloodier war than Vietnam to save the world from an unspeakable tyranny, and we then gave our wealth in rich measure to heal the wounds not only of friend but of foe. Show me a parallel.

Never has this nation taxed itself so heavily to give its disadvantaged—its poor, sick, aged, helpless—a second chance at a decent life. Welfare has become a way of life, perhaps too much so. So have pensions, hospitalization, unemployed pay, Social Security. The widowed are no longer herded to the county poor farm, the aged do not have to spin out their years a burden in the back room of their children's homes. We have quit hiding our "crazy" people, and have made a start in treating that most delicate of mechanisms, the brain.

We have given you a healthier world than we found. You no longer need fear epidemics of flu, typhus, diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever. We have banished the nightmare of polio. We are closing TB wards daily. Rickets and worms are rare. Childbirth is no longer feared. Improving safety laws protect the health of mine and factory workers. We are beginning to make startling progress in transplants, and are beating at the ignorance that surrounds cancer. We have pushed the boundaries of knowledge into the gene and out into space.

We have thrown open the doors of museums and concert halls where once only the rich entered. We have given you antibiotics, television, air conditioning and transistors. We have made a start (late, but a start) toward healing the scars left on our earth in our plunge across the continent. We are writing new meaning into conservation, trying to stop the erosion of our soil, the pollution of air and water, setting aside land for public enjoyment, learning to work with the forces of nature to preserve threatened life forms.

We have given you the knowledge and the means to enjoy sex, as you should, and yet combat the population surge that threatens to engulf and destroy civilization. Our divorce rate shows that we have not lived up to our moral code nor coped adequately with the subject of our sexuality. Taboos of centuries cling to us. But it was we who initiated the drive toward sexual honesty and frankness. You can discuss sex, with us or among yourselves, and perhaps you will find the way to a saner relationship between man and woman.

It is in the field of social relationships that we, like all before us, have fallen shortest of the goal. We have developed weapons that can end all life (do not lament this; nuclear power can be made to serve man as well as destroy him, and the questing mind cannot be asked to draw back from knowledge because it may prove dangerous). But even with the threat of annihilation hanging over us we have not found an alternative to war. Perhaps you can perfect the social mechanism

so that all men may, without the threat of force, pursue their course, in which we will no longer need laws or police to enforce them, or armies to prevent men of one belief from trespassing against others, though the violence with which you protest violence justifies little hope that you will. You must learn to hate injustice without hating the unjust, to hate war without hating those who resort to it.

Which brings us to the most sensitive of your protests. The root of your discontent, of our nation's discontent, the toothache that distorts all other sensations in the body politic is, of course, the war in Vietnam. I oppose this war as you do, and have from the beginning. But we must keep it and our reactions to it in logical perspective.

Recently the editor of *The Bennington* (Vermont) *Banner*, explaining the revolt of the young against their parents' generation, wrote of the war: "It is not just another war. It has been a military and political and moral blunder of a magnitude without parallel in American history . . . they (the young) rebel at the sins of their parents. And when the sins have been particularly monstrous, the youthful reaction is likely to be that much more shattering."

Ignoring the intellectual arrogance (not uncommon to editors) that essays this questionable interpretation of American history, I find this an intriguing and significant statement, no less interesting for the venom and intolerance that saturates it. On the way to Florida recently, I became confused by highway markers and took a wrong turn that cost us time and trouble. By the Bennington standards, I had committed a sin.

The decision to intervene in Vietnam was, I am convinced, a wrong turn, a mistake resulting partly from ignorance, as do most mistakes. But it was a mistake shared by most of our chosen leaders, including many of those most admired by the young. It was, as the Bennington editor says, a blunder. But it was made without the knowledge or intent of evil that marks sin, and we must wonder at the basic goodness of those who would impute sin to those who stumble.

I think that any factual assessment of Vietnam will show how decently we stumbled into this trap of history. It seems certain to go down in history as a bloody mistake (though history's verdict is by no means in yet), but I am convinced that we made it with the best of motives and that we remain in Vietnam not for pride nor profit, as so many young profess to believe, but because we have yet to find a way to quit without endangering both the people and principles we went to defend. And to infer sin in our decision indicates a misunderstanding of both government and man.

There is another interesting aspect to the war which I hope you will consider. In my opinion, our intervention in Vietnam is at least as defensible as our intervention in the Dominican Republic. We went to Vietnam—or so we thought—to give people the right to choose their government without external, or externally-supported pressure. In the Dominican Republic we intervened to uphold those who had overthrown the only elected government the country had ever had. But there was little campus outcry against this venture, and I can only wonder if it is because it was fought at little cost to the young. I do not blame you for not wanting to fight a war you oppose morally. But moral resentment should not wax and wane with the degree of personal sacrifice involved.

You protest that the government lies, conceals and compromises. But ideals alone are often an inadequate vessel for the rough trip through the rapids of international politics. And since neither Washington, Moscow nor Peking is run by holy men, survival sometimes requires compromise with full candor. Neither is Washington run, let me add, by men of omniscience or omnipotence. It is run

by human beings, as are the newspapers and great corporations you regard so bitterly.

Sometimes they don't know; sometimes they make mistakes, even, alas, as you and I.

You say that you have been dumped into a world you never made. Frankly, I cannot recall a generation having been given the privilege of choosing the shape of the world into which it was born. It has been said that yours is the first generation to grow up unsure that it will have a world to live in tomorrow. It has its tension, of course, as have all eras; we feel them as keenly as you. But in an individual sense (which may be the only relevant one) this has been true of all men since the spear. Whether because of the plague, the Hun or the hydrogen bomb, man has always lived with some lurking fear, and with no assurance that he will have a tomorrow. But before you become paranoid in your fear of nuclear doomsday, remember that we share this fear, and the danger behind it, and your determination that this force must be tamed. You are not alone in opposing the arms race, the ABM, the overbalance on defense spending. You will have help in your fight to control this violence. But remember that man has had these weapons for a generation now, and his fear of them has, in part, kept the great powers from falling on each other.

You insist we have given you a rotten system. It is not rotten and we have not given it to you. No generation gives power to the next. You will grow into it, regardless of us. You will control its production and wealth as rapidly as your talents enable you to fight your way to control. You will become its political leaders and set its policies as rapidly as you can convince people that your judgment is sound and your policies preferable. I would be disappointed if you were not impatient with the slow working of representative democracy. It may, indeed, be as bad as you say; Winston Churchill correctly declared that it is an impossible system of government, but the best that man has yet devised.

We worry about you because you seem more intent on destroying the system than in correcting it. Your willingness to resort to violence to force the will of your minority on the majority smacks more of the storm trooper than of the reformer. Your intolerance makes me wonder who your reforms are designed to benefit, just as your tactics make me doubtful that you will succeed. The minority that seeks to enforce its will invites the retaliation of the greater violence of the majority.

Believe me, I am glad to see your anger at discovering want and injustice. It speaks of something good in you. It will spur you, I hope, to make changes.

At the same time, I suggest that much of your shock comes from a delayed collision with reality. You recoil at want because you have never lived in its midst. You resent injustice, violence, and suffering because you have grown up in a comfortable world. You remind me somewhat of the child who discovers that his parents have lied to him about Santa Claus and is furious at them, ignoring the reality of daddy behind the myth.

You say the school-book view of America is false, that democracy, equality, brotherhood, liberty and justice for all are myths. You are wrong. They are the ideals, the goals, the vision put before us by the men who started all this. Is our democracy less than a reality because some (your militants, for example) abuse its privileges? Are the ideals of liberty and justice for all less inspiring, less worthy, less believable because we, being human and fallible, fall short of them?

You reject our middle-class values, but then define them yourself as being materialism, greed, conformity and an obsession with security, which is like our implying that your attitude toward Vietnam is based on cowardice. It is not easy to pinpoint our values, but among them are freedom from

fear, want and oppression, the right to rear one's children in love and conscience, to choose one's leaders and change one's government as times dictate, to be free to reach as far as our talents will permit, and to live in our homes in dignity, peace and security.

I think it is important for you to be aware of our attitudes and our experience for several reasons. It is good to know where you have been so that you can better decide where you want to go. And it is well for a man to think well of his forebears, those who went before and gave him life. For, as the saying goes, the apple does not fall far from the tree, and the traits you have inherited are those on which you must depend as you begin your work.

As a generation, you have good qualities, I think, from which to draw strength in time of stress.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I sent questionnaires to each of the more than 140,000 homes in my congressional district, seeking my constituents' viewpoints on some of the major problems and issues facing our Nation.

I have conducted such an opinion poll each year since my election to Congress in 1964, and the results have been exceedingly valuable in helping me determine grassroots sentiment in my district. This year, more than 16,000 persons participated, the largest return I have ever received. The returns were tabulated by volunteer workers in my district office, and I have reported the results in a newsletter.

Among the highlights were the following:

My constituents overwhelmingly favor tax reform, by 95 percent; increasing the individual tax exemption, by 91 percent; popular election of the President and Vice President, by 85 percent; expansion of Federal aid to education, by 72 percent; and congressional approval of overseas troop commitments, by 71 percent.

They strongly oppose deployment of the anti-ballistic-missile system, by 75 percent; continuation of farm subsidy and price support payments, by 67 percent; and lowering the voting age to 18, by 63 percent.

For the benefit of my colleagues who might be interested, I am inserting in the Record, at this point, the complete results of the survey:

ELECTION REFORM

Electoral college

Would you favor a Constitutional Amendment to substitute popular election of the President and Vice-President for the present Electoral College system?

Yes (85 percent)..... 13,877
No (15 percent)..... 2,251

Total replies..... 16,128

Voting age

Would you favor lowering the minimum voting age to 18 years?

Yes (37 percent)..... 5,931
No (63 percent)..... 10,266

Total replies..... 16,197

NATIONAL SECURITY

The draft

Proposals to revise our Selective Service System come before the Congress each year. Which of the following proposals would you favor?

The present system, which permits deferment of students (31 percent)..... 4,813
A random-chance lottery system, with no student deferments (41 percent)..... 6,482
A professional, all volunteer Army, with an annual estimated increase in payroll of \$6 to \$17 billion (28 percent)..... 4,484

Total replies..... 15,779

Space

The early Apollo series of space missions has been spectacularly successful. Would you:

Continue to fund the space program at its present level of \$3.8 billion (52 percent)..... 8,259
Reduce allocations for space exploration (26 percent)..... 4,145
Increase allocations for space exploration (14 percent)..... 2,156
Abandon the space program (8 percent)..... 1,462

Total replies..... 16,022

Anti-ballistic-missile system

Would you favor:

Construction of an antiballistic-missile system to defend our cities from missile attack, at a cost of approximately \$50 billion (25 percent).... 3,781
Negotiation of an international agreement with adequate inspection safeguards, to limit expenditures for anti-ballistic missile defense (75 percent)..... 11,288

Total replies..... 15,069

TAXES AND ECONOMIC POLICY

Surcharge

Do you favor President Nixon's suggestion to continue the 10 percent surcharge?

Yes (31 percent)..... 4,686
No (69 percent)..... 10,586

Total replies..... 15,272

Tax reform

Do you favor a comprehensive tax-reform program to close such loopholes as the oil-depletion allowance?

Yes (95 percent)..... 14,089
No (5 percent)..... 798

Total replies..... 14,887

Personal exemption

Do you favor increasing the individual income-tax exemption from the present \$600 to \$1200?

Yes (91 percent)..... 14,545
No (9 percent)..... 1,384

Total replies..... 15,929

FOREIGN POLICY

Troop commitments

Would you favor a Congressional Resolution requiring the President to obtain approval of Congress before U.S. troops are committed to fight in foreign countries?

Yes (71 percent)..... 10,882
No (29 percent)..... 4,428

Total replies..... 15,310

Foreign aid

This country's foreign aid program was reduced this year to \$1.7 billion, the lowest level in the history of the program. Would you prefer to:

1. Further reduce the foreign aid program (45 percent)..... 7,212

2. Continue it at about the same level (20 percent)-----	3,130
3. Increase the level of the aid program (3 percent)-----	483
4. Restrict foreign aid to non-military aid only (32 percent)-----	5,127
Total replies-----	15,952

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

School aid

Do you favor expansion of Federal aid to education to include direct grants for construction of schools in rapidly growing districts or in districts with obsolete and overcrowded schools?

Yes (72 percent)-----	11,170
No (28 percent)-----	4,376
Total replies-----	15,546

Farm subsidies

Do you favor continuation of farm subsidy payments and price-support programs?

Yes (33 percent)-----	4,748
No (67 percent)-----	9,612
Total replies-----	14,360

Postal service

Do you favor:

Retaining the present postal service, taking funds from general tax revenues to meet costs that exceed postal revenue (16 percent)-----	2,439
Reorganizing the Post Office Department to provide improved service, but still requiring some support from general tax revenues (23 percent)-----	3,436
Creation of a government-owned postal service corporation to provide improved service, on a self-supporting basis (54 percent)-----	8,205
Making the postal service a wholly tax-supported, non-revenue service such as public highways (7 percent)-----	1,000
Total replies-----	15,080

MAJOR PROBLEMS

What, in your opinion, are the three most important problems facing our nation in the years immediately ahead?

The war in Vietnam-----	6,042
Crime-----	5,141
Tax reform-----	4,142
Inflation-----	4,002
Civil rights-----	3,650
Education and mental health-----	2,706
Youth unrest-----	2,135
Poverty-----	2,099
Conservation-----	1,673
Foreign relations-----	1,447
Communist threat-----	718
Too much welfare-----	390
Disrespect for government-----	363
Overpopulation-----	351

CHEMICAL-BIOLOGICAL WARFARE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, Representative RICHARD D. McCARTHY and I are concerned about the continuing lack of information concerning the effects of chemical and biological warfare agents. We would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues three newspaper articles from the New York Times and a preliminary report on the ecological effects of the defoliation and antifood

campaigns in Vietnam. The conclusion one draws from these documents is that more scientific study is definitively needed to assess the environmental impact of our defoliation and crop-destruction activities in Vietnam. Exactly such a study has been called for in House Joint Resolution 691, which Representative McCARTHY and I introduced on April 30, 1969.

In addition, we are introducing two documents germane to the problems of testing and shipping toxic chemical warfare agents such as nerve gases. The first is an excellent account by Philip Boffey of the incident last year in Utah resulting in the deaths of approximately 6,000 sheep. The second is a statement prepared by the Committee for Environmental Information in St. Louis for the recent hearings held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. This statement describes ways that the toxic agents that the military proposed to ship over half way across the country could be safely detoxified without shipment. It illustrates the constructive contributions that can be made to such problems by groups of scientists such as the Committee for Environmental Information, the Scientists' Committee for Public Information, and other groups around the country that are part of the increasing role of scientists in the critical public problems facing our society.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1968]
USE OF HERBICIDES BY THE UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM DEFENDED

(By Walter Sullivan)

During the current fiscal year and the one preceding it the United States used herbicides in Vietnam on such a scale that the total cost will reach almost \$100-million.

This is in contrast to an expenditure of \$12.5-million in the fiscal year 1966. These figures were made public here yesterday by a military specialist who argued—that the killing of foliage that could conceal Vietcong ambushes leads to no long-term effects.

The speaker was Dr. Charles E. Minarik, director of the Plant Science Laboratory at Fort Detrick, Md., an adviser to the Pentagon on defoliation practices.

He addressed the Northeast Weed Control Conference at the Commodore Hotel and elaborated afterwards in an interview.

His arguments contrasted with charges made last week by Dr. Barry Commoner, director of the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University in St. Louis.

Dr. Commoner spoke at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

He said the association had tried in vain to obtain from the Department of Defense scientific data supporting the Pentagon's contention that the defoliation program would not have long-term ill effects on Vietnam and its population. At a news conference he said one of the herbicides, maleic hydrazide, had produced cancer in mice.

