

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS OF TEXAS
AND FACULTY OPPOSE ABM

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 20, 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from 13 members of the faculty and graduate students in the Physics Department of the University of Texas at Austin, Tex., another letter from 14 members of the Physics Department of Texas A. & M. University, and a letter from eight students and members of the academic community of the University of Texas at Austin, all opposing the ABM. The last-mentioned letter was attached to a petition containing the signatures of over 1,000 people at the University of Texas at Austin who are against the ABM proposal.

Mr. President, these names on the petition were collected over a period of several days when the petition was available for signature outside the Student Union Building at the University of Texas at Austin. The petition and these letters tell me that there is great public opposition to the ABM proposal in my home State of Texas. We cannot ram this multibillion-dollar program down the throats of an unwilling people. I hope that the Senate will keep this fact in mind when it votes on this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters, one from the Department of Physics, University of Texas, dated February 26, 1969; one from the Physics Department of Texas A. & M. University; and one from a group of University of Texas students dated April 19, 1969, along with the names of their signers; and the text of the petition from the University of Texas at Austin, together with the names of all of the signers, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT
AUSTIN, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS,
Austin, Tex., February 26, 1969.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We the undersigned faculty and graduate students at the University of Texas at Austin urge you to vote against any additional appropriations for the Sentinel Antibalistic Missile System. We believe that the Sentinel system does not constitute a technically feasible defense against a nuclear attack with ballistic missiles and that any advantage obtained from such system can be easily offset by minor, inexpensive modifications of offensive weapons. We also feel that the construction of the Sentinel system at this time will increase international tensions and lead to an immediate escalation of the arms race. We therefore conclude that the costs as well as the dangers inherent in placing nuclear warheads in populated areas far outweigh any advantages of the Sentinel system and we urge you to oppose its construction.

Robert G. Yoes, Faculty Associate in Physics; Eugene Couch, Faculty Associate, Dept. of Physics; Alfred Schild, Professor of Physics; Laurence Shepley, Assistant Professor of Physics; Richard Matzner, Faculty Associate, Dept. of Physics; Albert R. Exton, Faculty Associate, Dept. of Physics; William Kinnersley, Faculty Associate, Dept. of Physics; Richard Tropp, Teaching Assistant, Dept. of Physics; William H. Marlow, Research Scientist; Ph. D. Candidate; Physics; John W. Middleton, Teaching Assistant, Physics; Yinger Ehlers, Professor of Physics; Robert S. Castroll, Teaching Associate, Mathematics Dept.; John A. Campbell, Assistant Professor, Physics and Computer Science.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We the undersigned members of the physics department of Texas A. & M. University, wish to express our opposition to the proposed deployment of the Safeguard Antibalistic Missile System. We respectfully urge that you vote against the authorization and appropriation of the funds necessary to deploy the Safeguard System.

This petition reflects the individual sentiments of the undersigned individuals and in no way represents an official position of the named institution.

J. Nuttall, associate professor; Ronald Bryan, visiting lecturer; F. Alan McDonald, asst. prof.; William A. Pearce, asst. prof.; Lee C. Northcliffe, assoc. prof.; R. K. Vaneyer, asst. prof.; G. W. Kattaman, assoc. prof.; E. Reyne, assoc. prof.; C. N. Adams, grad student; L. L. Rutledge, Jr., grad student; Mity C. Plummer, grad student; Joe S. Ham, prof.; Donald F. Weekes, professor; Harold Cohen, post doctoral research associate.

APRIL 19, 1969.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We strongly believe that the ABM system advocated by the present administration is sheer madness. The Administration claims that this "defense" system is not provocative; this is simply not true. When the Soviet Union had set up a limited ABM system around Moscow we responded by developing the MIRV, the most deadly warhead ever created. This, in turn, forced the Russians to keep abreast militarily of the Americans. In now advocating the deployment of the ABM system, our military leaders fail to recognize how terribly they are escalating the arms race. Does our military assume the Soviet Union will react more sanely to our ABM than we did to theirs? There are purely technical reasons for opposing the ABM. In the February, 1968 issue of *Scientific American*, Hans Bethe maintains that after spending billions of dollars, the system could be quite easily foiled by new Russian technological advances. Another scientist, writing in the April, 1969 issue of the same journal, claims that the chances of nuclear war will be greatly increased if the ABM system is adopted. Presently, neither side can gain much of an advantage by initiating a nuclear attack. We, like the Russians, will suffer equally, whether we initiate or retaliate. If, however, ABM's are set up on both sides (if they indeed function; many scientists have their doubts), the country which attacks first will suffer least. Therefore, when a crisis situation arises, either side is more likely to push the panic button.

Militant nationalism is an absurd concept in this nuclear age. The United States can only protect her people by insuring world peace. This means that we must actively put an end to the action-reaction cycle which can only escalate the arms race, draining the financial resources so badly needed to cope with the world's domestic problems. The deployment of the ABM will serve only to bring us one step closer to a nuclear disaster, prompted by those who claim they are seeking but to defend the nation. Let us not force the Russians into the position of having to deploy a system even more terrible than the ABM, a device that will spell the doom of the up-coming arms negotiations, if not the world itself.

We are well aware of your solid opposition to the ABM. We hope this letter and the petition enclosed (signed by more than 1000 members of the Austin academic community) will bolster your position in Congress, and help influence your colleagues to follow your example. Please make our position known to as many members of Congress as possible.

We would appreciate a reply from you concerning the prospects for the fight against the ABM.

Sincerely,

James C. Kearney, Stacy Heinen, Ben Davis, Bill Holder, Claire Wilson, Steven Shankman, Marsha Maverick Wells, Nancy J. Moore.

We, the undersigned students of the University of Texas and members of the Austin academic community, deplore the Nixon Administration's advocacy of the ABM system, and we urge both Senators from the State of Texas to fight very strongly in Congress for the defeat of the ABM program.

Agnes I. Edwards, Karen Leiner, Suzanne Davies, J. B. Perkin, John R. Doggett III, James Coates, Carol Thompson, Kerry Kremer, Robert A. Devine, Jennifer Gee, Jan Dohoney, William Brans, Ryan W. Oliver III, Rachel Maines, Edwin O. Prince, Carole Myse, Adrienne Diehr.

Nancie B. Anderson, Eugene E. Wells, Jr., Claudia Stewart, Steve Brake, Bernard Duck, Jr., George Byars, Mr. and Mrs. P. Nugeon Guenluck, Bob Goldman, Tony Tenanella, Ken Bayn, John Dietz, Karen Rowlett, Sharon D. Rueler, Mark R. Lerner, Diana Allen, Carolyn Nance, Stuart Greenfield, Charles Cervantes.

Martha Sherer, Bruce E. Harberry, Robert G. Milne, Edward Malewitz, Carolyn Stark, Mr. and Mrs. Dennis R. Friedel, Mr. and Mrs. Roger Shattuck, Elizabeth Bernard, Charles Tandy, Joan Schler, Margaret Gardner, John H. Whiteford, Robert Logan, John H. Manneher, Arlene Welfel, Charles L. Borgeson, Jr., Ann Caraway, B. K. Guyler, Joel Finegold.

Mary Charles Lucas, Fred L. Stearns, James R. Eskew, John R. Schallow, Lucius A. Ripley, Gary B. Rodgers, William A. Brine, Phillip McGuire Martin, Victor J. Guerra, John W. Bowler, Gustavo R. Ortega, Charlotte Webb, Donald S. Webb, Judy Blumenfeld, David Spaw, Travis Briggs, Bob Goldman, S. C. Littlechild, Lacy Daniels, Richard Whiddon, Ted Samsel, Warren Dean, Joe Bryson, James Richard Rogers, Ferver E. Syleykas, Noel Hendricks, Gilbert Cardenas, Perrell D. Epperson, Ron Klcheeger, Blainie Cohen, Bev. Strittmatter, Juan Carotez, 14 St. 506 Michael Woodward, Cole, Forrest S. Higgs, Judith A. Zemore, Mark Simon, Katherine Murphy, Ann Locklear, James Reddell, A. S. Marshall, Betty Cotton, Rick Priwy, Jane Beek-

strand, Robert W. Hoffman, Kelvin B. Pratt, Thomas A. Green Jr., George Zapalas, Jan Marston.