Another cacodylic acid, used to kill elephant grass around American bases, contains arsenic, Dr. Commoner said. An area one-third the size of Montana has been sprayed, he asserted. In his prepared text he added:

"We have engaged in a massive environmental intrusion without being aware of the biological consequences."

Dr. Minarik said maleic hydrazide had not been used in Vietnam and that cacodylic acid, like most other herbicides in use there, was soon broken down by bacteria in the soil.

When eaten by cattle with their fodder, he

added, the substance is excreted in their urine and, unlike DDT, does not appear in their milk.

He said there was no known case of death or serious injury to anyone from herbicides in use in Vietnam, even in factories where large amounts of the material was processed. However, he added, that the Vietcong probably "believe their own propaganda."

They have said bleeding from the nose and ears had resulted from poisoning by herbicides, he said. The spraying of areas of potential ambush thus scares them away, as well as denying them cover, he said.

He argued that defoliation in Vietnam was essentially no more a threat to the balance of nature than the spray-killing of vegetation along power lines, railways and highways in the United States.

In Vietnam the goal is to kill vegetation within "a couple of hundred feet" of highways and waterways where ambushes are likely, Dr. Minarik said.

As along American power lines and other rights of way, the animal life retreats from the defoliated zone into the nearby forest with little effect on the region as a whole.

The Midwest Research Institute in St. Louis has completed for the Pentagon a study of the effects of large-scale use of herbicides on the life of a region like Vietnam, Dr. Minarik said.

The results have not yet been made public, he added.

One of the herbicides, Tordon 101, contains a component, picloram, which does not break down quickly in the soil, Dr. Minarik said. However, it is employed sparingly, he added. In this country it is used to kill conifers.

One problem is to find herbicides that act quickly, even on trees 100 to 150 feet tall. Those now in use usually take from four to six weeks for maximum effect. Regrowth begins after six to twelve months. Peasants are planting crops in areas that have been cleared of forest by defoliants, Dr. Minarik said.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1968]
DEFOLIATION STUDY CASTS DOUBT ON LONG-TERM DAMAGE IN VIETNAM

(By Walter Sullivan)

There are no clear indications that widespread aerial spraying to strip Vietnamese war zones of foliage will do long-term damage. However too little is known to assess the effects with confidence.

That, in essence, in the finding of a study in the field, undertaken for the Department of Defense by the Midwest Research Institute. It was carried out after a number of scientists had expressed concern at the possible long-term effects of such spraying on the balance of nature in that part of the world.

The study found no substantial evidence that the spraying of Vietnamese jungle would adversely affect the human population or have long-lasting effects on the wildlife or fertility of the land.

In an apparent attempt to head off possible charges of bias, the Pentagon asked the National Academy of Sciences to review the study.

The academy, while gingerly not taking sides on the controversy, found that the Midwest Research Institute, in Kansas City, had done a "creditable job" in reviewing literature on the subject.

However the academy review pointed out that there was a dearth of factual information on the ecological effects "of repeated or heavy herbicide applications." The ecology of an area refers to the interdependence of its life forms and their material environment.

REPORT HELD 'FIRST STEP'

On Jan. 31, Dr. Frederick Seitz, president of the academy, in forwarding its assessment of the report to Dr. John S. Foster Jr., direc-

tor of defense research and engineering, wrote:

"It is clear that the compilation of this report is only a first step in investigating further the ecological effects of intensive use of herbicides."

Never before, at any time or place, has there been such intensive spraying of defoliants, according to the report. A particularly intensive effort has been directed against vegetation in the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam. Some of the region's densest vegetation is to be found in this area.

Along canals where ambushes have been common, vegetation has been sprayed from one-eighth to one-half a mile on either side of the waterway.

The heavy rain forest around guerrilla strongholds, and vegetation near air bases, highways and rail lines has also been sprayed to deny concealments to the Vietcong.

The entire American production of one leaf killer, 2,4,5-T, is being diverted to Vietnam, cutting off American farmers from their supply. In 1968 a total of 7.5 million pounds of this chemical was used by farmers in this country.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Among the questions that cannot be answered on the basis of present knowledge according to the report, are the effects of defoliation on various species of animal on the brink of extinction. Likewise uncertain is the extent to which killing off the vegetation threatens to turn the soil into a substance with the consistency of adobe brick—a process known as laterization.

One of the endangered species of the region is the Douc Langur, which, the report says, has been described as "perhaps the most colorful of all mammals."

It is a monkey that lives almost entirely on leaves and hence is highly vulnerable to defoliation. Also in this category is the crested or Indochinese gibbon, an arboreal animal almost never seen on the ground.

Perhaps the most important of all is the Kouprey, an ancestor of modern cattle that has come down almost unchanged from the Miocene Era, some 20 million years ago.

The Kouprey, says the report, "was not even discovered until 1936." Only about 800 animals are known to survive in central Cambodia.

Vietcong supply routes pass through both Laos and Cambodia. According to the report, those in Laos have been "liberally sprayed" to expose the trails to air attack.

However, the report notes that some animal species have been aided, rather than harmed, by defoliation. The process, like logging, is followed by a surge of the undergrowth on which certain animals browse.

It will be particularly harmful to animals like the langurs and gibbons if large blocks of jungle are defoliated. However, unlike the situation with insecticides, such as DDT, the chemicals used against Vietnamese foliage do not persist in the food chain or concentrate in animal tissue, according to the report.

"The possibility of lethal toxicity to humans, domestic animals or wildlife by use of the noncrop plant herbicides discussed in this report is highly unlikely and should not be a matter of deep concern," says report. The term "noncrop plant" was used because the study does not deal to any extent with the use of chemicals to destroy enemy food crops.

While tests have been made on gross toxicity, the report says inadequate information is available on the effects of persistent exposure to lesser amounts.

It recommends research to see if changes in heredity or offspring result from such exposure, before a single herbicide is used in any areas over a long period.

In particular it cites cacodylic acid in this respect. That herbicide contains arsenic and,

while its manufacturer reports no ill effects on those making it, it has been singled out by critics of the defoliation program as being possibly dangerous.

Laterization, or conversion of the soil to a brick-like hardness, is typical of tropical regions of heavy rainfall. The rain leaches silica and other minerals from the soil, leaving it rich in iron oxides, and alumina. As long as such soil is covered with vegetation and humus, no harm is done. However when exposed to the sun it bakes into a sort of adobe brick.

A number of regions have become virtual deserts when the land was cleared for agriculture and then eroded. The soils of Vietnam are believed to be largely of the laterizing type. Even in the Mekong Delta this is true to some extent.

"We do not feel that we have sufficient information on the soil conditions of all of Vietnam to dry any valid conclusions covering the hazard of creating laterization of soil by the indirect action of herbicides," the report says.

Another area of uncertainty, according to the report, concerns the effects of herbicide spraying on the life of lakes and streams. The subject has not been extensively studied, in particular under the conditions characteristic of Vietnam.

The evaluation of the report by the Academy of Sciences contained a series of anonymous comments by members of the evaluation team.

One argued that the effect on water quality was unlikely to be harmful. Others questioned the emphasis on laterization, which they also considered improbable as a by-product of defoliation.

It was noted that the report had been prepared solely on the basis of interviews with some 140 individuals and a study of 1,500 items of scientific literature, rather than one-the-spot experience.

Chief authors of the report were William B. House, director of biological sciences at the Midwest Research Institute, Louis H. Goodson, Howard M. Gadberry and Kenneth W. Dokter, all attached to the institute.

The term that reviewed the report for the academy and, to some extent, gave advice in its preparation consisted of Dr. Alden S. Crafts, botanist of the University of California at Davis, chairman, Dr. Keith C. Barrows, director of plant research at the Dow Chemical Company; Dr. Richard Behrens of the University of Minnesota, Dr. William S. Benninghoff of the University of Michigan, Dr. William R. Furtick of Oregon State University and Dr. Warren C. Shaw of the Department of Agriculture.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 21, 1968]

STUDY FINDS VIETNAM ECOLOGY HURT

(By Douglas Robinson)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, September 24.—An American authority on tropical plant life has written a report saying that while there has been ecologic change in South Vietnam because of chemical defoliation, he does not believe it will cause permanent damage.

"That defoliation has caused an ecologic change is undeniable," he said. "I do not feel the change is irreversible, but recovery may take a long time."

The report, which is entitled "An Assessment of Ecological Consequences of the Defoliation Program in Vietnam," was prepared by Dr. Fred H. Tschirley of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Defoliants have been used in Vietnam to destroy the forest and jungle cover used by the enemy and to expose supply trails to air observation. The chemicals have also been employed to cut down the rice crop destined to supply enemy troops. Jungle areas near allied bases and highways have also been sprayed with defoliants to reduce enemy cover.

FULL REVIEW OF PROGRAM

Dr. Tschirley was among members of a committee set up earlier this year to review the herbicide program comprehensively. His report, released today, is only a small part of the over-all study, most of which is still classified.

Dr. Tschirley gathered his information during a month's stay last spring. Because of security reasons, many of his observations of defoliated areas were from helicopters flying as high as 2,000 feet.

A United States mission spokesman said, "There is a sufficient ground sampling to give full meaning to his report." The report, however, was studied with qualifying phrases such as "This report can in no sense be considered a complete, authoritative assessment of the ecologic effects resulting from defoliation of the forest canopy."

It continued: "The conclusions reached are judgments based on prior experience and the necessarily few observations that were possible in an area of war activity with the time frame demanded."

SOME MULTIPLE SPRAYINGS

The survey showed that 16.2 per cent of the total forested area of South Vietnam had been treated with chemicals through 1967, or about 5 per cent of the entire land mass. The figure included areas that have been treated two and three times.

In his study, Dr. Tschirley has concluded that defoliation, or even denudation, "has no measurable effect on atmospheric moisture and thus would have no effect on precipitation"; that the "possibility of flooding or of changes in the water table as a result of defoliation are subjects that need careful consideration," and that "the relative susceptibility of specific species in the . . . forests of Vietnam is not known."

The report identifies the three types of herbicides used in Vietnam by the color codes used on barrels of chemicals to identify them as well as by their constituents. They are:

Orange, the principal defoliant used in Vietnam, is composed of the butyl esters of 2,4-D (dichlorophenoxyacetic acid) and 2,4,5-T (trichlorophenoxyacetic acid).

White, a mixture of 2,4-D and picloram (aminotrichloropicolinic acid), which is known commercially as Tordon 101.

Blue, which has cacodylic acid as its more active ingredient, and is known by its brand name of Phytar 560G. Cacodylic acid is dimethylarsinic acid in a pentavalent state rather than the more toxic trivalent state.

Both orange and white are defoliants used against broadleaved and woody plants and trees. Blue is used on grasses and some crops, including rice.

In discussing whether the orange or white defoliant would destroy micro-organisms in the soil, a condition that would have a severe effect on the soil ecology, Dr. Tschirley concluded that neither chemical would have a detrimental effect on "microbial populations in soil." There is no discussion of what effect the blue defoliant might have.

NERVE GAS: DUGWAY ACCIDENT LINKED TO UTAH SHEEP KILL

Nine months ago some 6000 sheep grazing in Skull Valley, Utah, were killed or sickened by a mysterious ailment that attacked the central nervous system. The sheep were located near the Dugway Proving Ground, the Army's chief site for field testing chemical and biological weapons, so suspicions were immediately aroused that the sheep had been felled by a lethal substance originating at Dugway. These suspicions were heightened when it was subsequently revealed that Dugway had tested highly toxic nerve agents the day before the sheep became ill.

The massive sheep kill attracted to Utah a swarm of investigators from the military, from state and federal agencies, and from various universities. There were loud pledges from all concerned that there would be a no-holds-barred investigation into the question of what killed the sheep. For a time, while public interest in the incident remained high, status reports on the investigation were issued by the Army and by some of the civilian agencies involved. The Army generally took the line that, while Dugway was highly suspect, there was no conclusive proof as to what killed the sheep and further tests were necessary to establish the cause. At this writing, more than 9 months after the incident, there has still been no detailed report of what the investigation revealed. Brigadier General William W. Stone, Jr., of the Army Materiel Command, who headed the Army's investigation, has compiled a secret report on the incident, but the Army has not released an unclassified summary of this report and shows no inclination to do so. Nevertheless, it is possible, from the scattered statements the Army has made and from a variety of other sources, to piece together the outlines of what happened.

Virtually all the scientific and circumstantial evidence publicly available indicates that the primary cause of the sheep deaths was VX, a persistent nerve agent that was used in an aircraft spray test at Dugway the day before the sheep started dying. The scientific evidence will be discussed in more detail below, but, in brief, scientists have found traces of the nerve agent in the dead sheep and in nearby vegetation and snow water; they have established that the sheep were poisoned by an organic phosphate compound, of which the nerve agent is one; and they have shown that low doses of the nerve agent fed to healthy sheep will produce the same symptoms as those found in the sick Skull Valley sheep. There is evidence that the sheep ingested the nerve agent primarily by eating contaminated vegetation, and that the toxic material persisted in the area for at least 3 weeks after the incident. As a result of the unfortunate incident, a high-level advisory committee, headed by Surgeon General William H. Stewart, has recommended stringent new safety procedures for Dugway, and the Army last week adopted them *in toto*.

ACCIDENT AT DUGWAY

How the agent escaped from Dugway may never be known beyond doubt, but investigators suggest that a combination of circumstances conspired to bring about the sheep slaughter. There was an accident during the spray test at Dugway; shortly thereafter a change in weather conditions apparently carried the agent toward the sheep and then precipitated it around them; and sheep turned out to be unusually susceptible to the agent. Had any of these factors been absent, it is conceivable—though unprovable—that there would have been no "Dugway incident."

The Army's initial reaction to news of the sheep deaths was to deny that Dugway had been doing any testing that could have caused the incident, but this posture had to be abandoned when the office of Sen. Frank E. Moss (D-Utah), revealed on 21 March that Dugway had conducted three separate nerve agent operations on 13 March, the day before shepherds first noticed the sheep were ill. The Army had supplied the information to Moss and apparently intended it to be "for official use only," but Dale O. Zabriskie press assistant to Moss, says there was no restrictive marking on the document so he promptly released the information to Utah newsmen, much to the Army's consternation.

Surgeon General Stewart states that two of the nerve agent operations—a demonstration firing of 155-mm shells containing nerve gases, and a disposal operation involving the

burning of about 160 gallons of a persistent nerve agent—have been ruled out as possible sources of substance that kill the sheep. The third operation, in which a high-speed aircraft dispensed 320 gallons of VX in the form of liquid droplets from two pressurized spray tanks, remains highly suspect.

The purpose of the aircraft spray test, according to statements made by Army officers at an informal briefing for the Utah congressional delegation last March, was not to test the nerve agent, which had been released hundreds of times at Dugway before, but rather to test the total disseminating system, consisting of the nerve agent, the spray tanks, and the high-speed aircraft. "You test the entire configuration before you put it on the shelf," General Stone explained at the briefing.

The Army has consistently refused to say whether anything went wrong during the test, and Colonel James H. Watts, Dugway's commanding officer at the time of the incident, has even been quoted as denying rumors of a malfunction. But three sources who participated in the investigation—namely D. A. Osguthorpe, a veterinarian who acted as consultant to the Utah Department of Agriculture, G. D. Carlyle Thompson, director of the Utah State Division of Health, and Surgeon General Stewart—all confirmed to *Science* that there was, indeed, a malfunction. The malfunction resulted in the agent being released at a much higher altitude than anticipated.

The Army has publicly announced that the aircraft approached the target grid on a heading of 315 degrees true at an altitude of 150 feet (see map at right). Full details of what subsequently went wrong are not available but the following version has been pieced together from several sources.