John Lan, Randy Cally, Judy Morrison, Juan Valdez, John Taylor, Wallace Stapp, Mark D. Roffman, K. Douglas Anderson, Cornelius C. Laird, David Glover, Paulina Cook, Gerhard C. Geohandi, David Edwards, David Van Os, Herbert Hirsch, G. Bowman, Donald H. Sacks, Dennis R. Robinson, Joan Ellen Foote, Doug Bradley.

Richard W. Lehman, Patricia V. Lehman, Charlie Robinson, Jr., Ben Owen, Griff Batten, James Creswell, Tommy Hill, Richard L. Shocket, Carolyn Moore, Alan Lecklear, Leslie Fenton, Alan Fenton, Robert Whienmeny, Mike McMurtrey, James Oilsen, Mike Matthews, Jeffrey H. Kester, Luther Balllew.

Kenneth C. Fountain, Robert A. Koch, L. Parker, Nicholas C. Kaullos, J. D. Uzzell, Elizabeth Powers, William Green, Susan Krenik, Cynthia E. Mayo, Joe B. Ferguson, Kathleen Hughes, Stephen D. Drake, Jim Traweck, David Forman, Raymond L. Neubaur, Mal Lesly, Judy Kaplan.

David Earnest, Winford Harold Gattis, J. Renfro, Art Manouquin, Tommy Rainbolt, Jr., Mark Glen Chemsted, Frank Floea, Amelia Sonet, Jim Lurmore, Gary Rose, Richard B. Fuchet, Jr., John C. Cullen, Jack Ruchelman, Steven Foster, Gene Stoine, Ken Houston, Cyndy Fowler, Michael McKinney, Alicia Helton.

Jos. Wristers, Richard Moore, Bruce Goranson, Marie Friedman (Mrs. Lelan W.), Suzanne Evans, David A. Upper, Debby Passman, Michael Burgess, Allen R. Thomson, Perry Raybuch, Chris Taylor, Anne T. Payne, Tom Gonzalez, Mike Perry, K. M. Breen, Gilbert Rochiger, Lar Kaufman.

J. Keith Grienieks, Wiley J. Roark, Judith Searcy, Rita Richards, Kathy Bailey, Lang C. Owens, Jennifer Disbrow, Jeffrey W. Newman, Randall Hollis, Bob Higley, Ken Schutze, Charles Aherz, Barbara Greenberg, William M. Montgomery, Michael A. Lacey, Marc Bernstein, Dotty McDaniel, Jon Montgomery, Dick Yoer, Bob Baird.

Jole Bullion, Ella Dolomon, Carlos J. Chapa, Jeros Medeaq, Pat Guerra, Bonnie Hinshaw, Bill Cowsar, Franz E. Meadows, Edward V. George, Mildred W. Douglas, Sp/4 James M. Lutz, Lynn Elkins, Robert P. Poteat, Nan S. Blake, Troy Ellison, H. F. Oeandumbit, Bill Kimbot.

Len Sherman, Ellen Deacon, Ruth Keenan, Sherrie S. Cerris, Dennis Stacy, J. P. Hill, Jr., Albert R. Owens, Jr., Wayne Holtzman, Jr., Jimmie D. Freeman, Gary Agatt, Karen Northcott, Jan E. Siterl, Richard I. Grant, Jr., Robyn Barclay, Roy Powell, Steve Kotter, Connie Singleton.

Salvador Franco, Suzanne Wenger, Todd W. Cone, Peter Gill, Ron Walker, Allen Pitts, Mike Center, Steven A. Carriker, Clara Studar, Mark Plummer, John Ziley, Paul Neumann, Glennys Peterson, Debbie Drake, Linda Morgan, Gary L. Thicken, William R. Duncan, Toni Ward.

N. O. Brookshire, A. L. Mackey, Robert Mayfield, Eric Samat, John Hanal, Alfredo Peno, Mary F. Spencer, F. Dee Shorte, Mark B. Bader, James Zigler, Bill Smith, J. Payne, John Conley, Jim Colby, Rebecca Martin, Nelson Martin, Marlyn Hall III.

J. Wes Ingram, Robert C. Foster, Victor X. Rivera, Sybill Bossby, Christopher Blake Upjohn, Barbara Poston, Steve Hutchison, Charles G. Jennings, Jr.,

Wenorah Lyon, Tom Kincaid, Sharon Bosting, Larry Grisham, James M. Cody, Barry Banelle, Kurt Gustafson, Robert D. Bain.

Stuart Clayton, Walter E. Wehrle, Tony Pecora McAdoo, Frederick D. Asneq, Martha Alexander Petkas, Peter J. Patten, Barry Brookshire, Michael Anthony Howe, Kenneth B. McCullough, Frances K. Sage, Dana Waldman, David Peoples, Alex Arevalo, Phillip Rogers, Randy Boykin, James F. Wood, James C. Fogo, Kent Landrum, Meredith Morgan.

Scott L. Ferguson, Edmund S. Princoffs, Leoda Anderson, Hubert R. Fowler, Bert Meisenbach, Beto Brunn, Phillip E. Garrett, Charles Cervantes, Elliot Zashin, John Loyee, Joe A. Shull, Candy O'Keefe, R. J. Leddy, G. Wich C. Meirs, Aliddrington.

Stenan Shankmon, Henry T. Benedict, Dennis G. Flinn, Marsha Maverick Wells, Henry Allen, Thomas Kuber, Barbara Roseman, David A. Gongga, Nancy J. Moore, Kathy Hughes, Carey K. West, Sigmund D. Bue, Robert P. Aguirre.

Sebastian Davis, Tom Ricker, Jesse M. Garcia, Roger D. Duncan, Elizabeth Zane, Kirk Thompson, Bernard A. Nipply, James Bean, Roy Powell.

Bob Consel, John P. Herov, Frank J. Smith, Mike R. McHone, Carolyn Langley, Barry DeBakey, Bob Kar Hu, Jose E. Linnon, W. L. Richey, Jr., John P. Kin, Alyce Russell.

Glenda Boreice, Kaven Lane, Marilyn R. Barders, Frank Head, A. Joe Stubbs, Robert Westheimer, Robert Griffin, Michael L. Aee, Robert Waters, Greg Dun, Wm. J. Olson, Stephen E. Felp. Rowland R. Nathaway, James P. Allison, Stuart Isgeor, Rebecca Reznhoff, Claire Wilson, Michael P. Wesbegt, Richard W. Minis, Robert Printch, Alan Phenix, Caralee G. Woods.

James Sevell, Sharon Shelton, Flex O. Calvert, Lawrence Caroline, Dina Caroline, Sandy Carmichael, Steve Gibson, Nicholas A. Hophimus, Richard W. Tedlars, Carole J. Anderson, Tom N. Taylor, M. Ann Miller, Elaine Truman, Tony Abrigo, Pat Dillon, Avia Aguillard, Maria L. Abrigo, Tom Kincaid.

Nancy Bender, Barry K. Odell, Harvey L. Mayton, Robert J. Cartis, David L. Noblin, Mike Levin, Jennifer Oppenheim, Robert N. Thefers, Sheryl Patterson, Ann Clark, James Page, Richard Aldridge, Amelia L. Carolis, Jane Ross.

Donald E. Walker, Joe Jordan, Dave Haase, Bruce Grube, Philip Sterzing, Mark Macha, Kristine DeWeese, Jame Caillo, Joyce Sanders, Joi Ittillg, Mark Rinehart, John P. Hinds, Robert E. DeWeese, Henry C. Mecreek III, C. Thomas Bermann, A Marie Blazik, Gary Anderson, T. E. Fogwell.

Bill McGraw, Dickie Pena, Karen Welton, Wayne Maddox Jr., Michael Brophy, Michael J. Irwin, J. P. Mays, Laurie Sarger, Harry M. Pope, Donna Jane Graham, Mrs. Linda Garrett, John Beauduz, Suzi Duffy, Henry B. Green, James H. Hyrd, Steve Cavanaugh, Robert Connell, Quinn W. Schurwitz.

Tracy D. Terrell, William Mullen, Shelby Hallmark, William Levitan, Robert A. Wallace, Arch Ritter, Arthur S. Nietz, Howard Heitz, William R. Pakalhn, M. Banksont, Robert G. Twombly, Harry J. Sugulima, Henry Nahafeur, Robert L. Russell, Thomas W. Hainze, Jr., Thomas B. Hudson, Jr., Laura G. Richardson, Michael M. Garrile.

Anne Olivia Boyer, H. W. Johnson, Vernon Williams, David Sobeg, John

Bower, David Vando, Diane Shottand, Donald McQuarie, Anthony J. Stantzenberger, John Mikov, John Nibrow, Robert Mayfield, Ann K. Clark, Brooke Conley, Henry E. Bower, Ralph R. Read III, Asst. Prof. of German, Margaret Kleckhefer, J. M. Milburn.

Michael A. Archenhold, Hank Henriques, Gary R. Wells, Sylvia Hughes, D. W. Byde, W. Z. Schild, Mrs. Leslie Vuran, Robert L. Dislant Jr., Lynn Peery, Linda Helland, Jones T. M. Midler, Jr., Lyndon Knippa, Carolyn Shirley, Larry Hazard, J. Chrys Dougherty, IV, Bob Franklin, Jim Darden, Dave Gebser, Leon Gibson, Kent Gray.

Michael W. James, Gregory Hicks, Spencer Leitman, Iris Hennington, James C. Todd, Wm. Meacham, Jerry Poizner, Alberto de Lacerda, Bill F. Fowler, Carole Mgre, Rob Deacon, Wayne A. Rebhow, William W. Rienster, William C. Gruben, John Crowley, Peggy Redcom, James Houckins, Robert H. Zibul, Jenny Roquemore.

George Bou, Michael O. Tobin, Anna Kathryn Webb, Mark S. Goodrich, William L. Spilker, Richard Simpson, Wright Williams, Torn Macheor, Julie Ryan, Candace Camp, Robert Caldwell, Richard Bauman, David M. Norman, Nancy Niland, Joann Chang, Bill Holden, Dwight McMurrin.

Bettie Watford, Clyde James, Jr., David J. Wadden, Jr., Patricia K. Carlson, Scott Pittman, S. R. Smith, Daniel K. Morgan, Shelby Duval, Richard W. Vanderdraft, John Howard, Janet Binzegger, Jesus Tumbler B., Carolyn Gates, Lindole Callin, David Moore, Carletta Kassover, Walter Harrison, Jose G. Sanchez.

Carolyn Virginia Jamer, Bruce Gregg, Bill McKee, Dave Flacy, Barbara Stocking, J. R. Card, Jon Cavalier, Patrick L. Evans, Ann MacNaughton, Kig Page, Donna Dees, Ron Bates, Paul Bucke, Bill G. Dickey, Michael J. Cracraft, Robert W. Lewis, Jr., Julia O'Neal, Candida E. McCollom, James Michael Peal, William R. Green.

Wm. O. Bellmosko III, Bill Marshall, Mayne Walters, Barbara Wuensch, John H. Howard, Jr., David A. Stewart, Daniel Taylor, John R. Cope, R. Terince Stoup, S. J. Colletta, Bob Pian, James P. Keogh, Zigmunt W. Smuggy, Karen Carsch, Robert Ryman, Emet M. Hallock, Morton Lane, Susan E. Venel, Sandra McGumonville.

Karen Kilsdonk, Charlie Bicksley, Candase Page Herring, Beverly Huntsman, Mike Chase, Patricia Blum, Judith A. Smith, Charles Johnson, Jonathan Los, Janie Hall, Peggy Jan Mills, Clinton Mallari, Kate Keller, Becky Bolkin, B. K. Gulyer, Patricia Harp, Rafael Quintanilla, Allos Sloholl.

Douglas M. Webb, Richard Johnson, Bruce L. Gardner, Richard Lynch, Linda Maddox, David Rigney, Nell Landsman, Peggy Martin, Bob Russell, Richard Paul, Rosa Maria Gonzalez, John Christian, Roger Dickey, David Hall, Mark V. Roderick, William C. Davis, Spilor Veller, Otono Mims.

Armando Gutierrez, Jr., Lewis Mr. Rosenthal, Donald T. Carr, Tony M. Morgan, Dennis Stacy, Cliff Lewis, John Hay, Linda Mackey, Lewis A. Mcelvy, William D. Bradford, Betty Stevens, Stephen Sequist, Mary Marias, William H. Gorman, Danette Moss, Max L. Kischel, Rita Peterson, Richard Hill, Bob Ciderman.

Alex P. J. Mounlefer, Tom Robinson, Daniel C. Morgan, Jr., Margery Engel, Phyllis Caldwell, Carol Austin, George Bussy, James Peterson, Gary Michael, David G. Washburn, Barbara Sher, Ted

Kiptchek, Karen Peterson, David Moore, Bobby Skelton, Joe Trumm, Charlotte L. Tedhams, Charles W. Lindsey III, Thomas Herb, Thomas S. Anderson, William B. Proxter, Jr., John Exdell, John B. Shenill, Jr., Richard E. Frich, John Wm. Peck, Joseph S. Hosser, Lloyd Weathers, Neston Reyes, Patrick Shannon, John Donald, Edward Haverlah, Helen Gedde, John Redde, Russ Recker, Stephen L. Hastes, Woodlief W. Plive, Richard Ferroy, John Teltor, James Kearney, Gene Cunyon, Kenneth A. Fisher, Patricia E. Fisher, Richard C. Parish, Thomas J. Hannibal, James Lindsay, James Caldwell, Bruce Hoemes, Mike McDougal, Jane A. Dennis, John K. Clare, Ronald J. Herring, Duane Ripkin, Jeffrey F. Huntsman, Blews Vewell.

Darryl Bailey, Don Rodgers, Paul Terper, Jerry Morrisey, Sharon Berliner, Bill Harfbro, James Hales, Michael Berger, Carl Cochran, Mark V. Gregg, José Ramez, Lynne Tellington, Doug Rowley, Marta Berryman, Terry Pinkard, Charles F. Williams.

Robert D. Atkinson, Pamela Rutherford, Jimmy Chapman, Allen Bohne, Camil Handy, Cynthia Riessen, Jack Burill, Jerald R. Yankee, Tony Davidson, Linda R. Moore, Stacy Heinen, Ken Ligatt, E. F. Crim, Bill Batey, Fred Moffitt, Walter Arnold, Paul M. Jenck, Kim Sheftall, Robert E. Ferrell.

Jack A. V. Hals, Tyler Jansen, Patrick J. Gearing, James S. Sage, Judy Franklin, Helen Barthelme, Gerry Conrad, Richard C. Browne, Bob Heilbisor, Richard Santos, John Hel Buechey, Geoffrey C. Lacey, Douglas Lee Hall, Josephine Whiteford, David M. Robinson, John Bryant, C. Mosby.

Harriet Watts, Naomi Rosen, Dee Clary, Duane Christian, Jos. H. Thrash, Elizabeth Sienchez, Robert E. Smith, Jr., Killon P. Almond, Jr., Gordon Beaness, Barbara Kaster, Jacque Thiele, John S. Aldridge, Mark Sliajic, Frank Mather, John Lorne, Larry Weiss, Mark Aldridge, Thomas J. Gilbey, Jr., Gerald I. Livengood.

Robert C. Fox, Robert P. Lertzian, Jane Smith, Rudolph Houck, Eliot P. Tucker, Linda Forman.

Ernie Eden, David Smith, Nancy Ainsworth Johnson, Jim Bryce, Wm. E. Richey, Michael B. Foster, Martha Barthe, John M. Whelan, Jr., Carolyn Bucknall, Patrick A. Luciz, John H. Young, Naomi Feldman, Howard Black, David McClanroch, Larry Brittain, Melanie Hickerson, Thomas J. Nagy, Mary Jane Mills, Donna Jo Mills, Antonio Naranj, Suzanne Wheat.