Plans for the test called for the plane to dispense the nerve agent over the target grid, then pull up and jettison its supposedly empty tanks. But the pilot, unfortunately, has no way to shut off the tanks—they continue to discharge until they are empty. In the test on 13 March, according to investigators, one of the tanks failed to empty itself over the target grid and continued to dispense the nerve agent after the plane pulled up.

To what altitude the discharge continued is not completely clear. Colonel Watts, the former Dugway commander, has been quoted as saying the agent was released at a maximum altitude of 450 meters, or about 1500 feet. Osguthorpe, who has had access to much of the Army's data, believes the agent was carried somewhat higher. Either way, the agent was clearly within striking range of the ridge of the low-lying Cedar Mountains, which stood between the sheep and the test site. At their high point, according to the contour map distributed by Dugway, these mountains rise about 2700 feet above the Dugway flats, while at the points lying directly between the sheep and the test site, they rise only some 1200 feet above the valley. Somewhat less than 20 pounds of the VX is believed to have remained airborne after the 13 March test, according to testimony presented to a Senate appropriations subcommittee last May by Lieutenant General Austin W. Betts, chief of research and development for the Army.

At the time of the test, according to the Army, the winds at altitudes below 2300 feet were generally from the south-southwest, with gusts up to 35 miles per hour. Had this wind direction continued, the agent would have been carried up the west side of the Cedar Mountains and over barren salt flats. But there was a "weak front" in the area, reported the Army, and about 2 hours later the wind shifted and blew from the west. Betts said the wind "could have carried any very small particles of VX remaining airborne over the areas in Skull Valley and Rush Valley where sheep were later affected"

Betts also said scattered showers developed during the early evening after the test (which took place at 5:30 p.m.) and he added that "one of these rain showers could have washed this airborne VX out of the air and deposited it on vegetation and the ground." Snow was reported the following morning.

On 14 March, the day after the test, sheep in several bands in Skull Valley just east of Dugway began showing signs of illness. One herder described the sheep as "crazy in the head." They generally acted dazed, held their heads tilted down and off to the side, walked in a stilted, uncoordinated manner, urinated frequently, fell down, and were unable to get up. Dugway scientists say these are not the usual symptoms associated with the nerve agent, but it was later discovered that these symptoms can be produced by low doses of the agent.

The affected herds were located in a crescent extending generally east and northeast from the Dugway site. The nearest sheep were about 27 miles from the site of the aircraft spray test and were separated from the test by low mountains. The farthest sheep were 40 to 45 miles from the test site and were located in Rush Valley, beyond a second, higher range of mountains, but near a low-lying pass through the mountains. The sheep nearest the test site were the most severely affected while the herd in Rush Valley was touched only slightly. The course of the illness in the sheep that died was as short as 24 hours and as long as several weeks.

Investigators were initially mystified that sheep seemed to be the only animals in the area affected. Horses and cattle intermingled among the sheep showed no symptoms of illness, though chemical tests did indicate a somewhat depressed level of cholinesterase in the blood, an indication the animals had been exposed to an organic phosphate compound, a class which includes the nerve agents. Dogs and humans seemed unaffected. And while a survey of the area turned up at least 15 dead rabbits, rodents, birds, and other small wildlife, there seems to be no evidence that these small animals were killed by the nerve agent. One jack rabbit was observed to show signs of incoordination and trembling, symptoms which might indicate exposure to a nerve agent. But the Army, which had the area surveyed both before and after the test, maintains that the rodent population remained essentially unchanged.

Why were sheep the only animals affected? The answer seems to lie partly in the fact that sheep are more susceptible to the agent than many animals, partly in the fact that sheep had greater access to contaminated food than most animals.

Dugway scientists stated at the time of the incident that not much was known about the effects of the nerve agent on sheep. But during the course of the investigation, according to Surgeon General Stewart, it was learned that sheep are "peculiarly responsive" to the nerve agent and succumb to "much lower doses" than would harm a human being, even a child. Moreover, sheep, it seems, die easily once they become sick. Robert H. Huffaker, a Public Health Service veterinarian, who participated in the investigation, believes the first sheep that died may have been killed by the nerve agent, but those that died later succumbed to such secondary causes as starvation. "Sick sheep like to die," he says. "You won't find them crawling a mile to a waterhole on a broken leg."

The Army has stated that the sheep were apparently affected by eating contaminated vegetation, and feeding experiments conducted by the Agriculture Department's Poisonous Plant Research Laboratory in Logan, Utah, lend substance to this theory. When Logan scientists fed forage from the affected areas of Skull Valley to healthy sheep, the sheep showed a marked depression of cholinesterase activity (a sign of pos-

sible nerve agent exposure) and some of them developed symptoms identical to those observed in the sick Skull Valley sheep. In contrast, sheep placed in the affected areas but muzzled and fed only hay and water brought in from outside showed no signs of toxicity, though some investigators doubt it.

There was speculation early in the investigation that the sheep may have been sickened by licking contaminated snow, and since at least one laboratory has identified traces of the nerve agent in snow water, this may remain a possible source of the poison.

The toxic substance seems to have persisted in the area for at least 3 weeks after the incident, possibly longer. Logan scientists placed three different groups of normal sheep in the affected area on 19 March, 1 April and 4 April and all groups developed illness identical to that of the sheep in the initial outbreak. By 3 months after the incident, however, the poison had apparently dissipated. Healthy sheep fed forage collected from the affected area on 12 June, and on several occasions subsequently, showed no signs of illness.

The massive sheep kill has raised questions about the potential danger to human life. Alvin Hatch, manager of the ranch that suffered the greatest losses, told *Science* his herders often obtain their water by melting snow, though at the time of the incident they were carrying a water supply. Since the nerve agent has been identified in snow water, Hatch speculates that his herders may have had a "narrow escape."

There were also reports that one of the sheepherders and two Agriculture Department scientists who autopsied the dead sheep developed headaches, nausea, dizziness, and diarrhea, but an Agriculture Department report, dated 15 July, says "there was no confirmation that these (symptoms) were directly associated with the cause of illness in the sheep." The Public Health Service and the Army tested the vast majority of humans in the affected areas and found no evidence of nerve agent effects. Whether humans escaped harm primarily because the level of nerve agent present was too low to affect them, or because they did not wander around the range munching vegetation, is not clear from the information available to *Science*.

HAS GAS ESCAPED BEFORE?

Dugway has had no offbase chemical monitoring system, so it is impossible to tell whether any significant amounts of lethal agent have escaped in the past. The advisory committee headed by the surgeon general states that the Marsh sheep kill "provided the first off-post event which was suspected of being connected to Dugway operations," but such a statement does not rule out the possibility that nerve gas agents may have escaped previously and simply failed to strike populated areas. Fay Gillette, sheriff of Tooele County, Utah, for the past 22 years, told *Science* that on several occasions some 6 or 7 years ago he received "confidential calls" from Dugway, generally in the evening, asking him to patrol U.S. Highway 40, 35 miles north of Dugway, and tell people who were stopping along the side of the road to get moving. "They never told me why and I never asked them," says Gillette. Seymour M. Hersh, author of a recent well-reviewed book on chemical and biological warfare, spent 3 weeks in Utah investigating the Dugway incident and concluded that "this is not a freak event—there have been other similar occurrences at Dugway." Hersh says he has detailed his findings in an article scheduled to appear in *Esquire* magazine.

ARMY ISN'T TALKING

The weight of circumstantial evidence—the accident at Dugway, the weather conditions, the location of the affected herds—strongly suggests Dugway was the source of the substance that killed the sheep. But even stronger evidence was turned up by scientists

who participated in the investigation. Unfortunately, complete information on the scientific findings is apparently known only to the Army, and the Army isn't letting its scientists say much. *Science* requested an interview in August with Mortimer A. Rothenberg, Dugway's chief scientist, and Rothenberg agreed, subject to approval by his superiors. Such approval was denied.

The Army told *Science* it could submit questions to Dugway in writing, so four questions were mailed in on 22 August. More than 3 months passed before the answers came back. Even then, the answers were, in some respects, incomplete and ambiguous.

Fortunately, the Army is not the only source of information on the investigation. Dozens of civilian specialists from federal and state agencies and from various universities participated in aspects of the investigation, and some were actually on the scene in Skull Valley before the Army even knew any sheep had died. After considerable prodding, *Science* was able to obtain reports from the two major federal agencies involved, the Public Health Service and the Agriculture Department. From these reports, and from the few public statements made by the Army, it seems clear that the preponderance of scientific evidence has implicated the nerve agent as responsible for the sheep deaths.

The most convincing evidence comes from chemical tests conducted by the National Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, a branch of the Public Health Service. Chemists at NCDC used gas chromatography infrared spectroscopy and mass spectrometry in an effort to find traces of nerve agent in the dead sheep or in such environmental materials as snow and grass. In a report to Utah's health director, dated 29 April, NCDC said unequivocally that chemists found traces of the nerve agent. The report's "summary of chemical results" states that:

"—Water and forage from Skull Valley as well as blood and liver from ill sheep showed an agent which proved to be identical in chemical composition to a sample of the test agent supplied by Dugway.

"—Rumen contents from ill sheep showed the same response on instruments as the authentic test agent furnished in water by Dugway, that is, hydrolysis products of test agent.

"—Infrared chromatograms of test agent, hay, and water extracts showed similar scans indicating identity of agents under study.

"—Mass spectrometry of test agent hay and water isolates *prove beyond doubt* [italics added] that these responses are in fact identical and can only be attributed to the same chemical."

CONFIRMING TESTS AT DUGWAY

Confirming chemical tests seem to have been conducted in Dugway's laboratories, though the Army is much less emphatic in asserting that it definitely detected traces of the nerve agent. General Betts, the Army's R & D chief, testified last May that Dugway's chemical analysis of large samples of vegetation from the affected area had proceeded "to the point where it was considered possible that traces of VX or a similar organic compound were very likely present." More recently, in a 25 November response to the questions posed by *Science*, the Army said that "traces of agent or agent-like material were found in samples of vegetation collected at several periods of time after the March 13th incident."

The chemical tests were conducted with great difficulty, for they required instruments capable of detecting minute traces of the nerve agent and considerable sophistication in interpreting the results. Army scientists initially analyzed several hundred samples of water, soil, snow, vegetation, and wool from Skull and Rush Valleys and found no evidence of VX. Only after "very large samples of vegetation" were analyzed did

the Army conclude that the agent might "possibly" be present. Meanwhile, the Agriculture Department initially thought it had detected "some similarity" between decomposition products of the nerve agent and substances in the tissues from affected sheep, but later concluded that the similarity was caused by products normally found in sheep tissue and was not significant. Agriculture officials say they also had problems with their instruments. In all, according to the Army, several thousand samples of environmental materials from a 100-square mile area were analyzed by various agencies in the effort to determine what killed the sheep.

ARMY STILL SKEPTICAL

As a result of the inherent difficulties of the analysis, some Army scientists are said to remain unconvinced that the nerve agent has been unequivocally identified. Nevertheless, NCDC Atlanta remains confident of its results, and no one has publicly challenged the seemingly conclusive findings. Surgeon General Stewart told *Science* that, at the time of the incident, NCDC had "better equipment than Dugway to detect very low levels" of the nerve agent.

In addition to tests identifying the nerve agent itself, there is considerable evidence, apparently undisputed, that the sheep were poisoned by an organic phosphate compound. These compounds are found in nerve agents, many common pesticides, and some noxious plants as well. They interfere with the action of the enzyme cholinesterase at nerve endings, and a depressed level of cholinesterase is thus considered a rather specific indication that an organic phosphate is involved. Numerous investigators have reported a severe depression of cholinesterase in the blood of the affected sheep. Moreover, the Agriculture Department has reported finding a cholinesterase depressing substance in snow collected from the area of the sheep kill. Thus it seems clear that the sheep were subjected to an organic phosphate poison, and since the investigation turned up no evidence that death was caused by poisonous plants or pesticides, the most likely culprit among the organic phosphates is the nerve agent tested at Dugway.

Further evidence implicating the nerve agent comes from feeding experiments at Dugway. When healthy sheep were fed small doses of VX, they developed essentially the same symptoms as the sick sheep in Skull Valley.

Army scientists are not convinced, however, that VX was the only cause of the sheep deaths. In its 25 November response to *Science* the Army said: "Although minute quantities of the agent were detected off-post, the results from these investigations have not provided conclusive evidence that nerve agent by itself caused sickness or death in the sheep. The answer is still unknown and may never be determined. The evidence suggests a combination of factors or effects." The Army is currently conducting experiments to determine whether the toxicity of the nerve agent is increased synergistically by the action of pesticides, noxious plants, trace elements in the soil, or the condition of sheep following the rigors of trailing and lambing. Thus far the Army has concluded that there is no synergism when sheep are fed both nerve agent and heptachlor, a pesticide which has been found in portions of Skull Valley.

Though Brigadier General John G. Appel, who has immediate command over Dugway, was quoted on 6 December as denying that the nerve agent caused the sheep deaths, the Army has accepted legal responsibility by paying \$376,685 to one rancher for the loss of 6249 sheep (4372 dead, 1877 others sickened) as well as a lesser amount to some Indians who lost a small number of sheep. According to an Army letter to members of Congress, such compensation is proper, under the Military Claims Act, "where the Army's activities contributed to the loss."

NEW SAFETY RULES

The sheep kill incident has caused the Army to tighten up the safety procedures used in testing persistent lethal chemical agents at Dugway. On 5 July, Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor announced the formation of a high-level advisory committee, headed by the Surgeon General, to review the safety of chemical testing at Dugway. Last week, the committee's recommendations were released, and Resor announced that every single one had been ordered adopted.

The new regulations state that highspeed aircraft must maintain "positive control" over the dissemination of lethal agents and that no release of such agents shall be made above 300 feet. They also prohibit testing when the wind speed exceeds 15 miles per hour, or when thunderstorms are occurring or predicted within 100 miles of the lethal cloud.

One of the most significant new rules requires that Dugway release agents in such a way that the agent cloud remains in the barren salt flats area north and northwest of the test site and does not cross heavily traveled U.S. Highway 40, to the north, for at least 3 hours (by which time the cloud would presumably have dispersed to the point where it is harmless). Heretofore, Dugway has not worried much about the direction of travel of the cloud and has counted on dilution of the cloud to render it nonhazardous. To carry out the new rules, Dugway will have to extend its ability to predict downwind behavior of the cloud from the present range of a few miles to "several tens of miles."

Another significant regulation requires Dugway, for the first time, to establish a monitoring system to detect the entry of chemicals into the environment outside the proving grounds. The system will consist of air samplers to sound an immediate alarm (though there is some question whether such samplers can be made sensitive enough) as well as ecological surveys to detect penetration of chemicals into local animal populations, both domestic and wild.

UTAHANS NOT WORRIED

Although the sheep death incident caused concern throughout the nation, the people of Utah and their community leaders did not seem particularly worried. The incident was not treated as front-page news by the Salt Lake City papers, and the Tooele Chamber of Commerce actually passed a resolution expressing confidence in Dugway, presumably because Dugway contributes heavily to the local economy. Moreover, there was virtually no reaction from Utahans when the Army revealed that lethal nerve agents, which had aroused a storm of protest in Denver, would be transferred in part from Denver to the Tooele Army Depot.

The Army has consistently said there was no negligence on the part of anyone at Dugway, so the sheep slaughter was presumably the result of inadequate safety regulations rather than a failure to follow prescribed regulations. Surgeon General Stewart told *Science* that Dugway was operating "on a set of assumptions that had worked in practice for so long that the assumptions became truths." In retrospect, the Army can clearly be blamed for a lack of caution in handling the deadly nerve agents, as well as a lack of candor in informing the public about the cause of the incident.—Philip M. Boffey.

ON THE TRANSPORTATION OF CHEMICAL WAR AGENTS THROUGH POPULATED AREAS AND DISPOSAL DUMPING IN THE OCEAN
(Statement by the Committee for Environmental Information)

A series of shipments of mustard gas and nerve gas may be shipped through St. Louis beginning later this month.