Allen Finegold, Mike Killebrew, Jim Crook, Judith F. Hanson, Patricia L. Porter, Dick Waitt, Chuck Newell, John Jennings, Charles Chemnitz, Jerry L. D'Asto, Roy Hanson, Jr., Carol D. Caldwell, Lorelei Bourg, David A. McCam, Richard Johnson.

Barry M. Bloan, George Briston, Kenny Kremer, Betty Bruckhart, Nick Duncan, Judy Glass, Cathy Carter, Mark Nacol, Carol Moczygomba, J. Ann Schatz, Cosette Nolen, Roy Larsen, Gene Dolp, Natcohn Bruce McNeil, Terry W. Hesson, Jeff Oger, Hazel Henderson, Pat Cuney.

Clare A. Gregorian, Roger L. Chesser, Charles Schmid, Susan Berliner, James M. Williams, James H. Hallbach, Donald Baer, Mrs. Margaret M. Jennings, Mike Anderson, Will Darby, Deanna McNamara.

Harry Finigin, David Smith, David Barnes, Ronald Lee Klingenberg, Frankie G. Miller, Jeff Joseph Jones, George A. Fisher, Tom Perkins, Jr.

Tom MacLeod, Barbara Hines, Betty Fulwiter, Larrle Hall, Raul J. Garcia, Jr., Fran Ditti, George R. Prey, Thomas C. Chase III, Albert B. Harper, Douglas B. Balfour, Ronnie C. Stewart, Linda Muller, Wanda Wutzler, Andree Nolen, J. Barton Arnold III, Elmer L. Deal, Jr.

Stephen Cornell, Larry Frey, Ronny Knappe, Thomas Wagner, George Entemer, Arthur J. Orbin, Edward J. M. Rhoads, Levie C. Jacobs, Mark Durin, George H. Moore, Jr., William A. Reaves, Peter Foster, Ralph Allen, Jerome Frank, Jr., Mike S. Harms, Gale Alexander.

Virginia Printz, Bruce Lane, Robi Glewonor, Bruce Hallock, Patsee Luce, Eldridge, Dennis Greusky, Robert M. Sweeney, Marie E. Goyen, Patti Walther, Savis E. Rogers, Frank S. Sisti, Grace Angelena Hede-mann, Randy Rogers, David Koenig, Bernard Wollank, Robert C. Gray, Barney DelBakey, Peter Riskind, June Skinner, David Braun, Don Rawlins, Brian Orne, James Byrd, John G. Corbett, Laurel Seltzer, Alan Seals, Margret M. Niel, Erick Dela Queize, Robert C. Mint, James A. Benrie, Henry W. Raeleft, Henry E. Sadle, Mary McConkey.

Gail Bentwayne, Locke B. Casey, Barry Read, Susan McEwan, Jaime E. Rodriguez, Jim C. Snyder, Ruf Well, Jonathan Grant, Allen Robert Alford, Myron S. Logan, Bob Archerbold, St Gafurke, Patricia Lorang, Keith Schuchard, Susan Dezelle, Janice Hullum, Henry Langley, Richard Shorter.

J. Ivan McLaren, Greg Wan, Douglas Hickman, J. E. Hecler, Yvette Bourhoff, Bruce Flach, Rebecca Reznihoff, Emma Pratt, Steve Schwetz, Howard Pratt, Jr., Laura Williams, Laurence Paxson Eggers, Susan Torian, Jobel Kalbaugh, Harry Balch.

Sharon Hewlett, Tom Suford, Roland Roms, Tim Patten, Martha Cushing, David Anders, F. Jay Brockman, Jane Granskoy, Karen McCormick, Kathryn Quirem, Carlos Carrizalez, Jr., Alicia Garces, Larry Anderson, Thomas Martin, Walter Rast, Jr., Janice M. Carlson, Robert Carter Fox.

Leonard Stern, Robert Brooks, Julia Bearden, Lynda McCray, Gerald M. Slaton, Pete E. Romero, Charley Brady, John Roach, John Courtade, Toni Aguilar, K. Rogers, Melanie Hickerson, Phyllis Della Croce, Elizabeth Cary, Stephen L. Beres, Jr., David Cummings, Mary Cannar, Phillip Prim, Diana Petty, Suzanne Anderson.

Lindy Lawson, Glorinda K. Moore, John R. McNeely, Martin Murray, G. Michael Major, John M. Sanchez, Karen E. White, Sedalla Long, Larry Hill, Jeanne Geller, Sandra Shapiro, John R. Sims, William K. Armstrong, Stephen Grimmett, M. H. Dunson Jr., G. D. Echelson, Mark Swepe.

Larry Winn, Rowe Suggs, Nelan Neokleon, Michael B. Charton, Larry Schmucker, Chisto Whalls, Flomla Chiles, Louis Glatzer, Andrew C. LeCompte, Larry H. Jackson, Marsha J. Worrell, Judith Sims, Jim Crozier, Celia Carroll, Michael Bouwkoff, James W. Duncan, Henry M. Holl.

Rosanne G. Patten, Les Garley, Robert Waters, Charles W. Chambers, Gary Pahl, Suzanne S. Barth, Marcellas Haltman, Becky Speck, James A. Sparks, Cleaburn R. Zevernemann, Alan Frank, David E. Summers, A. M. Ruth, Jean H. Newbold.

Jeffrey K. Lindzey, B. Westlund, Fred Mannan, Michel F. Johnson, John P. Halpa, Ann Strieber, Dluberd Gody, Harold Wylie, John Gilsa, M. G. Hall, William M. Kleman, Dan Maul-

din, Pat H. Thornton, Ashton Pitre, Leon F. Kenman, Jack Millin, Marguerite Gillis.

Robert G. Yaes, Faculty Associate, Dept. of Physics; Lawrence Shepley, Assistant Professor, Physics; Alfred Schld, Professor of Physics; Eugene Couch, Faculty Associate, Physics; Ronald S. Parsons, Assistant Professor, Physics; Arnold B. Lopez-Apero, Faculty Associate, Physics.

RECOGNITION OF THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, I had the pleasure of attending a testimonial dinner in the honor of Speaker Marshall Cobligh of the New Hampshire General Court. The guest speaker for this event was the Honorable Albert J. Abrams, secretary of the senate for the State of New York. The context of Secretary Abrams' address, which will follow these remarks, was a discourse on the role of legislatures in representative government. Secretary Abrams discussed the need for legislative reform in order to assure that these bodies can continue to perform effectively as they were originally intended.

It is gratifying to note that there are individuals outside of this Congress who feel that the status of legislatures can be expanded from its present role as "watchdog" to a position of leadership.

Last February 6, on page H851 of this Journal, I included for the benefit of my colleagues, the context of the inaugural address delivered by the speaker of the New Hampshire House of Representatives, the Honorable Marshall Cobligh. The speaker's remarks concerned the status of the New Hampshire Legislature and the need for its reform. Speaker Cobligh, cited in his address one of my favorite quotations from the great Jefferson:

Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also and keep pace with the times.

I wish to express my thanks to Secretary Abrams and Speaker Cobligh for their insight and ability to see the need for legislative reform to protect our representative democracy.

The address referred to follows:

THE MOST UNDER-UNDERSTOOD BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

(By Albert J. Abrams, Secretary of the Senate, New York State)

INTRODUCTION

It is a measure of the liberality of New Hampshire that you have invited here to speak tonight in this testimonial to one of your own great leaders, Marshall Cobligh, not only a "foreigner" from outside the state, but amazingly someone from the Upper House! Not only someone from the Upper House, but a staffer to boot!

I always view with some trepidation this microphone, because in the Senate of New

York I once read from the podium the title of a bill about to come up for debate. The bill would have regulated spawning beds. Only it resounded in the Senate Chamber over the microphone like this: "An act to amend the conservation law in relation to the regulation of sporting beds." Up sprang one of our older Senators and said, "Mr. President, are we regulating that too?"

The British poet, W. H. Auden, put the whole problem of legislative modernization succinctly when he said:

"We would rather be ruined than changed
We would rather die in our dread
Than climb the cross of the moment
and let our illusions die."