It is perfectly possible that all 27,000 tons of chemical war gas could pass through St. Louis without harming anyone. Other hazardous materials are frequently shipped by rail with safety. However, accidents do happen. For example, on February 19, 20 cars of a 120 car Chicago, Burlington and Quincy freight train from Denver went off the track at Crete, Nebraska and toppled onto two cars of ammonia on a siding. The fumes drifted through the town, and eight people were killed.

What would be the hazard to the people in the vicinity if such an accident happened to one of the one-ton containers of war gas? We have inadequate information about the safety of the containers to answer this question. It has been said that it would be as dangerous to empty them, in order to subject them to the tests usually required for containers in which hazardous materials are shipped, as to ship them without this test. What this means is that we do not know what would happen if a container were tipped off its railroad car, or how much pressure it would actually withstand if something heavy—like another railroad car—fell on it. If there is no safe method of removing the material from them, these are not safe storage containers.

There are two types of gas to be included in these shipments, and the effects would be very different, depending on which one might escape.

Mustard Gas. Low concentrations of sulfur mustard will cause eye and skin blisters, which can be deep and may require weeks or months of healing. High concentrations may produce shock. A victim who survives the initial effects may later show damage to the bone marrow and ulceration of the gastrointestinal tract. Mustard gas may cause cancer or may have genetic effects—that is, may result in a birth defect in the progeny of parents injured by mustard gas. In its liquid form—presumably the form in which it is stored in the tanks to be transported—it can penetrate leather, clothing, plastics and other materials. It evaporates very slowly. It would be prudent for railroad workers in the vicinity of the trains to wear protective clothing or ointment and to have chemical purification sprays available for decontamination of the air and any contaminated surfaces. In case a tank were ruptured in an accident, the area should be evacuated immediately and decontamination handled by workers wearing gas masks and protective clothing.

Nerve Gas. The nerve gas to be disposed of is one of the "G" agents, now outmoded by the "V" agents, such as the VX which killed more than 6000 sheep in Utah last spring. The G agents, however, may be more dangerous in a situation like this, as they are more volatile than VX. That is, if the liquid leaks from the tank, it can more easily be transformed into a vapor, and inhaled. Some of the G agents are also more persistent than the V agents. Nerve gas is many times more toxic than mustard gas, and inhaled into the lungs, it acts within a few minutes; even the least lethal of the G agents can kill in relatively small amounts. Gas masks and protective clothing are even more important in the case of the nerve gas than in the case of the mustard gas. A small amount of liquid G agent on the skin can kill within a half hour to an hour. The danger of accidental release of nerve gas in a city is a most serious problem. The only known antidote to nerve gas poisoning is atropine. This may be used in conjunction with oxines. In some cases, artificial respiration is necessary also, and sometimes additional treatment for convulsions. The antidote usually has to be administered within a few minutes after exposure if the victim is to be saved, and atropinization maintained for 24 hours. It is routine

in laboratories and plants which work with nerve gas to have atropine-filled syringes readily available on wall brackets for instant use. In a crowded area such as a city, this would mean that a large number of atropine-loaded syringes would need to be available for instant use in order to save the lives of the people who are exposed to the gas. However, heavy exposure to the nerve gas requires a spectrum of medical care, not simply a shot of atropine. Obviously, this would require an elaborate organization in any heavily-populated area through which the gas was to be shipped prior to the time the shipment was expected to pass through the city. It should be noted that some medical authorities are doubtful of the usefulness of the atropine antidote under such conditions because of the need for carefully balancing the amount of atropine against the amount of nerve gas received. Finally, in a very densely populated area, it is doubtful that a sufficient number of doses of atropine could be made available at short notice.

There are two other questions that should be considered: whether the war gases should be transported across the country at all, and whether they should be dumped in the ocean.

Part of the research that has gone into chemical warfare has been concerned with chemical defense, and agents for chemically decomposing the war gases have been found. An alternative method of disposal, therefore, would be to render the gases harmless at the arsenals where they are now stored or at the places where they were manufactured. Undoubtedly, there would be some hazard to the workers doing the job, but it would be a known hazard to a few individuals under controlled conditions (as in the case of the manufacture of the war gas in the first place) instead of an unknown hazard under uncontrolled conditions, perhaps to a large number of people.

To convert mustard gas to a non-toxic compound, all that is necessary is to treat it with chlorine, or with nitric acid or with hydrogen peroxide. Treatment with a strong alkali would detoxify the G agent. The chemistry of destroying these agents is very much simpler than the chemistry of making them. The cost could easily be calculated. For what reason has the Department of Defense chosen land shipment and sea disposal rather than these methods of chemical destruction of the noxious gases?

The Department of Defense should be asked if it has estimated the cost of deactivating the war gas, and how this compared with the cost of transportation and dumping. If such a cost comparison was made, were all the necessary safety precautions, such as decontamination teams, personnel to supervise evacuation, and preparation for medical care in case of an accident included in the cost of the proposed transportation scheme?

In regard to dumping the gases in the ocean: Reassuring statements have been quoted to the effect that at the depth of 7200 feet there are only crustaceans, that it would take 400 years for the water at that depth to reach the surface, and that the gas would last only 185 hours (8 days) after escaping. We have limited information about the effect on marine life. However, some forms of ocean life, such as whales and squid may move vertically as much as 7200 feet; a slow leak in a tank might provide continuous contamination over a long period of time, even if the gas remained toxic for only 8 days. We don't know where the dumping is to be done, and, therefore, in what direction and how rapidly the currents would carry the material. If the tanks ruptured on impact, tons of mustard gas might be released which might have a massive genetic effect on a variety of marine organisms. Much more should be known about the possible effects on marine life before such dumping is done.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION RESPONDS TO THE NEEDS OF THE DISADVANTAGED

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's concern for the disadvantaged people of this country is being borne out by deeds rather than empty promises. I am indebted to William Raspberry of the Washington Post for the latest example. Writing under the heading "Potomac Watch," Mr. Raspberry tells of new rules recently laid down by Robert L. Kunzig, Administrator of General Services. In the future, Mr. Kunzig states that the General Services Administration will avoid constructing public buildings or leasing private property in locations which would work hardships on employees. The hardships mentioned included the lack of adequate housing for low- and middle-income workers and the lack of accessibility for those who would have to travel from other areas of the urban center.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that this administration has an understanding of the problems facing the disadvantaged and is directing its energies toward the solution of these problems.

I am, therefore, inserting Mr. Raspberry's article into the RECORD, so that all my colleagues may learn of this most important change in policy:

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1969]

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 applying 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 Reg-

ister, 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 employe 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.

A STUDY OF CONGLOMERATES: WHERE ARE THEY LEADING US?

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include my address before the American Management Association, Inc., briefing session, at the Americana Hotel in New York City, on Thursday, June 12, 1969. The statement follows:

A STUDY OF CONGLOMERATES: WHERE ARE THEY LEADING US?

It is a pleasure to meet with you today to discuss conglomerate corporations. Everybody now recognizes that the United States is undergoing a merger wave of unprecedented proportions. Many people feel that these mergers, particularly mergers by the conglomerates, threaten the basic structure of American industry.

In its March 1969 report on Current Trends in Merger Activity, the Federal Trade Commission notes that all previous levels of merger activity were eclipsed in 1968. There were 4,003 mergers of all types in 1968, and this was an increase of 68 percent over 1967, when there were 2,384.

Not only is the total number of mergers at an all time high. In 1968, the number of large acquisitions, that is, one where the acquired firm has assets of \$10 million or more, increased substantially. In 1968, there were 192 such large companies acquired, as compared to 169 in 1967. The total value of the assets acquired in these large mergers equalled \$12.6 billion in 1968. This was more than 50 percent larger than the \$8.2 billion

assets acquired in manufacturing and mining mergers in 1967, and three times greater than the \$4.1 billion assets in 1967. Projections for 1969 indicate that \$18 billion of large firm assets will be acquired.

The impact of mergers in large corporations is underscored by the disappearance of companies with assets of \$250 million or more. During the two decades between 1948 and 1967, there were only 12 firms acquired which had assets of more than \$250 million. In 1968, however, 13 such firms were merged. This included one in excess of \$1 billion, Ling-Temco-Vought's acquisition of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, now under challenge by the Department of Justice.

Fortune's 500 list shows what is happening. Twenty-two percent, 110, of Fortune's 500 in 1962 have disappeared by merger. In 1968, 31 companies disappeared from the list, 26 by being absorbed into other companies. In 1968, six of the firms with assets of more than \$250 million which were acquired had been listed by the FTC among the 200 largest corporations in 1967.

The current merger movement differs from the prior merger waves in the 1890's and in the 1920's. The current movement is lasting longer, and is of greater magnitude, than its predecessors. Moreover, the current merger movement is different because of its conglomerate character. In 1968, the Federal Trade Commission reports, conglomerate mergers accounted for 84 percent of the number, and 89 percent of the assets of all recorded large acquisitions.

The Federal Trade Commission classifies conglomerate mergers as "product extension" or "market extension" if the merging companies have discernible relationships in either production or marketing. If no such relationship can be found, the Federal Trade Commission classifies the merger as "other conglomerate." In 1968, 43 percent, or \$5.5 million, of acquired assets, fell in this "other" category. Among the 47 "other" conglomerate mergers in 1968, were a movie distributor's (Loew's Theatres) acquisition of a tobacco company (P. Lorillard & Co.), and a communications company's (ITT) acquisition of a bakery (Continental Baking) and a paper company (Rayonier).

Statistics alone do not show the impact of the merger movement. Examination of what happens to employees and communities adds flesh and blood to the statistical skeleton.

Frequently corporate headquarters are moved from a small or medium sized city to a metropolis. Local management is removed or subordinated to outside interests. Civil leaders, familiar with community needs, may be replaced with professional managers whose concern is for the problems of a profit and loss statement, and who have little time or interest for the problems of local school boards, municipal and county government, community charity, local real estate taxes, adequate policing of crime, and solutions to other civic disruptions manifest throughout the land.

There have been two case studies that provide dramatic illustrations of these conditions. *Business Week*, in its April 26, 1969 issue, reported a nationwide survey it had conducted into the effects in local plants and companies of takeovers by outside corporations. *Business Week* described the situation, which it called the "Blaw-Knox syndrome," that resulted when White Consolidated Industries, Inc. acquired Blaw-Knox Company. In 1968 the merging companies announced that there would be no changes in personnel and policies, and that Blaw-Knox would continue to operate as an autonomous division. One year later, however, *Business Week* found that the company's 230 man headquarters staff had been reduced to 40 people, and its 8 operating divisions had been scattered around the country. The chairman of Blaw-Knox had left within a year, and its vice presidents

began to leave within 4 months. Not only was there disaster among the upper level employees. Business suffered drastically, apparently through the new management's inability to cope. *Business Week* reported that new orders for mill equipment, Blaw-Knox's biggest product line, had plunged from \$55 million in 1967 to a six month rate of \$4 million.

The *Business Week* survey found that Pittsburgh lost 9 of its 23 major corporate headquarters through mergers of local companies. The loss of a corporate headquarters nearly always results in the acquiring company selecting new representatives and agents. Banks, advertising agencies, insurance brokers, and other services may be switched.

The State of Wisconsin, through its Division of Economic Development, has jointly sponsored with the University of Wisconsin a most valuable study into merger effects. The report entitled "Social and Economic Consequences of the Merger Movement in Wisconsin," was published in May 1969. The report focuses its attention on social and economic implications of the merger movement, as distinguished from the effects of mergers on competition and prices.

Although the report in its Conclusions and Recommendations makes it clear that it is difficult to generalize about social and economic consequences, some mergers, particularly mergers where outside corporations acquired Wisconsin companies, had measurable adverse effects. In the 1963-1967 period covered by the survey, it was found that 55 percent of the acquired companies after they had been merged had a slower rate of employment growth. Both in-State and out-of-State mergers had more declines than advances in employment growth in the post-merger period. Acquisitions by out-of-State corporations, the Wisconsin report found, had a more severe impact on employment growth. The report states:¹

"The growth of aggregate Wisconsin employment of companies acquired by out-of-state corporations declined substantially more than that of those acquired by in-state corporations. The premerger aggregate growth rate of firms acquired by out-of-state firms was 6.02 percent. Following the mergers their growth rate declined to—48 percent—108 percent less than in the premerger period. The data, plus information from survey of acquired companies, indicate that several parent corporations have failed to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the acquired companies. Undoubtedly, opportunities still exist for increased investments which would generate expanded employment and payrolls in Wisconsin communities while increasing the profitability of the companies."

The Wisconsin study found, also, that 53 percent of acquired companies after the merger had a slower rate of payroll growth. Payroll growth, notably in large firms acquired by out-of-State corporations, was depressed by mergers. Inflation in recent years has markedly raised wages and salaries. It would be reasonable to expect that payrolls in acquired companies, because of the inflation, would have advanced more than employment. In this connection, the report states:²

"The fact that this frequently did not happen in companies acquired by out-of-state firms would lead one to believe that their acquirers have transferred a portion of the higher salaried employees to a location outside Wisconsin. Such transfers mean a loss of talent, retail expenditures, and personal income taxes in the economies of Wisconsin's communities and the state."

The Wisconsin study also examined contributions to the United Fund. Thirty Milwaukee companies acquired by out-of-State

corporations were compared with 30 similar companies that had not been acquired. The following significant findings were made:³

"The total 1968 contributions of the 24 companies acquired in the 1963-1968 period were less than their contributions in 1963.

"The total 1958 to 1968 rise of United Fund contributions of the 30 acquired companies was less than half as large as the increase of the non-acquired companies. Contributions of the acquired corporations rose 16 percent during the ten years, while those of the non-acquired companies rose 34 percent."

The Wisconsin study and the *Business Week* survey made it clear why corporate mergers, particularly conglomerate mergers, have sparked an unprecedented number of investigations at the national level. There are now at least eight investigations underway into national questions about conglomerates. In addition to the House Antitrust Subcommittee investigation, announced in October 1968, there are the following:

1. The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.
2. The Federal Trade Commission.
3. The Federal Communications Commission.
4. The Securities and Exchange Commission.
5. The New York Stock Exchange.
6. The House Ways and Means Committee.
7. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

The last five have been started since January 1969.

Although there are naturally some areas of overlap, each of these investigations involve different aspects of the conglomerate merger problem. Each investigation will provide insight on the basis of its own specialties and responsibilities. The results from each will be mutually useful and complementary.

A word about the House Antitrust Subcommittee's investigation. It is now underway and documents and information are being delivered by conglomerate companies which have been selected for inclusion in our sample for intensive study. The investigation now is in the fact gathering stage. The next stage—public hearings—will commence as soon as our schedule permits.

It is, of course, still too early to spell out what ultimate conclusions and recommendations, if any, will be needed. While I believe it is clear that the Celler-Kefauver Act in an appropriate case applies to a pure conglomerate acquisition—it is not clear that the Act is adequate to correct all conditions that may result in public injury. That is the reason for the House Antitrust Subcommittee's investigation.

We aim to find out the answer to this question: If a multi-industry company merger does not substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, and thus does not violate the antitrust laws, is there any effect that nonetheless needs to be corrected by legislation?

To answer this question, a wide spectrum of information is required.

Although conglomerate mergers now dominate the merger wave and therefore are the center of attention and criticism, conglomerate is but part of a larger picture. An inexorable increase in the concentration of economic power in the American economy is our basic problem. Mergers historically have contributed to increased concentration, and conglomerate mergers since they disregard established industry boundaries, are feared by many to presage a complete industrial restructuring. Staff studies for the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability, published in January 1969, indicate that between 1948 and 1967, there was a "... persistent and substantial upward movement in the share of assets controlled by the 200 largest manufacturing corporations." The

sharpest rise coincided with the vastly accelerated merger activity in recent years. By 1967, the 100 largest corporations held 47.6 percent, and the 200 largest corporations held 58.7 percent of the assets of all manufacturing corporations. By 1967, the 100 largest manufacturing corporations held about the same share of manufacturing assets that the 200 largest had held in 1948.