However, your Speaker is not one who has a fear of change. In a courageous leap to leadership he is in the forefront of those who seek to bring our legislatures dragging, squawking and protesting into the 20th century.

Tonight, I'm supposed to talk and you're supposed to listen. If you get through before I do, please let me know.

I appreciate your chairman's generous introduction. It is a great deal more sympathetic than one I received in New York City, when after listening to the master of ceremonies recite the dreary facts of my life I heard him conclude: "And now we shall hear the latest dope from Albany."

It is just great to come to New Hampshire, from whence many of our New York leaders gain new energies and new insights. Our New York Senate Minority Leader Joseph Zaretzki has lived in New Hampshire for years, but votes in Manhattan! And our Senate Majority Leader Earl Brydges extracts as many fish from your waters as your generous laws permit. Unpublicized, many of our New Yorkers come to New Hampshire to get a breath of unpolluted air, unpolluted water and unpolluted politics.

Your state flower, the purple lilac; your state tree, the white birch; reflect so well the clean tangy scent of your air and the dignity of your people.

And I bring you greetings from Gov. Rockefeller who was educated here. When he was a kid, before he went to Dartmouth, his father, so the story goes, gave him blocks to play with—50th Street, 51st Street, 52nd Street.

We have just gone through the 1969 session. In New York, we had nearly 6,000 bills introduced in the Senate alone, and about 7,500 in the House. We passed 1,500 bills and at this moment the Governor is signing about 1,155 of them. It was an exciting session, replete with history-making events—the first school decentralization law in the history of the nation, an increase in the sales tax, an attempt to curb campus rioters and a move to re-write state-aid formulas that was fiscally crippling the state. Also, we had a wonderful under-estimate of revenues some people are snide enough to say is designed to keep us going through the election year of 1969. And our leaders reduced the number of interim committees because some cynics say we found there were committees that had solutions to which they couldn't find problems! I mean they had wonderful answers but couldn't find the questions to go with them!

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION IN THE WORLD

Today legislative bodies around the world are in dire trouble. The military have taken over in many parts of the world from weak legislatures, and civilian dictators make some parliaments meek rubber stamps. A Peruvian legislator visited me and said his Congress wouldn't dare oppose the military lest they be killed!

If we were to paint the globe white on those spots which have virile, creative, forceful legislative systems, the globe would appear mostly black.

In the trouble spots of the world, you will find on the whole they have weak legislative systems. Let us call the roll:

Egypt, with a dictator.
Nigeria, with a military government.
North and South Viet Nam, both with military leadership.
China, where a party bureaucracy dictates.
Russia, where legislative independence would be deemed an affront by the Omnibureaucrats.

Latin America, where legislatures generally are window dressing for hard-nosed autocracies with military governments.

South America, where legislatures are puppets generally for military rules.

Africa, parliaments on the whole are anemic and new governments are run by strong-men dictators.

The British parliamentary system is still strong. And in Australia, India, Canada, Israel, and in the Scandinavian countries, legislatures are not afraid to make and initiate policy, nor to hold executives to account. Our United States Congress at times appears to have lost its capacity for broad policy initiation, having recently implored the President to submit a legislative program to which it could react; but if it has lost power in the areas of foreign relations and war to a powerful Presidency, at least in the field of program auditing it is showing spark.

The truth is that most of the world's population does not know government by strong, independent legislature. And one of the most useful steps the nations of the world could take to strengthen freedom would be to bolster their legislatures. A people that does not have a free, strong legislature is not free.

Of course in Lebanon, they have solved the problem of parliaments. The rule there is that controversial subjects that cut into religious lines may not be brought before the legislature! They have solved their problem. They have deep dug-in religious sects which would be at each other's throats if issues of controversy were to come before their legislature, so they have worked out their own system: no controversial legislation!

THE STATE LEGISLATURES

New Hampshire has given the nation the motto: "Live free or die!" That is the cry our whole country has for the world. And that is the message of our legislatures to our people. Unfortunately, there is current in our nation a massive cynicism toward legislatures and an elitist cynicism that is destructive of representative democracy.

Each group in our society, the educators, the doctors, the engineers, the scientists feel they know better than the legislatures how to run our government. But it is the unique function of the legislature to apply the common sense of the generalist to the diverse viewpoints of the specialists.

Our state legislatures are under fire from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean. Some of the attacks by civic reformers has some basis.

Our legislatures have not organized for their main tasks, but have permitted themselves to be snowed under a paper blizzard of trivial legislation. Do we really need the 35,000 new laws adopted by our states each biennium?

They have permitted themselves to be outmaneuvered, out-staffed, out-budgeted by the Governors. They have permitted themselves to become ratifiers rather than initiators. They have permitted themselves to be punched senseless by editorialists who never had to mediate between conflicting forces in our society, and who rarely have access to time or research to sift fact from dazzling headlines. They have permitted the bureaucracy to mobilize a vertical ladder of decision-making extending from the localities to the states to the federal agencies, by-passing the legislatures.

And ruefully I must agree that legislatures have brought deserved attacks on themselves with their all-night sessions, and closing night hi-jinks. The glaring headlights of publicity shine on these theatrics. And the

log-jam of the end of the session has brought outcries from the citizens, who little understand the natural rhythm of legislation in representative government, who little understand that conflicting forces defer compromises until certain the legislature is going to adjourn.

I could talk to you endlessly about the need for procedural changes, the need for more scheduling to space out sessions more evenly, the need for pre-filing, improved research staffing, annual sessions, better floor decorum, better office facilities for our committees, and a decent pay for decision-making.

Incidentally, it is not known in my own state that the salary of \$15,000 base pay for our legislators who work 3-5 months in session and work the rest of the year part time at the very least in interim studies, in acting as ombudsmen for their constituency, in sounding out sentiment, get only \$8 per decision they are called upon to make on the floor of the Senate; only \$8 per vote they are called upon to make ranging from a \$6.4 billion budget to delicate issues of church-state. And the public little understands that a legislator makes more decisions in a session than the average man makes in a lifetime.

THE REAL REFORMS

But let me warm to the task of suggesting where the real strengthening of our legislatures lie. It lies in knowing itself. The real task of legislatures is setting broad policies. The states are a \$60 billion a year business! *Legislatures need to tool up, staff up and shape up.*

I will not stress the electronics and computers that many legislatures are using to help draft bills, codify statutes, and test alternate policy proposals. I will not stress anything tonight but main routes to get at the guts of bringing legislatures back to the glory that was theirs in the early 19th century.

These channels of strength are:

1. *The legislature must gain control over the planning function of state government.*

Today, the federal government is requiring comprehensive planning in higher education, welfare, health, highways—in virtually every segment of government—and the planning is being done by executive agencies usually without knowledge or consent of the legislature. Today state agencies are developing broad programs of economic development and these by-pass the legislatures. Today state agencies develop plans for the physical growth of the state, and these blueprints frequently escape legislative review. Planning is power, and legislatures are being locked into spending by plans over which they have little control.

2. *The legislature must gain control over the allocative function, over determining how much money will be distributed between private and public sectors and what the priorities are within the public sector.*

Today, our legislatures are using often primitive methods in budget. Few use an investment budget; few use an economic development budget. Few legislatures are given a broad economic review before the legislature convenes or after. Legislatures need more than fiscal notes on bills; they need to correlate area-spending with area-unemployment to make certain the money is going where the money is needed. The legislature needs a short-range and long-range budget. Money is power and legislatures weakened by the executive budget system need to be brought back into the partnership.

3. *Legislatures are being inundated with trivia, and need to gain control over the big decisions.*

Legislatures are being swamped with bills. And little effort has gone into keeping the trivia out of the legislative machinery. We need new mechanisms to keep the work-load down and the brainload up. We need explore concepts of negative legislation, retaining review over expanded administrative regu-

lations; consolidating bills; eliminating local bills, and concentrating on the bull's eye.

We need to bring in \$1-a-year men to advise our legislatures, the nation's top scientific brains, foremost industrial management brains. We should not be shy about asking for help. Marshall Cobleigh has already moved in this direction.

There are so many other procedural improvements urgently, desperately needed by our legislatures. Internship programs, systems analysis, program development emphasis, systematic modernization of legislative rules, a standing committee system geared to do its job of evaluation, are but some of the obvious improvements needed.

We need better, closer relationship between our legislatures and the Congress. Legislatures through control over congressional reapportionment have considerable leverage they have not used to gain a proper hearing at Washington.

The legislature's job is management of tensions and hostilities in society. If it continues to fail, if it continues to fumble and stumble, our whole system of representative government is in danger. And so I would urge a massive restructuring of our state legislature to do the job they need to do, a massive redirection of legislative activity to focus on planning and new kinds of fiscal controls, shedding the trivia and zeroing in the big problem areas.

The legislature is never going to be loved. Its job is that of umpire and who ever heard of a pitcher and batter sending love notes to the man in blue behind the plate. But that is your job: to call the balls and strikes as you see 'em, let the curves come as they may!

CONCLUSION

The Legislative leaders of our nation's 8,000 state legislatures are helping to shape the resurgence of the states. They are being joined by Speaker Marshall Cobleigh, from the White Mountain State, a dynamic young man who seeks to strengthen the legislature and the legislative system, who shunned the easy path for hard work, who shuns the quiet life of ease, which as Elizabeth Barrett Browning said, "Is no life at all."

In an age of mankind that cries out for leadership, Marshall Cobleigh is rising to the challenge. And from New Hampshire there goes out to the nation an electric message: "We have here a man who can help mankind bind its wounds, who can gain common ground from diverse points of views, who is not afraid of change, who can see the far distances, who has hope and determination and the qualities so desperately needed today as our nation copes with congestion, mobility, revolt, corruption, pollution, immorality and the curse of inflation."

Let me end with the poem of Emily Dickinson who couldn't believe that men would die for law. The great Persian army under King Xerxes, moving to conquer Greece, found standing in the way at the pass at Thermopylae a small band of Greek soldiers hemmed between mountain and sea. These were the 300 Spartans under King Leonidas left to hold the narrow pass. And the King sent a stranger back to Sparta, saying, "Go stranger, and tell Sparta that here, obeying her commands, we fell."

And Emily Dickinson, as a woman, couldn't understand this sacrifice. She wrote:

"Go tell it—What a Message.

To whom—is specified—

Not murmur—not endearment

But simply—we obeyed—

Obedy—a Lure—a Longing?

Oh Nature—none of these—

To Law—said sweet Thermopylae

I give my dying kiss."

Today we still have in our legislatures men like King Leonidas. Men like Marshall Cobleigh—willing to fight for principle—willing to fight for law.

THE NEED FOR LABOR LAW REFORM

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 20, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, for several years I have called the Senate's attention to the need for a restoration of balance in the administration of labor law in the United States today. Over and over cases have come to my attention in which the rights of individuals have been subordinated to the interests of big labor organizers and in some cases employers have been willing to go along with these inequities.

Now it comes to my attention, through an article in U.S. News & World Report, that a nationwide group is embarked on a program of labor law reforms. I note that the priorities expressed by this group are along the same lines I have been advocating over the years; namely, the protection of the rights of individual workers.

I commend this effort on the part of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and a panel of 100 labor relations lawyers who are attempting to restore balance to those charged with the responsibility of administering our labor laws, to the attention of Senators for their study and information.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the U.S. News & World Report of June 16, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW BUSINESS HOPES TO CHANGE THE NATION'S LABOR LAWS

An employer drive to rewrite the basic labor law is getting under way, with a specific list of changes being sought.

For years, employer groups have asked for curbs on the National Labor Relations Board, on the ground that the NLRB's rulings have been giving unions the breaks.

But, in recent years, Democrats controlled the White House and Congress. Nothing came of the "reform" pleas.

Now, with Republicans in the White House and labor's support weakened somewhat in Congress, pressure for changes is being stepped up.

One of the leading groups in this campaign is the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It announced on June 4 that it is setting up some 25 meetings of businessmen across the country—called "labor-law reform workshops."

Anthony J. Obadal, in charge of the campaign as the Chamber's labor-relations manager, said these workshops "will emphasize the need to remove from the NLRB jurisdiction over unfair-labor-practice cases and assign them either to the federal courts or to a special labor court."

Mr. Obadal made it clear that the strategy is to build pressure for the "reforms" in the 1970 congressional races, hoping to get legislative action from a new Congress in 1971.

TWENTY-ONE-POINT PROGRAM

From a longer list of complaints drawn up by a panel of 100 labor-relations lawyers, the Chamber is concentrating on 21 specific proposals.

A poll taken among local chambers of commerce and trade associations, Mr. Obadal

said, gave top priority to the proposal to strip NLRB of power to rule when an employer or union has committed an unfair labor practice as defined in the labor law.

Some 28 per cent of the votes put that change in the No. 1 position.

Here, in order of preference as indicated by the poll, is what some of the other proposals would do:

Grant bargaining rights only after secret-ballot elections—not on showing of cards signed by workers. Twenty-three per cent gave this top priority.

Amend the preamble to the National Labor Relations Act to make it clear that federal policy allows workers to decide for themselves whether to join or not to join a union. In the poll, 19 per cent rated this No. 1.

Stop unions from picketing a store in order to punish a manufacturer of products on sale there.

Compel unions, before going on strike, to submit the strike question to a secret-ballot vote of workers, if requested by the employer or by 10 per cent of the employees involved.

Allow employers to sue a union for damages if the union violates a no-strike clause in the labor agreement.

Prevent NLRB from restricting an employer's right to discuss unionism with his workers prior to elections.

Give back to employers "management rights" which the Chamber says have been turned over to unions by NLRB. An example offered: forcing a company to bargain with a union on matters such as contracting part of the operation to an outside firm.

Prohibit unions from fining their members for such actions as working during a strike or exceeding work quotas fixed by the union.

Set new rules for determining the size of a bargaining unit to prevent what the Chamber calls NLRB's tendency to "gerrymander" the unit to fit the part of the shop that is organized.

CHAMBER SAYS: IT'S ONLY FAIR

The Chamber argues that those changes, with others on its list, are essential if employers are to be given a fair break with unions under the labor law.

The basic law—the National Labor Relations Act, or Wagner Act—was adopted in 1935. There was a major revision in 1947, aimed at putting some curbs on union powers. This was the Taft-Hartley Act, written by a Republican Congress upset about the postwar wave of strikes.

In 1959, after Senators had heard testimony of racketeering and corruption in some unions, Congress passed the Landrum-Griffin Act. It included a "bill of rights" for union members and restrictions on some forms of strike and secondary boycotts.

The Chamber of Commerce, in a leaflet outlining its campaign, declared that the Labor Board has failed to apply the proper balance to its rulings. The booklet stated:

"The NLRB . . . refused to abandon the philosophy of encouraging unions and it is this intransigence, more than anything else, which explains unfair decisions of the Board. The Board sees whatever will strengthen the unions as being in the best interest of the nation. . . ."

Therefore, the Chamber said, it "has taken on the ambitious job of bringing reform to the NLRB, to change that agency into a neutral decision maker, rather than a promoter of unions."

Chairman Frank W. McCulloch of the NLRB has denied that the Board favors unions or employers. He says the Board is applying the law as it was written.

OUTLOOK FOR NLRB

Members of the NLRB are named to five-year terms. Two of the five present members are Republicans.

President Nixon's first chance to nominate an NLRB member does not occur until Dec. 16, 1969, when the term of Sam Zagoria—a Republican—expires. The White House has indicated that a new Chairman will be designated at that time. Mr. McCulloch could remain as a member.

The next vacancy is due on Aug. 27, 1970, when the McCulloch term ends. There is to be another opening in August, 1971, with expiration of the term of Gerald A. Brown. Mr. Brown and Mr. McCulloch are Democrats.

Thus, it will be late 1971 before President Nixon could name three members—barring resignations. Employer spokesmen contend that all five present members usually favor the union side.

This delay in revamping the Board's membership is cited by some employers as a reason for the proposal that NLRB be eliminated, or at least confined to handling election cases.