The staff study found that distribution of total assets of manufacturing corporations in 1968 was as follows:⁴

"The 78 corporations with assets of \$1 billion or more held 43 percent of the total, and the 529 corporations with assets of \$100 million or more held 73 percent. Another group of 791 medium-size corporations, with assets of \$25 million to \$100 million, held another 9 percent. The remaining 18 percent of the assets was held by approximately 185,000 corporations. Although about 250,000 proprietorships and partnerships are engaged in some form of manufacturing, their assets are less than 2 percent of the assets of manufacturing corporations."

Concentration of power in the American economy is the basic problem. When we consider new legislative remedies for concentration problems and conglomerate mergers, however, we face the realization that time-honored tests for determining the public interest may no longer be adequate. Under the antitrust laws, good behavior is distinguished from bad behavior by measuring how the activity affects competition or restrains trade. The assurance of free access to markets where competitive conditions exist has been one of the main objectives of antitrust legislation. The Celler-Kefauver Act, for example, strikes down mergers which substantially lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce in any section of the country.

If we conclude that a conglomerate merger contains features that should be prohibited, even though its competitive effects do not amount to a violation of the Celler-Kefauver Act, then we must reexamine the policy underlying the antitrust laws. We must find a test other than direct effect on competition. Most of the remedies that have been suggested involve more direct Government controls in conjunction with a test based on a concept that size in and of itself can be antisocial or so subject to abuse that control is necessary. Of course, where size is measured by the share of a market, and the market share has amounted to a monopoly, the antitrust laws have always applied. Controversy has arisen when the size of the market share did not amount to monopoly power. If we are to accept a "size" test how do you determine what is the appropriate size? What may have been too large in 1920 might not be too large under conditions in 1968. We must be careful not to inhibit necessary growth in the economy or in the institutions that are its constituent parts.

A number of remedies have been suggested. The Task Force Report on Antitrust Policy, the so-called "Neal" Report, dated July 5, 1968, which was prepared for President Johnson and released by Assistant Attorney General McLaren on May 20, 1969, contains two proposals that illustrate application of a size test.

First, the Neal Task Force recommended new law, called the Concentrated Industries Act. This act would attack concentration in oligopoly industries. These are industries in which four or fewer firms account for 70 percent or more in industrial sales. An oligopoly firm would be one whose market share in an oligopoly industry would be 15 percent or more. When the Attorney General found that oligopoly conditions existed he would be authorized to institute a proceeding to re-

¹ "Social and Economic Consequences of the Merger Movement in Wisconsin," p. 75.

² *Ibid.*, p. 76.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁴ "Studies by the Staff of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability," p. 45.

duce concentration. The case would be heard by a Special Antitrust Court, appointed by the Chief Justice and composed of circuit and district judges.

The Special Antitrust Court would determine whether an oligopoly industry existed, and which firms were oligopoly firms in such industry. After a one-year waiting period, to provide for voluntary adjustments, further proceedings would be conducted for appropriate relief. The court could order appropriated relief, including divestiture within a reasonable period of time, not in excess of four years, to reduce concentration so that the market share of each oligopoly firm would not exceed 12 percent.

The second act recommended by the Neal Task Force was a Merger Act. Under the Merger Act no "large" firm, that is, any firm that had sales in excess of \$500 million, or assets in excess of \$250 million, could merge or combine with any "leading" firm. A "leading" firm is one which has a market share of 10 percent in markets where the aggregate market share of any four or fewer firms was more than 50 percent.

This outline of the Concentrated Industries Act and the Merger Act recommended by the Neal Task Force shows their novelty and complexity. Many adjustments will have to be made in our present policies to accommodate these concepts. Adjustments of this magnitude generally are difficult and accompanied by heated controversy. So far neither the Johnson Administration, which initially received the Task Force Recommendations nor the Nixon Administration, which released them, has endorsed these proposals. No Member of Congress, I believe, has suggested their adoption by introduction of bills. This matter needs much more study before I make up my mind.

In the 89th Congress, in connection with efforts by the President to persuade business to restrain price increases, I introduced a bill requiring prior notification of price rises in certain industries. This bill provided for the designation of a list of basic industries. Basic industries, then, would be subject to certain procedures with respect to their pricing practices. The bill listed the steel industry, the aluminum industry, the petroleum refining industry, the copper industry, and the automobile industry, and provided for the Secretary of Commerce to add to the list by the application of a size test. Industries could be designated "basic" if "the combined sales of the four largest units amounts to 75 percent or more of aggregate sales in the industry, when the aggregate sales in the industry amount to _____ percent of the gross national product." Under this definition, a "basic" industry would be determined by two factors: (1) its magnitude, and (2) its concentration. It may be that these measures of size might be appropriately considered in conglomerate merger legislation. This might or might not be another test.

There have been other proposals to reduce concentration. These include massive divestiture proceedings, similar to the breakup of the public utility holding companies, in oligopoly industries when concentration reached certain levels. Former Assistant Attorney General Donald F. Turner favored divestiture and took the position that "The disruptive effects of divestiture are . . . commonly exaggerated, and in any event are short-run consequences greatly outweighed by prospective long-run gains."

Remedies to halt future increases in concentration have included prohibitions against further expansion by merger after a firm reaches a certain size or whose market share reaches a certain size. Another remedy is the proposal where after a large corporation reaches a certain size it would be permitted to acquire another corporation only if at the same time it divested itself of approximately an equal amount of assets. The "Neal" Task

Force specifically refused to endorse the suggestion that further expansion by large firms by merger be prohibited.⁵

Another remedy suggested for control of concentrated economic power has been advanced by the economist, Adolph A. Berle, Jr. On the assumption that fewer companies and more corporate bigness is inevitable, Mr. Berle would advocate more direct Government action. French style "indicative planning" would be used to guide and influence activities of corporations for the public welfare. The Government defines problems, sets goals, encourages business through incentives, contracts, or, if necessary, controls. Corporate decisions on where to spend capital are assumed to have too great an impact on the public to permit such decisions to be made in the absence of participation by representatives of the public. Obviously suggested changes of this magnitude bear the seeds of prolonged controversy. A number of European countries are used to more direct Government participation in business behavior. The European models, however, must give us pause. The heritage from a medieval aristocracy has produced an all too willing acceptance of the inhibiting effects of cartel structures and practices.

When these proposals are considered, it is clear that, other than the adjustments in the tax laws to inhibit mergers, new legislation is both nebulous and controversial. It may be that our investigations will show that additional legislation will not be needed to cope with conglomerate mergers. We may ultimately conclude that if a merger does not have the requisite adverse competitive effects under the Celler-Kefauver Act, its benefits may equal or exceed the damages it may cause. On the other hand, the investigations now underway may disclose facts and considerations which make it mandatory that affirmative and far-reaching controls, based on new concepts of relationship of Government to industry, be enacted.

USE POLLUTION TO BENEFIT MANKIND

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, two of the major problems facing this Nation and the world are the need to provide a nutritious food supply for the expanding population and at the same time to keep that growing population from being strangled by environmental pollution. The ideal solution for these problems would be to find a way to use the waste materials that pollute our society in a reconstituted form to feed the growing number of undernourished. While that does sound a little like "pie in the sky," efforts are being made to obtain protein from petroleum wastes and yeast from industrial wastes. These and other research efforts are described in an article in the May 1969 issue of *Ocean Industry*. For the information of my colleagues who have an interest in recycling and reclaiming the resources for the benefit of mankind, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the subject article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

⁵ Task Force Report, III-6.

USE POLLUTION TO BENEFIT MANKIND (J. Leon Potter, Vitro/Hanford Engineering Services)

Among the problems facing mankind are maintenance of a nutritious food supply and prevention of environmental pollution. Only with proper planning is it possible to feed the people and clean up after them while allowing the essential biological life cycle to continue unbroken.

The population of the world is about 3.5 billion people. Conservative estimates say the world will have from 5.3 to 7.4 million persons by 2000 A.D.—with 80 to 85% of this population being in the underdeveloped countries.

In part, this means we need (1) more efficient food production; (2) more efficient utilization of the now-wasted organic compounds as byproducts; (3) new sources of food and food supplements, such as algae, yeast and fish protein concentrates, and (4) development of the efficient techniques of protein production by maximum utilization of our resources.

Approximately half the world's population lives on diets dominated by cereal crops which fail to provide protein of either the quantity or quality needed for adequate human nutrition. Chronic protein deficiencies will become one of man's most threatening problems because it can cause irreversible mental damage and premature death due to a low resistance to infectious diseases.

The alternative is to provide a nutritional supplement of 10 to 20 grams of animal protein per day to the diet. The world-wide problem of increasing need for protein and the great changes expected in the world food economy in the next 20 years emphasize the need for future development of the sea's food resources.

Instead of considering organic waste, thermal effluents, oil spills, sewage nutrients and garbage only as pollution, we must demonstrate that these currently wasted organic compounds—if properly managed—can be treated as enrichments to estuarine areas. With controlled symbiotic systems, it will be possible to solve our protein deficiencies while improving our environment.

Protein from petroleum wastes. Waste oil and other petroleum materials constitute a constant pollution threat to the estuarine system. In 1968, the California State Department of Fish and Game reported 181 oil spills in the Los Angeles and Long Beach areas.

The clean-up of oil wastes depends on the capability of containment, collection, on-shore treatment and eventual disposal or utilization. To this end, each major port or oil producing area should have an oil waste task force to abate oil pollution by routinely inspecting and making recommendations for prevention of accidents, cleaning up minor leaks and spills and taking immediate action in case of emergencies. This task force also can be responsible for the storage, treatment and eventual utilization of the oil as a private enterprise. Such activity should lead to the next step—conversion of waste oil into protein compounds for marketing as animal feed supplement.

How a French plant handles petroleum waste. A plant at Lauera, France is selling protein produced from waste, low-grade petroleum. Micro-organisms, growing on a diet consisting primarily of oil hydrocarbons, are producing an excellent high-grade protein. This concept has proven so successful that there is good reason to believe petroleum will become an important food resource for the earth's growing population.

A pound of bacteria, feeding on crude so worthless that it is burned as waste, can grow fast enough to produce 10 lbs. of protein in a day. If a yearling calf were able to manufacture protein at the same rate, it would end the day roughly the size of a

three-car garage and it would have consumed several tons of expensive grain in the process.

The proteins produced by fermentation of waste petroleum are no different in quality than protein made by any other natural resource. Petroleum proteins are rich in B vitamins and include a well-balanced variety of amino acids. In particular, they have a high content of lysine which makes them a useful complement to the cereal grains.

Yeast from industrial wastes. Another major source of estuarine pollution are the industries such as pulp and paper, food processing, etc., which produce organic compounds as a waste effluent containing primarily carbohydrates, sugars and organic and inorganic nutrients.

Plant-treatment systems should be used to collect the solids, concentrate them and convert them into compost fertilizers and animal feed additives. The soluble nutrients and sugar compounds can be collected and converted by selective fermentation by *Torula* yeast into marketable protein for use as food additives and animal feed supplements.

Protein production from carbon-containing compounds is not a new idea. For many years the growing of yeast for animal supplements and human foods has been an appreciable, though small, industry.

Yeast cells grown on carbohydrates have a high nutritive value, not only because of their protein content, but also because of the presence of vitamins and amino acids. Yeast cells grow rapidly. *Torula* yeast under optimum conditions will double in size and volume every 30 minutes. These cells can be grown in tanks or lagoons using only waste organic compounds for food.

Table 1 demonstrates the high value protein and other nutritious content of *Torula* yeast, one of the most complete foods available.

Using domestic sewage. Modern sewage plants are designed to destroy or render harmless the solid waste and oxide of the nutrients in solution.

Because most plants are over-loaded and, therefore, inefficient, the effluents are befouling our environment and high volumes are moving to our oceans. The waste effluents discharged from those plants are in both solid and liquid form. Sludge solids, if properly treated, can be used for compost soil additives and fertilizers. This sludge, blended with garbage wastes, can be developed into an excellent and marketable compost while the millions of gallons of nutrient-rich effluent can be utilized as food for the more efficient protein-producing plant life, such as algae and plankton.

Soluble nutrients contained in the millions of gallons of wasted fresh water need to be utilized, or at least managed, to gain an economic re-use. In areas such as water-short southern California, re-cycling or multiple use of water is becoming a necessity.

Work at the University of California and other institutions around the world has demonstrated the economic potential of recovery of nutrients and pollution abatement while producing a marketable protein for cattle, poultry feeds and fish food with unicellular algae and plankton in processes using controlled photosynthesis.

The cost of protein produced from waste effluents is approaching 3 cents/lb., compared with agriculture and animal protein at 10 cents/lb. Algae produces protein at a rate of 30 to 50 tons/acre/year, compared with the conventional agriculture of 3 to 5 tons/acre/year.

Algae is used for many purposes. Marine algae is processed to obtain iodine. Agar is produced from numerous genera and species of algae. Alginates (polymers of manuronic acid) obtained from marine algae are used as thickeners or stabilizers in the production of plastics, ice cream and candy. Marine algae also has long been used as fertilizer,

livestock feed and human food—particularly in the Asian countries.

More recently it has been suggested that unicellular forms of algae, such as *Chlorella*, be used to alleviate protein deficiencies or for space travel food. It has been used to purify sewage and reclaim waste waters. The nutritive value of algae grown on sewage has been studied with rats and chicks. Table 2 shows the nutrient content of algae grown from sewage.

Habitats need to be improved: Habitat improvement likely will play a major role in improving the productivity of estuarine systems. All future land fills, bay realignment and dredging projects should be designed around the principle of such improvement. The most productive zones for fish ecology are our rapidly disappearing estuaries. Irregularities in bottom topography—such as reefs, rock outcrops, vegetated cover, piers or artificial habitats—attract fish and the vertebrates in greater abundance than nearby flat, barren bottoms. Recognition of this fact makes it important to create artificial irregularities in the barren bay bottoms which have been dredged and worked. With a planned dredging program it is possible to make the changes needed and still improve the habitat of the lower aquatic benthos.

Abandoned cars and other refuse cluttering our cities and countryside have proven to be good material for building fishing reefs in the sea. Fish are attracted to the artificial reefs to feed off mussels and other organisms which attach themselves to the reef materials to seek protection in the crevices or simply to have a "home."

Using thermal enrichment to develop food: A major use of industrial water is as a coolant. For each kilowatt generated in a modern coal-fired power plant, approximately 6,000 Btu's of heat must be dissipated via * * * heat exchangers. Nuclear reactors are less efficient, requiring the dissipation of 1,000 Btu's per kilowatt hour generated. By 1980, the electrical power industry will require 200 billion gallons of water per day for cooling purposes.

This water has great potential in the production of food through development of aquaculture and enhancement of biological life. Thermal energy can increase the growth rate of the lower forms of marine life to provide additional food for the higher forms.

Aquaculture comes of age: The cultivation of marine organisms has been practiced for hundreds of years, but intensified farming using supplemental feeds and warm water discharges has just begun.

The Inter-Chem Corp. has an oyster hatching facility at Oyster Bay, Long Island, where oyster spat are raised to a shell diameter of 2 to 3 millimeters and then moved to the thermal effluent discharge channel of the Long Island Light and Power Co. plant for accelerated growth. The process has been so successful that Inter-Chem is expanding the hatchery and growth areas.

Scotland's White Fish Authority has found that to fully utilize the increased growth potential of fish via thermal enhancement, it is necessary to supplement their diet with additional food. Special thermally heated algae ponds are producing an adequate feed supply for the thermally produced fish by using the nutrient from sewage of a nearby town. The results are so successful that each new nuclear-fueled electric power station in the British Isles will be established with aquaculture areas being an important part of the plant design and setting.

To apply the full potential of thermal effluents for fish protein production, provisions must be made for feeding these aquaculture areas. The use of waste organisms from industry and domestic sewers to produce marine organisms is the answer.

Symbiotic industries: In conclusion, I would like to suggest a utilization concept

demonstrating one feasible recycling approach for converting waste materials into food.

By utilizing the nutrients available from now-wasted organic compounds, enhanced by thermal energy from the power industry and combined with planned marine habitats, highly efficient symbiotic food production systems, as shown in Fig. 1, could be produced. Such systems, designed to utilize the waste of man for the production of the necessary protein for man, will be one of man's greatest scientific advances.

COMMUNICABLE DISEASES ACT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was joined last Thursday by 14 colleagues from New York City in introducing the Communicable Diseases Act of 1969.

This measure will amend the Public Health Service Act to provide Federal funds to cities and States to be used specifically for the control of communicable diseases. The most immediate problem this bill addresses is the control of tuberculosis.

Under present Federal programs, TB control funds are available to States and communities for the specific purpose of controlling and treating that disease. But under a proposed change in the budget of the new Administration, these funds would be diverted to broader, less specific grants to State health departments on the basis of population and per capita income.

DOUBLE PROBLEM

Diverting funds in this manner would hurt New York City's TB program in two ways.

First, the entire State would get less money for TB control despite the fact that the State has the highest number of new, active TB cases each year.

Second, New York City would get fewer dollars from the new allotment to New York State since other factors, extraneous to control of TB, would influence the state health department's distribution of funds. For example, less urgent but more politically palatable programs in public health would be competing for the same dollars now used to fight TB.

Since tuberculosis is principally a problem in poor areas where the disease thrives on inadequate housing, poor diet and insufficient medical care, it is clear that New York City has the greatest need for funds to fight TB.

WHERE TB OCCURS

The statewide incidence of tuberculosis also demonstrates that New York City's poverty problems result in a very serious TB situation. Of the 5,069 new active cases of the disease reported in 1967 in New York State, 3,542 were in New York City. The city now receives funds from the Public Health Service approximately in proportion to this serious TB incidence rate.

But under the proposed funding, the whole State would lose initially over two

hundred thousand dollars. Then, when the State government distributed these funds, it would be under statewide pressure to use them for new programs unrelated to the city's serious TB problems.

As the New York State Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association said in its June 5, 1969 testimony before a House Appropriations subcommittee:

"Unless funds are earmarked as under the 'project' method, States would only be encouraged to use funds for tuberculosis control, being under no obligation to do so. With added pressures for new programs, therefore, control efforts may be seriously curtailed. In essence, large cities, where the incidence of tuberculosis is highest, would be at the mercy of State health departments for operating funds."

THE SAME PROBLEM

I might add that the same problem New York City has in other fields in getting its proper share of Federal and State funds would now extend to TB control if the administration's refunding proposal is not cancelled.

I am convinced that this decision would not have been made if the administration had received and accepted expert medical advice before making its decision. After the decision, the only recourse Congress has is legislation, as we have introduced today, to put tuberculosis, and several other communicable diseases, in a separate category for funding as national health problems deserving specific and directed attention at the highest level.

Our legislation, therefore, while concerned immediately with a problem in New York City, will face the national problem of eight serious communicable diseases with a proper coordinated program of Federal, State and local action.

A DIFFERENT RESPONSE

The spread of communicable diseases constitutes a special kind of health problem for the Nation and indeed for the world. Because it differs in kind from all the other health challenges we face, it requires a different response—a response that is truly national and nationwide.

Communicable disease knows no boundaries. In a society like ours, characterized by enormous mobility with unfettered passage across jurisdictional lines, the only protection is national protection. An excellent program of protection in one community or State cannot guard its people against the effects of an inadequate program half a mile or half a continent away.

Moreover, communicable diseases are not conquered until the last case is eradicated from the earth. Therefore vigilance must be unceasing. We have seen syphilis break loose in epidemic proportions again in our own time after it had been considered under control. We have seen polio flare up in localized outbreaks after we had allowed ourselves to think that it was gone forever. Measles, which 5 years of nationwide effort have brought to its lowest point in history, could rise up again.

ANOTHER CONQUEST

Now we stand on the threshold of another great conquest, as vaccine becomes available to prevent rubella, commonly

called German measles, that deceptively mild disease in adults which has caused such tragedy through its effects on unborn infants. I believe this Congress will provide for the first year of a major national attack on this disease. But bringing rubella under control will require much more than a 1-year effort.

Therefore I urge that the special needs of communicable disease control be met by a program tailored to these needs. I subscribe fully, both in principle and in practice, to the concept of the Partnership for Health legislation which in essence assigns to the States and communities the responsibility for determining their health priorities and encourages them to use funds available to them through Federal channels to meet these identified priority needs. I believe that this approach, in general, will yield the most effective use of the resources available to health care, in terms of meeting human need.

PARTIALLY PROTECTED

I am firmly convinced, however, that we in the Congress and in the Federal health agencies have a national responsibility for assuring that every person and every community is protected against the preventable ravages of communicable diseases such as syphilis, tuberculosis, polio, rubella, and others. I believe that such effective protection on a national basis cannot be guaranteed if some States and communities should choose to use all their health resources for other purposes. A nation partially protected against communicable disease is a nation unprotected.

For this reason I am introducing legislation making Federal funds available to the States and communities to be used specifically for the control of communicable disease. I believe such legislation to be in the national interest, and essential to the health protection of the American people. I believe that it will have the effect of complementing the Partnership for Health concept of which I wholeheartedly approve, by setting apart from the competitive arena at the State and local levels the resources necessary to do this essential work for all the people of our land.

I include below a summary of this legislation and its sponsors.

SUMMARY OF COMMUNICABLE DISEASE ACT OF 1969, H.R. 12153

I. This bill will assist states in preventing the introduction, and transmission of communicable diseases in the United States from interstate and intrastate sources and from foreign countries. Grants would be awarded by the Secretary of HEW to States and their political subdivisions with the approval of state health authorities.

II. Grants would be available to: assist in financing communicable disease control programs; finance the purchases of vaccines or other means for those population groups especially subject to those communicable diseases; help pay personnel and other program expenses for organizing, promoting and investigating disease control programs.

III. Principal diseases covered under this bill would be: tuberculosis, venereal diseases, rubella, whooping cough, measles, poliomyelitis, diphtheria, and tetanus.

IV. Amends Section 361 of Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 264).

Sponsored by: Joseph P. Addabbo, Mario Biaggi, Frank J. Brasco, Jonathan B. Bing-

ham, Hugh L. Carey, Leonard Farbstein, Jacob H. Gilbert, Seymour Halpern, Edward I. Koch, John M. Murphy, Bertram L. Podell, Adam C. Powell, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, and James H. Scheuer.

CONGRESS AND THE UNIVERSITY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, two clear voices have spoken against headstrong action on student unrest.

The Harvard faculty has made an excellent statement on the rights and responsibilities of the university community in dealing with dissent. Forbidden under this Harvard policy is violence against any member or guest of the university community as well as deliberate interference with academic freedom, freedom of speech, and freedom of movement, and theft or property destruction and obstruction of normal university functioning. Appropriate penalties are stipulated.

The rights of dissent are also protected under this Harvard policy. All individuals and groups within the university have the right "to press by appropriate means for action on any matter on which they believe the university can and should act, and they have the right to be given a full and fair hearing and serve the essential commitment of the university and the rights of individual or collective expression of opinion or dissent."

This interim statement, it should be noted, was announced the same day that Harvard severed 16 students for their roles in seizing a university building 2 months ago.

The second important statement came from the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence which warned against legislation that would punish either students or colleges for campus disorders.

I hope that these words of caution will be heard by the House when it considers whether legislative interference is an appropriate response to campus disorders.

The Commission report is also an interim statement which it issued because "so threatening is the situation, so essential is the need for understanding and calm appraisal" that the situation could not wait for the full Commission report in the fall.

The principal charge of the Commission's report is that campus disorder cannot be understood in isolation. There is no single cause, no single solution. Ill-tempered laws, the Commission adds, might only make more radical the roles of already radical minorities which disrupt the campus.

Do we really want thousands or tens of thousands of radical students cut loose from their universities and discharged into society with their alienations intensified and their tenuous ties to society completely severed?

Do we want to remake the universities in our image and not let them remain places where, no matter what tur-

moil, students may find some form for their attempts to make sense of the world they inherit?

Where are those who proclaimed so often in the past that Federal control of education was evil, that a free and independent system of education was vital to America? Where are those who feared that Federal aid to education would lead to Federal control? I hope that they are on the side of the Commission which counsels "patience, understanding, and support for those in the university community who are trying to preserve freedom and order on the campus."

If Congress makes no distinction between peaceful protest and violent disruption, will the students do so? If we see no difference between the nonconformity of youth and the terror tactics of the extremists, will we encourage or discourage the college administrators and faculty, like Harvard's, which try to make these differences clear and meaningful?

I encourage my colleagues to read these two excellent statements, which I include below, and thus encourage the discourse of reason in the Halls of Congress and on the university campus. I also include a perceptive article by Tom Wicker titled "How To Radicalize the Students":

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1969]
TEXT OF A STATEMENT ON CAMPUS DISORDERS
BY THE NATIONAL VIOLENCE COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, June 9—The members of this commission, along with most Americans, are deeply disturbed by the violence and disorder that have swept the nation's campuses.

Our colleges and universities cannot perform their vital functions in an atmosphere that exalts the struggle for power over the search for truth, the rule of passion over the rule of reason, physical confrontation over rational discourse.

We are equally disturbed, however, by the direction of much public reaction to campus unrest. Those who would punish colleges and universities by reducing financial support, by passing restrictive legislation, or by political intervention in the affairs of educational institutions, may unwittingly be helping the very radical minority of students whose objective is to destroy our present institutions of higher education.

Thoughts for summer

So threatening is the situation, so essential is the need for understanding and calm appraisal, that this commission feels compelled to speak now rather than to remain silent until publication of its final report next fall.

We offer our comments during the summer pause in the hope that they will contribute to constructive thought and action before the beginning of the new academic year in September.

The problem of campus unrest is more than a campus problem. Its roots lie deep in the larger society. There is no single cause, no single solution. We urge all Americans to reject hasty and simplistic answers. We urge them to distinguish between peaceful protest and violent disruption, between the nonconformity of youth and the terror tactics of the extremists.

We counsel patience, understanding and support for those in the university community who are trying to preserve freedom and order on the campus. We do so in the conviction that our universities and colleges are beginning to learn how to achieve change without disorder or coercion.

I

During the past year, many of America's universities and colleges have been seriously wounded. These wounds arise from multiple causes. One is the increasingly violent expression of widespread student discontent.

Although much of this discontent often focuses on grievances within the campus environment, it is rooted in dissatisfactions with the larger society that the campus can do little about.

Students are unwilling to accept the gaps between professed ideals and actual performance. They see afresh the injustices that remain unremedied. They are not impressed by the dangers that previous generations overcome and the problems they have solved.

It means little to them that the present adult generation found the way out of a major depression to unparalleled heights of economic abundance, or that it defeated a massive wave of vicious totalitarianism and preserved the essential elements of freedom for the youth of today.

To students, these triumphs over serious dangers serve primarily to emphasize other problems we are just beginning to solve.

Idealism and impatience

Today's intelligent, idealistic students see a nation which has achieved the physical ability to provide food, shelter and education for all, but has not yet devised social institutions that do so.

They see a society, built on the principle that all men are created equal, that has not yet assured equal opportunity in life. They see a world of nations—states with the technical brilliance to harness the ultimate energy but without the common sense to agree on methods of preventing mutual destruction.

With the fresh energy and idealism of the young, they are impatient with the progress that has been made but seems to them to be indefensibly slow.

At a time when students are eager to attack these and other key problems, they face the prospect of being compelled to fight in a war most of them believe is unjustified. This traumatic experience has precipitated an unprecedented mass tension and frustration.

In assessing the causes of student unrest, it would be a mistake to assume that all causes are external. There are undoubtedly internal emotional pressures and internal value conflicts in many students which contribute to their own dissatisfaction and thus to the tension and turmoil of campus life.

Students attribute the shortcomings they see to the smugness of their elders and the weaknesses of social institutions. They see the university, guardian of man's knowledge and source of his new ideas, as an engine for powering the reform of the larger society, and as the first institution they are in a position to reform.

Acceptance of democracy

We emphasize that most students, despite their view of society's failures, accept as valid the basic structure of our democratic system; their main desire is to improve its ability to live up to its stated values.

Their efforts to do so are welcome when they take the form of petitions, demonstrations and protests that are peaceful and non-violent. Although many persons are unsettled by these activities (which are often of a bizarre nature), we must all remember that peaceful expression of disturbing ideas and petitions for the redress of the grievances are fundamental rights safeguarded by the First Amendment of our Constitution.

Methods of dealing with "campus unrest" must not confuse peaceful protest and petition with violent disruption. To do so will aggravate rather than solve the problem.

A small but determined minority, however, aims not at reform but at the destruction of existing institutions. These are the nihilists.

They resort to violent disruption as the means best suited to achieve their ends.

By dramatic tactics of terror, they have focused wide-spread public attention upon themselves and have often induced university authorities either to surrender or to meet force with force. When they have managed on occasion to provide counterforce to an excessive degree, they have succeeded in enlisting the sympathies of the more moderate campus majority.

They are the agent that converts constructive student concern into mindless mob hysteria. They are the chief danger to the university and its basic values.

There is also a minority of students who are not nihilists, but who feel that violence and disruption may be the only effective way of achieving societal and university reform.

II

Forcible obstruction and violence are incompatible with the intellectual and personal freedom that lies at the core of campus values. In its recent declaration on campus unrest, the American Council on Education noted that "there has developed among some of the young a cult of irrationality and incivility which severely strain attempts to maintain sensible and decent human communications. Within this cult is a minute group of destroyers who have abandoned hope in today's society, in today's university and in the processes of orderly discussion to secure significant change."

These "destroyers" seek to persuade more moderate students that verbal expressions of grievance go unheeded while forcible tactics bring affirmative results.

Despite some eloquent and subtle rationalizations for violent methods of protest, the record of experience is incontrovertible. While violent protest is sometimes followed by the concessions sought, it more often produces a degree of counterviolence and public dismay that may gravely damage the cause for which violence is invoked.

Even when violence succeeds in achieving immediate social gains, it tends frequently to feed on itself, with one power group imposing its will on another until repressive elements succeed in re-establishing order.

The violent cycles of the French and Russian Revolutions and of the decade resulting in the Third Reich are stark summits of history to ponder. All history teaches that as a conscious method of seeking social reform, violence is a very dangerous weapon to employ.

President's reminder

That is why our nation has sought to avoid violent methods of effecting social change, and to foster instead the principles of peaceful advocacy proclaimed in the Bill of Rights and the rule of law. As the President has just reminded us:

"The purpose of these restraints is not to protect an 'establishment' but to establish the protection of liberty; not to prevent change, but to insure that change reflects the public will and respects the rights of all."

The university is the citadel of man's learning and of his hope for further self-improvement and is the special guardian of this heritage. Those who work and study on the campus should think long before they risk its destruction by resorting to force as the quick way of reaching some immediate goal.

Father Theodore Hesburgh of Notre Dame has observed that the university, precisely because it is an open community that lives by the power of reason, stands naked before those who would employ the power of force.

It can prevail only when the great majority of its members share its commitment to rational discourse, listen closely to those with conflicting views, and stand together against the few who would impose their will on everyone else.

Kingman Brewster of Yale has persuasively articulated this policy:

"Proposition one is the encouragement of controversy, no matter how fundamental; and the protection of dissent, no matter how extreme. This is not just to permit the 'letting off steam' but because it will improve (the university) is a place to be educated."