OUTSIDE THE LAW

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, as revelations about the nature and extent of illegal Government wiretapping continue, the citizens of this Nation grow daily more concerned and more fearful. Added to the revelations about tapping of the telephone of Dr. Martin Luther King, we now have the Justice Department baldly asserting that its authority to wiretap extends to organizations which, in the estimate of the tappers, may be seeking to "attack and subvert the Government by unlawful means."

The vital question—the question which really transcends the details of recent revelations—is who will decide when a case involves "national security." Who determines when a real threat to our Government exists? And once the decision has been made in a case or series of cases, what internal administrative controls exist to insure that the tapping does not go on even after the responsible policy makers have made their decision against it? These are questions which must be answered. Congress and the people of this Nation must be reassured that there are effective, functioning controls on would-be wiretappers which will give some concrete meaning to the judicial warrant procedures enacted into law last year.

This morning's Washington Post, Mr. Speaker, carried an editorial which eloquently expresses the sense of outrage and dismay with which millions of Americans greeted the King wiretapping disclosure and events which have followed it. I insert that editorial today for the contemplation of my colleagues, and for the purpose of helping us all reflect on what widespread, uncontrolled, illegal wiretapping by the Government will mean for the future of free communication in America.

The editorial referred to follows:

OUTSIDE THE LAW

The Department of Justice has come forward with an appalling paradox: entrusted

with enforcement of the Federal laws, it holds itself to lie outside the ambit of those laws; committed to the championship of the United States Constitution, it holds itself to be free from the restraints of that fundamental charter. Expressly, the Department declared on Friday that it possesses legal power—despite a clause of the Constitution and an Act of Congress to the contrary, and without bothering to obtain judicial authorization in advance—to carry on electronic surveillance of any members of organizations who, in its opinion, may be seeking to "attack and subvert the Government by unlawful means."

No more pernicious notion has ever been propounded by an agency of the United States Government. What this comes down to is a bald assertion that the Department can take the law into its own hands whenever it thinks the national security is threatened—from within or from without. Last week, in a Federal District Court in Chicago, the Department disclosed that it had employed wiretapping or bugging devices to monitor conversations of the antiwar activists who were indicted for inciting riots at the Democratic National Convention last August. What is the Department's justification? "Any President who takes seriously his oath to 'preserve, protect and defend the Constitution,'" the Department asserts, "will no doubt determine that it is not 'unreasonable' to utilize electronic surveillance to gather intelligence information concerning those organizations which are committed to the use of illegal methods to bring about changes in our form of government and which may be seeking to foment violent disorders."

Of course, the Constitution which any President has taken an oath to "preserve" specifically forbids unwarranted searches. And the Supreme Court has plainly said that electronic surveillance constitutes a search permissible under the Fourth Amendment only when properly circumscribed and authorized in advance by a judge. Congress only last year, wishing to regularize and control electronic eavesdropping, stipulated precisely in the Crime Control Act the conditions under which bugging and wiretapping could be authorized.

Yet the Department of Justice appears to be saying that both the Constitution and the Crime Control Act can be ignored whenever the President thinks that certain groups are "committed to the use of illegal methods to bring about changes in our form of government." What could better illustrate the absurdity of this standard than its application in regard to the tatterdemalion crew of New Leftists who stirred up disorder in the streets of Chicago. If the President or the Department of Justice can see a threat to the Nation's security in that tawdry, loose-lipped cabal, it can see a threat in anything.

And if a supposed threat to national security can justify setting aside the Constitution and the law respecting electronic eavesdropping, why can it not be used to justify setting them aside for any other purpose the President and the Department of Justice may deem expedient or convenient in the protection of national security? Will they some day think it not "unreasonable" to set aside the prohibitions against arbitrary arrest or against random physical searches of citizens' homes or against imprisonment without trial or against suppression of speech deemed dangerous? What the Department of Justice has so blandly enunciated is the rationale of dictatorship. It is the justification of every despot from Caligula to Adolf Hitler.

It has been disclosed recently that the Federal Bureau of Investigation systematically, over a period of years, tapped telephones in flagrant violation of the law and in cases having nothing whatever to do with national security. It bugged and tapped the homes and hotel rooms of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King and of Elijah Muhammad,

the Black Muslim leader, for example. It is beside the point if, as the FBI now asserts, the Attorney General, at that time Robert F. Kennedy, authorized the eavesdropping; no Attorney General had any authority to do so. The FBI also bugged and tapped numerous persons alleged to be part of that undefined group called the "Mafia." This eavesdropping was done in violation of the Constitution, in violation of the law, in violation of a presidential order and in violation of repeated assurances by the Director of the FBI that it was not being done. J. Edgar Hoover has forfeited the confidence of the American people. He ought to resign or be removed from office.

A Federal Bureau of Investigation which eavesdrops on citizens is a peril to privacy and a menace to freedom in any circumstances. But a Federal Bureau of Investigation which does this in direct defiance of Congress is intolerable. Congress, in its wisdom, decreed last year that bugging and tapping could be done under court order. For the Department of Justice to assert now that it may bug and tap at its own discretion is to undermine the whole concept of a government of laws.

DEMANDS OF CERTAIN BLACK MILITANT GROUPS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 20, 1969

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the demands of certain black militant groups were the subject of an interesting column by the able and perceptive writer, James J. Kilpatrick, which was published in the June 19 edition of the Washington Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kilpatrick's column be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

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

BLACK DEMANDS FOR MONEY GREETED DOCCLELY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is not so strange, when you come to think about it, that Roy Innis should be putting the bite on the bankers and James Forman should be making the churchmen kneel. After all, banks and churches have money. Innis and Forman would like a large chunk of it. If you're going to make hay, you look to the high grass.

What is strange is the calmness with which acts of sheer effrontery are now received. A curious paralysis seems to have hit our sense of right conduct. In the presence of irrational behavior, rational thought is suspended. Gross rudeness passes as acceptable civility, and the most preposterous demands are reported in the press as soberly as budget hearings on Capitol Hill.

Consider the scene the other day in Chicago. The American Bankers Association and the National Bankers Association had arranged a conference on urban problems. The 300 delegates had barely sat down when a disturbance was heard at the rear of the hall. In marched Innis, executive director of the Congress of Racial Equality, at the head of a squad of fifteen. He strode to the podium, completely uninvited, and announced that he intended to make the conference relevant to black people.

Did the bankers give him the bum's rush? No, indeed. They asked him to lunch. Whereupon Innis demanded six billion not as a loan, mind you, but as a gift. And not really

as a gift: This was to be an initial down payment "as recoupment of the birthrights of black people with compounded interest."

"We're not here to make threats," said Innis, "but we are here to give you a message: We have two kinds of operations. We operate either in the streets or on the drawing board. We would prefer to operate on the drawing board."

Innis let that sink in. Then he advised his hosts that while he was in no particular hurry, it would be nice to have the \$ billion in a couple of weeks. His Black Urban Coalition was waiting.

Were the bankers flabbergasted? Disturbed? Resentful? Apparently not. They listened to Innis as mildly as if he were asking them to support the Community Chest. The churchmen, reacting to the demands of Forman, have been equally docile.

Forman's thing is the National Black Economic Development Conference, organized last April in Detroit. The conference came up with a manifesto demanding that predominantly white churches pay \$500 million—since raised to three billion—as reparations for oppressions imposed upon the black man. The money would be used for a land bank and a black university, among other things; mainly it would be used for building "a Socialist society in the United States."

By way of making their intentions clear, Forman and his followers have been occupying church property, invading pulpits, and threatening "guerrilla warfare" if the churches fail to pay up. In Detroit last week, they simply took over a vacant Presbyterian church building, declared it "liberated territory," and demanded \$50,000 in ransom as the price for getting out.

Have the churchmen called the cops? Gone to court? Have they even denounced this churlish fellow as a new kind of highwayman, engaged in a new form of extortion? Not for a moment. The United Presbyterians invited Forman to address their conference in San Antonio; when he demanded \$80 million, they applauded.