"Proposition number two is a convincing intention to deal speedily and firmly with any forcible interference with student and faculty activities or the normal use of any (university) facilities . . . I see no basis for compromise on the basic proposition that forcible coercion and violent intimidation are unacceptable means of persuasion and unacceptable techniques of change in a university community, as long as channels of communication and the chance for reasoned arguments are available."

Belief in an enclave

Several attitudes held by members of the university community have often interfered with the application of these sensible standards.

One is the belief of many that the civil law should not apply to internal campus affairs. They feel that the academy is an enclave, sheltered from the law, that the forces of civil authority may not enter the campus, save by invitation. This is a serious misconception—a residue of the time when the academy served in loco parentis, making and enforcing its own rules for students' behavior and protecting them from the law outside, save for such extreme crimes as murder and arson.

Now that students themselves have finally discarded school authority over their personal lives, they must logically accept the jurisdiction of civil authority. They cannot argue that of all Americans they are uniquely beyond the reach of the law.

At the same time, the university is ill equipped to control violent and obstructive conduct on its own. Most institutions have few campus police; most of these are not deputized and thus do not possess true police power.

Few schools have explicit rules either defining the boundaries of permissible protest or stating the consequences if the boundaries are crossed. Some have very loose rules for disciplinary proceedings; others have diffused disciplinary power so widely among students, faculty and administration that effective discipline is difficult to impose, and is seldom imposed quickly enough to meet an emergency.

And in most institutions the ultimate internal disciplinary sanction of suspension or expulsion lies unused because the campus community shrinks from its probable dismissed students to the draft and what students call the "death sentence" of Vietnam.

III

Out of many discussions with faculty members, students and administrators, and with full appreciation that no two institutions are the same, we offer the campus community the following specific suggestions:

1. A broad consensus should be achieved among students, faculty and administration concerning the permissible methods of presenting ideas, proposals and grievances and the consequences of going beyond them.

Excellent guidelines have been provided by the American Council on Education's recent declaration on campus protest. These could usefully be supplemented by more detailed statements developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors, the American Association of Universities, the American Council on Education, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the National Student Association, and possibly others.

Where agreed upon and explicit codes of student conduct and procedures for student discipline are lacking, they should be adopted; where they already exist they

should be reviewed and, if necessary, improved.

Students have the right to due process and to participate in the making of decisions that directly affect them, but their right of participation should not be so extensive as to paralyze the disciplinary process itself.

Codes for campus conduct should place primary reliance on the power of the institution to maintain order in its own house, and on its courage to apply its own punishment when deserved.

These codes should also recognize the universal duty to obey the civil and criminal laws of the larger society, and the right of the civil authorities to act when laws are violated.

The use of police

2. Universities should prepare and currently review contingency plans for dealing with campus disorders. Advance plans should be made to determine, insofar as possible, the circumstances under which the university will use (1) campus disciplinary procedures, (2) campus police, (3) court injunctions, (4) other court sanctions and (5) the civil police.

A definite plan, flexibility employed at the moment of crisis, is essential. There have been enough violent and obstructive incidents on enough campuses to permit institutions to assess alternative courses of action and to anticipate both the varieties of disorder which might occur and the most appropriate response.

Most importantly, university authorities should make known in advance that they will not hesitate to call on civil police when circumstances dictate and should review in advance with police officials the degree of force suitable for particular situations:

It is a melancholy fact that even in cases where the need for calling back the civil police has been generally recognized, the degree of force actually employed has frequently been perceived as excessive by the majority of the campus community, whose sympathies then turned against the university authorities.

Indeed, there is reason to believe that a primary objective of campus revolutionaries is to provoke the calling of police and the kinds of police conduct that will bring the majority over to their side.

Clear decision-making

3. Procedures for campus governance and constructive reform should be developed to permit more rapid and effective decision-making. There is great misunderstanding and confusion as to where ultimate authority for campus decision-making lies. The fact is that the authority is shared among several elements.

By law, trustees are granted full authority over colleges and universities. But trustees cannot supervise the day-to-day affairs of a university; hence they delegate power to the president. The president, however, in addition to being the agent of the trustees, is the leader of the faculty. His effectiveness derives as much from campus consensus of faculty and students as it does from the power delegated to him by the trustees.

In the American system of higher education, the faculty plays the primary role in determining the educational program and all issues directly relevant to education and faculty research. Unlike the systems of some other countries, educational control in the American system is faculty-oriented; anything else is a deviation from the norm.

Faculty control of education and research is the best guarantee we have of academic freedom. It is a precious asset that must not under any circumstances be sacrificed. Most student demands for change pertain to educational and research matters and too often their efforts have been directed toward administrative officers who usually do not have the power the students assume they possess.

And often, too, some faculty members have

mistakenly joined with students in using coercive force against administrative officers when it is the faculty itself that should deal appropriately and effectively with the issues in question.

Quick response urged

Most other powers in the university are diffused. For most purposes, shared power is an asset. But to prevent disorders, universities must be able to respond quickly.

Campus protests are sometimes escalated to the level of force because legitimate grievances, peacefully urged, have been referred to university committees which were slow to respond. Scholars have the habit of examining any hypothesis, debating it exhaustively, deferring decision to await more evidence, and when something must be decided, shunning a consensus in favor of subtle shades of disagreement and dissent.

For the process of education, these are admirable qualities. But for dealing with naked force, they can be a prescription for disaster. Faculties therefore have a special obligation to organize themselves more effectively, to create representative groups with power to act and to maintain constant and systematic lines of communication with students.

They should be ready to meet every challenge to the educational integrity of the institution. If this integrity is compromised, it will be the faculty that suffers the most.

Students should, of course, have a meaningful role in the governance of all noneducational, nonresearch functions. They should serve, too, on committees dealing with educational and related questions, exercising their right to be heard on these subjects, so long as the faculty remains paramount.

Better communications

4. Faculty leaders and administrative officers need to make greater efforts to improve communications both on the campus and with alumni and the general public.

Campus difficulties are constantly aggravated by misinformation and misunderstanding. On campus, large numbers of faculty and students often act on the basis of rumor or incomplete information. Alumni and the general public receive incomplete, often distorted, accounts of campus developments.

The communications media, on and off the campus, concentrate on controversy. Much of the peaceful progress of our colleges and universities is never communicated to the outside world. Campus authorities have the responsibility to see to it that a balanced picture is portrayed.

IV

To the larger society, we make these suggestions:

1. The majority of the American people are justifiably angry at students who engage in violent and obstructive tactics. While the public varies widely in its desire for social change, it shares a common belief in the value of social order.

It also regards university students as among the most privileged in society—among those who should understand best the importance of freedom and the dangers of anarchy.

One outlet for this public resentment has been the support of legislation withholding financial aid both from students who engage in disruption and from colleges and universities that fail to control them.

There has also been a steady weakening of public sentiment in favor of the additional public funding that higher education so badly needs. Current appropriations for new facilities and for annual operating costs have been insufficient. Some private universities have faced a reduction in individual and corporate gifts.

Existing laws already withdraw financial aid from students who engage in disruptive acts. Additional laws along the same lines would not accomplish any useful purpose.

Such efforts are likely to spread, not reduce the difficulty.

More than seven million young Americans are enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities; the vast majority neither participate in nor sympathize with campus violence.

If aid is withdrawn from even a few students in a manner that the campus views as unjust, the result may be to radicalize a much larger number by convincing them that existing governmental institutions are as inhumane as the revolutionaries claim.

If the law unjustly forces the university to cut off financial aid or to expel a student, the university as well may come under widespread campus condemnation.

Use of legislation

2. We believe that the urge to enact additional legislation should be turned into a channel that could assist the universities themselves to deal more effectively with the tactics of obstruction, State and municipal laws against trespass and disorderly conduct may not be wholly effective means of dealing with some acts of physical obstruction.

They were not written to deal with such conduct, and they do not cope with the central issue—forcible interference with the First Amendment rights of others.

We are presently considering whether there is a need for statutes authorizing universities, along with other affected persons, to obtain court injunctions against willful private acts of physical obstruction that prevent other persons from exercising their First Amendment rights of speech, peaceable assembly, and petition for the redress of grievances.

Such laws would not be aimed at students exclusively but at any willful interference with First Amendment rights, on or off the campus, by students or by nonstudents. They would also be available to uphold the First Amendment rights by students as well as other citizens.

3. Finally we urge the American people to recognize that the campus mirrors both the yearnings and the weaknesses of the wider society. Erik Erikson, a renowned student of youth, has noted that young and old achieve mutual respect when "society recognizes the young individual as a bearer of fresh energy, and he recognizes society as a living process which inspires loyalty as it receives it, maintains allegiance as it extracts it, honors confidence as it demands it."

One effective way for the rest of us to help reduce campus disorders is to focus on the unfinished task of striving toward the goals of human life that all of us share and that young people admire and respect.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HARVARD FACULTY

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., June 9.—The central functions of an academic community are learning, teaching, research and scholarship. They must be characterized by reasoned discourse, intellectual honesty, mutual respect and openness to constructive change. By accepting membership in this community, an individual neither surrenders his rights nor escapes his fundamental responsibilities as a citizen, but acquires additional rights as well as responsibilities to the whole university community.

They do not require him to be silent and passive. But they do require him to see how easily an academic community can be violated—knowingly or unknowingly—whether by actual violence or by lack of responsiveness to widely perceived needs for change; whether by impatience or by insensitivity, or by failure in a process of decision to make sufficient effort to consult those who have to live with the results of the decision.

We believe it timely to state explicitly what certain of these rights and responsibilities are, and to establish procedures for their pro-

tection and enforcement. The present formulation is an Interim Statement, limited to activities that touch on the essential functions of a university. We recognize the need to formulate, in the near future, a document that will emerge from the widest discussion within and will reflect a wide consensus of all members of the Harvard community. This statement shall apply equally to students, to officers of instruction and to officers of administration.

ALL HAVE THE RIGHT

All individuals or groups within the university community have the right to express, advocate and publicize their opinions. They also have the right to press by appropriate means for action on any matter on which they believe that the university can and should act, and they have the right to be given a full and fair hearing and serve the essential commitment of the university and the right of individual or collective expression of opinion or dissent.

We have taken and will continue to take measures aimed both at dealing with issues and grievances raised by members of the community and at improving and broadening the procedures by which such matters can be resolved and decisions made. We welcome participation of all members of the community in this endeavor.

We regard the following activities as unacceptable because they would prevent or impede the performance of the essential tasks of the university and are incompatible with the shared purpose of an academic community:

- Violence against any member or guest of the university community.
- Deliberate interference with academic freedom and freedom of speech (including not only disruption of a class but also interference with the freedom of any speaker invited by any section of the university community to express his views).
- Theft or willful destruction of university property or of the property of members of the university.
- Forcible interference with the freedom of movement of any member or guest of the university.
- Obstruction of the normal processes and activities essential to the functions of the university community.

Any such activity shall subject the violator to discipline by an appropriate agency.

SUBJECT TO DISCIPLINE

In case of any violation of any of the subparagraphs A through E by a student, he shall be subject to appropriate discipline within the full range of possible disciplinary measures by the faculty or by a committee or agent to which the faculty may have delegated disciplinary power.

Appropriate discipline for a student who violates sub paragraph A will ordinarily be expulsion, dismissal, separation or requirement to withdraw. In cases of violations of sub paragraphs C, D, and E, discipline will ordinarily be initiated upon complaint by a member of the university community adversely affected, or on a determination of probable cause by a committee or agent to which the faculty may have delegated disciplinary power.

In cases of violation of any of the subparagraphs A through E, a student found to be engaging in unacceptable activities may be warned to stop. If, despite the warning, the student persists in the unacceptable activity, he may be suspended summarily from the university by a committee or agent to which the faculty may have delegated disciplinary power, pending completion of a regular disciplinary proceeding.

Occasions may arise that may require the appropriate university authorities to use other proper means to control or terminate unacceptable activities. It is the sense of the faculty that the appropriate authority

should attempt, whenever possible, to deal with such occasions through the disciplinary measures described in the preceding paragraphs. The faculty also urges that appropriate university authorities consult with representative student and faculty bodies to the maximum extent practicable in devising and implementing ways to invoke other proper means of control.

While this Interim Statement is in effect, the disciplinary authority over students engaging in the activities listed above shall be delegated to the Committee of Fifteen or a designated successor. The power of summary suspension shall be delegated jointly to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Committee of Fifteen (or its designated successor), who are authorized to establish appropriate working arrangements to give effect to this power.

We further affirm that an officer of instruction or administration who engages in the unacceptable activities listed above should also be considered subject to discipline by the appropriate agencies of the university.

HOW TO RADICALIZE STUDENTS

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, June 9.—It may already be too late to stop the punitive, unnecessary and ill-conceived legislation against students and universities now being seriously considered in the House of Representatives; but if anything can halt the blundering rush of vengeful politicians into Federal control of education, it may be the sensible statement issued today by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

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

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

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

CUTTING OFF AID

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

This does not refer merely to student loans and grants; the bill says specifically that the assistance to be terminated also includes veterans' benefits under the G.I. Bill of Rights; payments of a surviving child's insurance benefits under Social Security; and salaries of faculty members engaged in training Peace Corps volunteers. All these, plus loans and grants, to be denied for a period

of five years, and almost as an afterthought, the bill adds that if a student so penalized at one institution then transfers to another, the second has to honor the cutoff of assistance ordered by the first, no matter what the student's subsequent conduct.

DANGERS OF MEASURE

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

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

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

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

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

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

MORE JUDICIAL RESIGNATIONS— BUT FROM THE WRONG PARTNER- SHIP

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in my speech of May 15, I had included extracts of public records identifying land partnerships involving several Federal judges. Anyone with a second grade education could see that such participating judges fall under suspicion as to their judicial decisions affecting land values in this area because of their vested real estate interests.

Now we find that from Justice Brennan to Judge Skelley Wright, second thoughts are arising on their plantation investments and that they may even dispose of their interests.

The question unanswered is the degree to which their partnership businesses prospered as a result of their extremist social decisions which have brought about population and business relocations in the area.

If they are sincere jurists, dedicated to the idea of impartial justice, then they know way down deep inside that the injury inflicted on our judiciary nationwide by their selfish greed demands

more than self-exoneration by ceasing that particular wrongdoing. It demands that they immediately resign from the bench.

Various newspaper clippings follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star,
June 12, 1969]

APARTMENT INVESTMENT LINKS SEVERED BY JUSTICE BRENNAN (By Lyle Denniston)

Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan Jr. has severed his financial investment in an Arlington apartment complex as part of his full withdrawal from non-judicial activities.

A spokesman for the justice said yesterday that Brennan has given up the limited partnership which he has held for about three years in Concord Village Associates, which operates a large apartment development in Arlington. Official records have indicated that Brennan's share in the group was worth an estimated \$15,000.

It was disclosed earlier this week that Brennan had resigned from his annual position as a teacher at a judges' seminar at New York University Law School.

Yesterday, his office said that resignation came on May 23, the same day on which the justice decided to cancel all speech commitments and to withdraw from all other off-the-bench activities.

CONNECTION CUT

A day or two after making those decisions, Brennan's office said, he sold his only stock investments and severed his connection with the apartment venture. The stock he sold was in American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Public Service Co. of New Jersey. All the securities had been left to him by his mother, his office said.

Asked what had led Brennan to withdraw from non-judicial affairs, a spokesman in his office said only that it was "a personal decision."

The justice's withdrawal came within nine days after a colleague, Justice Abe Fortas, resigned from the court amid controversy over his non-judicial connections.

Arlington County records indicated that, in addition to Brennan, the limited partners of Concord Village Associates included Justice Fortas, his wife Carolyn Agger, and two judges on the U.S. Court of Appeals here—J. Skelley Wright and David L. Bazelon.

Judge Wright told a reporter yesterday: "In view of Justice Brennan's position, I will certainly reconsider my position."

Wright said that his investment in the group was "the smallest on the list," and he valued it at about \$7,500.

Judge Bazelon was quoted by the Associated Press yesterday as saying he was considering what to do about his interest in the venture, but had not yet made up his mind.

Meanwhile, a second Senate subcommittee announced that it would examine the outside activities which federal judges ought to perform and the general question of judicial ethics.

FIVE-DAY HEARINGS

Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr., D-N.C., chairman of the Senate subcommittee on separation of powers, said his panel would hold five days of hearings beginning July 11.

Although the senator said his panel would be looking into the probability of new legislation, a subcommittee aide said there was no intent to move rapidly towards action on reform bills. The subcommittee study was described as more of a basic analysis of the problem of off-the-bench ethics.

Another Senate subcommittee on judicial efficiency, headed by Sen. Joseph D. Tydings, D-Md., has been active in the field of judicial ethics recently.

Both the Ervin and Tydings subcommittees are part of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1969]
BAZELON TO REVIEW HIS REALTY INVESTMENTS
(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

Chief Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals here has decided to "review" the propriety of more than \$300,000 worth of investments he has in at least eight local real estate syndicates.

He told a reporter this yesterday, as a fellow appellate judge, J. Skelley Wright, disclosed he is withdrawing from similar real state ventures.

Wright's move followed a similar withdrawal earlier this week by U.S. Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan. Wright said that, like Brennan, he has severed all financial ties outside the court.

Wright said that because "continuing publicity has unfortunately reflected on the judiciary" and his family, he has decided to request a real estate firm to liquidate his property investments. He described the investment as residential property in Arlington County that is "in no way connected with the Government."

Bazelon's holdings in the syndicates, which own office and apartment buildings here, are much more extensive than were those of either Brennan or Wright.

In the wake of the recent resignation from the Supreme Court of Justice Abe Fortas, the Judicial Conference of the United States adopted apparently non-enforceable resolutions prohibiting Federal judges from receiving any "compensation" for "services" outside the courthouse.

Investments and the receipt of investment income did not appear to be barred, although details of a judge's investments would be filed with the Judicial Conference.

Justice Brennan and Judges Bazelon and Wright—along with investors that included Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), former Justice and United Nations Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, and former Justice Fortas—have been partners in syndicates investing in large office buildings and apartment complexes here.

Most of the syndicates were assembled by Washington builder and community leader, Charles Smith and his firm. They bought or built office and apartment buildings in Washington, Alexandria and Arlington.

Key partners in some of the deals were Washington parking and land magnates Dominic F. Antonelli Jr. and Kingdon Gould Jr. Gould recently was named Ambassador to Luxembourg.

Tax experts generally regard investments such as these "tax shelters" that can reduce the income tax impact on wealthy investors, primarily through accelerated depreciation deductions and capital gains tax rates.

Brennan and Wright each held small shares of just one of the syndicates, Concord Village Associates, owner of a large apartment complex in Arlington. Brennan's share was worth an estimated \$15,000; Wright's \$7500.

Bazelon's investments, according to public partnership records, have been much more extensive. Reporters found him listed as an investor in eight syndicates. His wife, Miriam, is listed as an investor in three of them; trust funds for his two children hold shares in one syndicate.

Bazelon would not comment on whether this was the complete extent of his investments in these ventures. He also would not say how much the holdings were worth.

Partnership records list the total value of his share in just four of the ventures at more than \$200,000. Information in other records makes it possible to estimate the value of his holdings in all eight at between \$300,000 and \$400,000.

"I went into these investments because I thought they were proper," Bazelon said yesterday. "They are all matters of public record."

If in his review of the holdings, he finds that they may now lie outside the new code or appear otherwise undesirable, Bazelon said, he would drop them.

Besides Concord Village Associates, the syndicates in which Bazelon has invested include:

Colorado Building Associates, which bought Colorado Building at 1341 G st nw. 1919 M Street Associates, which built a high-rise office building at that address.

1140 Connecticut Avenue Limited Partnership, which built a new office building at that address.

Downtown Associates, which owns an office building at 1201 E st nw.

Duke Associates, which developed the Orleans Village apartment complex in Alexandria.

Crystal House Associates, developer in the Crystal City office and apartment building complex.

Wilson Associates, developer of another Arlington high-rise.

Bazelon's share as a limited partner in these ventures ranges from 2.4 per cent of 1140 Connecticut Avenue Limited to 8 per cent of Colorado Building Associates.

His financial share, according to public records, is as high as \$60,000 (plus another \$15,000 invested by his wife) in 1919 M Street Associates, and \$61,229 invested in Crystal House Associates.

Sen. Ribicoff is listed as a partner of both Duke Associates and 1140 Connecticut Avenue Limited. Goldberg is listed as owning 2 per cent of 1140 Connecticut Avenue Limited.

All three have said that they were brought into the syndicates by Charles Smith, who has also been a limited partner in most of the ventures. The limited partners only contribute capital and share in the profits or losses of the ventures.

General partners, most often members of Smith's family or firm, handle negotiations for and management of the properties and all other work involved in the investment.

Smith, a highly successful developer here, became well known to the judges and other investors through his civic, philanthropic and Jewish community activities.

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 1969]

RIGGING OF JUDICIAL PANELS IN COURT OF APPEALS DENIED—ATTORNEYS SUSPICIOUS OF SYSTEM

(By Thomas W. Lippman)

Is it true, as some critics suspect, that the panels of judges at the U.S. Court of Appeals here are sometimes rigged so that certain cases will be decided in certain ways?

That question, often asked by lawyers in private conversations, provided a tense moment last week when one attorney dared to put it directly to the court at the Washington Judicial Conference.

Norman M. Littell, who has practiced law in the courts here for years, raised the issue in a room occupied by most of the city's trial and appellate judges and by many of its influential lawyers.

Why is it, Littell wanted to know, that on the "Bazelon court," certain "sociological cases" always seem to be assigned to certain "liberal" judges?

His reference was to Chief Judge David L. Bazelon, leader of the liberal wing on a court that has broken much new ground in criminal, mental health and civil liberties law during his seven-year tenure in that office.

Many of the controversial cases were decided by 2-to-1 votes, over the dissents of such "conservative" judges as Chief Justice-designate Warren E. Burger. Most cases in the court are heard by three-judge panels.

Littell's question was directed at Judge J. Skelly Wright, who was representing the

court in a panel discussion on dockets and calendars. He is a legal ally of Bazelon.

"The cases are selected by lot," Judge Wright said. "The panels are designated by lot—they are literally picked out of a hat, at random, by the clerk. I don't know of any complaint that this system has been breached in any way."

Wright then called Nathan J. Paulson, the clerk of the court, to come to the microphone and give an explanation of the case assignment procedures.

"I would have been fired," Paulson said, if there had been any question about the assignment of cases.

He said that he put the names of sitting judges in one tin, and the numbers of the cases in another. "I don't even know what the cases are," he said, "because they're listed only by number. I pull out the names of three judges, and the numbers of three cases, and that's the calendar for the day, period."

Lawyers who practice before the court do not know until the day of argument which judges have been assigned to hear their cases. But when they find out, they are often heard exchanging such remarks as, "with that panel, we're dead," or, "we got a good panel."

And it does sometimes appear that the outcome of some issues can be guessed in advance because of the marked views of some judges on certain issues.

Judge Bazelon, for example, has a strong interest in mental health and in the law of criminal insanity.

Since Jan. 1 of this year, the Court has issued written opinions in seven cases in which mental health or criminal insanity was the central issues. Bazelon was on the panel in all of them. Judge Edward A. Tamm, perhaps the most vigorously conservative of the active judges, was in only one of them.

On the other hand, opinions have been issued in 18 criminal cases in which the central point was either the validity of police identification procedures, or the admissibility of confessions, both sensitive issues.

In these cases, no visible pattern of judicial assignment emerges. No active judge was on the panel in more than 10 of the 18 cases, or fewer than three.

The problem with any assessment of the court's activity is that it takes no account of the scores of cases decided without a formal opinion. These are cases in which the court issues a cursory order, without explanation, so that it is impossible to tell which judge took what views of the issues raised—or even what those issues were.

A case on criminal insanity, for example, might prompt the issuance of a landmark opinion from one panel of judges, or be dismissed without comment by a different panel.

So it is theoretically possible that the reason Bazelon appears in all the criminal insanity opinions is that only when he is on the panel do such cases prompt written opinions at all.

A review of a dozen major opinions issued by the court in the past 18 months, on lord and tenant law to vagrancy statutes, shows a wide variety of judges on the panels that issued them. Most lean to the so-called liberal side, but then the liberals have had a wide majority on the court, so that no inferences other than mathematical probability can be drawn.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 13, 1969]

WARREN HELPED JUDGES ADOPT RULES ON INCOME

(By Lyle Denniston)

Chief Justice Earl Warren apparently helped persuade a meeting of federal judges to adopt a strict ban on their outside income by hinting that Supreme Court justices would follow the example.

Several sources had varying versions of what Warren told the 25-member U.S. Judicial Conference on Tuesday, when it met here to write a flat prohibition on "compensation" for all federal judges—except justices.

But they agreed that the chief justice had left "implications" that, before Warren retired on June 23 or 30, some degree of compliance by the justices themselves would be promised.

However, the judges apparently had no assurance, as such, that the court would act—collectively or individually. In fact, some jurists came away from the meeting of the conference, the policy-making arm of the federal judiciary, doubting that Warren could get action even if he tried.

The continuing discussions among judges about whether they had taken vows of self-denial that the high court would not imitate indicated they were beginning to sense the pressure on them from the newly adopted restrictions on off-the-bench activities.

The curbs plainly were prompted by the recent controversy over the outside affiliations—and income—of high court members, particularly former Justice Abe Fortas and Justice William O. Douglas.

Yet, when a participant suggested the resolution's wording be changed to make it apply to "judge or justice" instead of simply "judge," the meeting Tuesday was told the conference has no power over the Supreme Court.

It is clear that some of the judges at the meeting did not know, in advance, that the justices would be completely exempt from anything adopted by the conference.

Apparently reacting to this discovery, some of them brought up with Warren what—if any—reaction could be expected from the justices.

Reportedly, Warren said he expected the matter to be under further discussion within the court, and that something may come of that. Some judges have interpreted these remarks as an assurance of action; other considered them only a broad hint.

The chief justice, one source said, had made a point of stressing the independence of each member of the high tribunal, and that he had to be careful not to suggest they could be required to do anything.

GENERAL FERGUSON, AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMANDER, SAYS ROUTE TO MOON PASSES THROUGH ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER IN TULSAHOMA, TENN.

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 16, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Gen. James Ferguson, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, recently delivered the principal address at the dedication of the new airport at Arnold Engineering Development Center in Tulsa, Tenn., in the Fourth Congressional District which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

General Ferguson pointed out that the route to the moon passes through Tulsa and AEDC because of the unique and essential testing which AEDC provides for space vehicles.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in our aerospace program and because of the outstanding role which this major test-

ing facility plays in our space and aircraft development programs, I place General Ferguson's remarks in the RECORD.

The address follows:

REMARKS AT ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER, FORMAL OPENING OF NEW AIRFIELD, ARNOLD AIR FORCE STATION, TENN., MAY 28, 1969

General LUNDQUIST, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a pleasure for me to be here with you today to celebrate the formal opening of a long-awaited and much-needed addition to this important national test facility.

The Arnold Engineering Development Center is a great national facility—indeed, as I have stressed on many occasions this past year, it is a great national resource. By operating as a service to the military, NASA, educational institutions and civilian industry, Arnold plays a vital role in maintaining and advancing our nation's aerospace technology.

Virtually every major space and aircraft system in our nation's inventory spent part of its early life here in Middle Tennessee.

In a very real sense, the route to the moon passes through Tullahoma, Tennessee and the Arnold Center. Through the use of the giant wind tunnels, unique test cells and space simulation chambers at the Arnold Center, the nation is able to reduce the costs and times required to develop today's complex aerospace systems.

On this significant occasion, we recognize once again the wisdom of General Henry Arnold, the vision of Dr. Theodor von Karman, and the foresight of the other men of science and government who advocated and fought for these facilities a quarter century ago. Where would we be today without their vision and direction?

Consider the tragic and unnecessary losses in aircraft, in missiles and spacecraft, the money and time misspent—and most importantly—consider the lives which might have been lost if we had to test in the air what

we now probe on the ground in these Arnold facilities.

The Arnold Center is more than a sprawling collection of mortar, inlets, compressors, combustors, nozzles, diffusers, and pressure tanks. It is a closely knit group of dedicated men and women—professional in their approach, responsive to the problems of an expanding aerospace environment, and imbued with a strong sense of urgency to meet the nation's critical needs for improved facilities and new test techniques.

AEDC and similar facilities must continue to grow if they are to fill their vital role in the technological world of tomorrow. To this end, we have the responsibility and the obligation to inform our fellow citizens and their elected government representatives of the need for new and improved test facilities.

There are some important reasons why we should expand our facilities here and at our other test sites throughout the country.

First, we must look at the competition—it is clearly evident that the Soviet Union is placing a heavy emphasis on progressive research, test, and technical facilities. They are sparing no effort to insure that they will have the facilities to test their future aerospace systems.

The second reason for concern is the state of our own facilities. While they have been adequate to meet our present needs, we have definitely reached a limit in our ability to "make-do" on a year-to-year basis. Advances in the state-of-the-art are rapidly making obsolete some of the facilities and methods of testing used here today. For example, we have no test cell in this country at present which is completely adequate for testing the C-5A engine without flying it.

Third, we know from our experience at Arnold and other facilities that our test capability must anticipate future requirements before the requirements themselves are clearly understood. It is virtually impossible to advocate a major new facility on the strength of a specific future program. In many cases, the facility must exist before

the technologies necessary to the program can be identified.

Fourth, we must face the fact that it takes from three to five years to design and construct any greatly advanced test facility. It usually takes even longer to justify the expenditure, get budget approval and have the money appropriated.

These four points add up to the fact that we are already behind the times and the state-of-the-art in planning for future test facilities. Our test facilities are the foundation of our aerospace future, and we cannot afford to let this foundation crumble.

There are two groups presently studying our national test requirements. One is the Joint Coordinating Board of the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The other is the Joint Commanders' Ad Hoc Group for Testing Facilities. The urgency of this matter leads us to hope that they can make recommendations as far reaching as those made by Dr. von Karman's Scientific Advisory Committee, which led to the establishment of the Arnold facilities.

We are assembled today at a visible milestone of progress in the 20-year history of the Arnold Center. We have been pressing for construction of this runway for years, and its completion means that our operation here will serve its many users more efficiently.

This landing strip will eliminate the necessity for trucking rocket motors and other critical and sensitive test items over highways from Stewart Air Force Base, Northern Field and other airports in the area. It will speed up the testing process as well as eliminate a major inconvenience to the using agencies.

This runway represents yet another useful addition to one of our country's most vital national resources.

We all share your enthusiasm and your aspirations for the continued growth and achievement of the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

Thank you.

SENATE—Tuesday, June 17, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, look upon this good land, which Thou hast given us, and forsake us not in our hour of need. Let Thy spirit come upon us once more with purging, cleansing, and redeeming power. Search out the dark places of our souls, our homes, our schools, our cities, our whole culture, and by the light of Thy presence, lead us again to true brotherhood, to moral rectitude, and to the spiritual splendors of our fathers. Deliver us from the ravages of division, discord and hostility, and lead us to unity, concord and peace. Bring us to Thee and to Thy law; forgive us and encompass us in Thy love, lest we perish. Put Thy law in our minds and Thy love in our hearts, that we may show by our lives what we proclaim with our lips—a nation whose God is the Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication addressed to the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1969.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 16, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the

Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar, No. 395.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated, as requested by the Senator from Montana.