Maybe the psychiatrists can explain this curious reaction in terms of a national guilt complex. Or perhaps an explanation lies in the infinite impositions to which society becomes accustomed; in a world of unlimited rudeness, arrogance becomes acceptable social behavior. Even so, the patsy syndrome holds exceedingly small appeal. The bankers would be better advised to tell Innis generally where he can go, and leave it to the preachers to make the directions more precise.

TITLE IX—A NEW DIMENSION IN FOREIGN AID—V

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schott's paper, which I have been inserting in the RECORD in sections, contains excellent suggestions for carrying out the congressional mandate for political development as an integral part of our foreign aid efforts. The next portion follows:

HOW TO PUT TITLE IX IN EFFECT

Yet, given these obstacles, is it realistic to anticipate a serious and imaginative response to Title IX on the part of A.I.D. or its successor agencies? From this vantage point, there are three prerequisites to such a response:

(1) *Change in the foreign policy stance of the U.S. Government.*—With rapid

changes taking place within the Soviet bloc, with significant developments taking place in military hardware and its deployment, and with an increasing influence in international politics being assumed by the Third World, the strategic calculations of the 'fifties and the concept of Soviet containment are becoming increasingly obsolete. This allows for and necessitates consequent changes in the approach of the United States towards third-world countries. In particular, it enables the U.S. to be less concerned with short-run, strategic considerations or the fluctuating cold-war posture of such countries; it should give A.I.D. the opportunity to consider the longer-term, broader-gauged development needs of these countries and to offer—or refuse—assistance in accordance with the degree to which Title IX goals appear realizable.¹⁴

The relevance of Title IX in this new foreign policy context critically hinges upon whether U.S. foreign policy is accommodated to this new international configuration and whether popular and Congressional pressure behind Title IX causes that provision itself to become a determinant of the manner of that accommodation.¹⁵ Such an accommodation would entail: (a) a major analytical effort to understand and identify the responsible forces of social and political modernization in individual LDC's; and (b) a search for ways to support overtly—through public or private channels—those groups who represent these forces and to promote the institutional developments which will channel them in organizationally responsible and developmentally constructive di-

¹⁴ This position is reflected in a conclusion of a conference on Title IX sponsored by A.I.D. during the summer of 1968. See *The Role of Popular Participation in Development*. Report of a Conference on the Implementation of Title IX . . . June 24 to August 2, 1968 (Max F. Millikan, Conference Chairman), Chapter Two.

¹⁵ It might be argued that if bipolar, cold-war security considerations no longer need loom so large as a justification for foreign aid, the United States can turn its attention to urgent domestic priorities, leaving the Third World at least temporarily to fend for itself. Such a policy would be short-sighted in the extreme. Foreign aid must always be with us in one form or another if only because of the ever-increasing interdependence of the nations of the world and because the great mass of the world's population happens to live in countries where the standard of living is appreciably below ours. Just as conflicts based upon glaring inequalities within our own society are surfacing today, the gross inequalities within individual LDCs and between the rich nations and the poor are bound to lead eventually to international forms of conflict (in which the U.S. cannot help but become involved) unless concerted action is taken to reduce the social and political inequities which tend to give rise to conflict. Foreign aid is a small price to pay for some insurance against the forms of retaliation that activist groups in the benighted nations may eventually be in a position to take against us. This is the opposite side of the more humanitarian, "no man is an island" argument in favor of foreign aid, which is equally valid. To give cogency and pertinence to either argument, however, requires reference to individual LDC country situations and a variety of other variables important to a determination of relative national priorities, which is far beyond the scope of this paper. Here it need only be said that the arguments of this paper are based upon the assessment that foreign aid is a valid and effective device to overcome some of the sources of conflict in particular LDCs, and that it is in the U.S. national interest to extend foreign aid for this purpose.

rections. For this, three things are necessary. In the first place, resources must be made available to A.I.D., the State Department, and other internationally involved agencies to enable the requisite analytical work to be undertaken. Secondly, a resolution of the existing organizational and attitudinal conflict between the roles of State and A.I.D. toward the LDC's must be sought. And ultimately, a presidential decision must be taken that continued U.S. Government association (whether inadvertent or deliberate) with the *status-quo* forces in aid-recipient countries must gradually give way to a more far-sighted and subtle *rapprochement* with the popular forces of change in these countries.

(2) *Broadening the Scope of the Country Planning Process.*—Individual "grass roots" projects can in cases contribute significantly to Title IX objectives. Yet Title IX does not encourage an *ad hoc*, project-oriented response. On the contrary, its successful implementation will require the integration of a variety of mutually reinforcing activities and the utilization, in concert, of a variety of public and private assistance instruments. Technical assistance efforts divorced from (or ineffectively dove-tailed with) related capital projects, or *vice versa*, can spell the relative failure of both. Sector loans which neglect to address systematically—and often concomitantly—a variety of social, cultural, political as well as economic problems in that sector can produce counterproductive disequilibria and popular frustrations harmful to the process of development already underway.

In recent years, A.I.D. has progressed far towards developing relatively sophisticated economic planning tools and procedures, although statistical imprecision still renders many of the findings suspect. Occasionally these tools are employed for more than public relations purposes. More often, however, country programs are determined by such other factors as host-government priorities, U.S. strategic considerations, the availability of funds, and the special interests and expertise of USAID field officials, each of whom has his private developmental axe to grind. Further refinement of the country programming approach is required to increase its influence on the allocation of resources by adherence to explicitly stated long-term development goals. Changes in the foreign policy context of aid programs and consequent changes in American foreign policy goals could now make this possible.

Beyond such refinement, however, is the need for the expansion of this programming approach so that a broader range of activities is considered and systematically intermeshed with host-country development goals. Simply because a given activity is a "good thing" is no excuse to fund it; similarly, because a given activity is likely to contribute to Title IX objectives does not imply that it should be programmed at this time, or under U.S. government sponsorship, or without supporting or ancillary activities being undertaken simultaneously. The interdisciplinary long-term planning which this approach assumes will require both personnel and organizational changes within the official foreign affairs establishment, and a much greater emphasis upon research and evaluation than has been traditional for A.I.D. and its predecessor agencies to undertake.

(3) *The Effective Coordination of U.S. Public and Private Assistance Instruments.*—Just as Title IX constitutes more than a simple package of discrete projects, so also does its implementation require resources beyond the capabilities of any one agency. For its successful implementation, Title IX should become a responsibility of the wide range of U.S. public and private agencies which are involved, in one way or another, in the foreign aid business. As the principal coordinator of U.S. foreign policy instruments, the State Department should assume a pre-

eminent role in this, ideally orchestrating the instruments reposing in the U.S.I.A., the Department of Defense, the Peace Corps, and A.I.D. to make certain that each performs, in a complementary and mutually reinforcing way, a developmental (rather than purely strategic, or propagandistic, or otherwise self-serving) role in the LDCs. This requires within the Washington foreign affairs establishment a greater centralization of existing analytical and decision-making responsibility with respect to the LDCs than is presently the case; it also involves a degree of bureaucratic self-abnegation and policy reexamination on the part of each of the concerned agencies. The impulse behind Title IX should discourage unrelated programs serving incompatible objectives within individual countries. Experience has regrettably shown that the Country Team concept is in itself unable to harmonize diverse programs implemented by different and sometimes antagonistic agencies. The job, at least in part, must be done in Washington.

In addition to this, effective procedures must be established to coordinate government-sponsored activities with those of U.S. private organizations sponsoring or directly undertaking developmental activities in the Third World. This is a hope long dreamed of among foreign aid administrators. Yet the extraordinary diversity of these organizations and their understandable suspicion of government regulation and interference have thus far enabled them to fend off any government-sponsored "rationalization" of their overseas activities. Token attempts at this have been made, both in Washington and the field, but not with any particular success.

Yet if Title IX is to be taken seriously, such coordination of public and private development efforts becomes more desirable than ever before. Many of the activities to which this provision draws attention can best be done by private sector organizations: It is they who can most efficiently administer small-scale projects and can maintain a high degree of flexibility in the manner in which they undertake them. They also frequently prove to have greater access to certain countries and relevant private sector groups than a U.S. public agency required to act on a government-to-government basis. Coordination need not imply control nor the rigidification of NGO programming procedures—but it does involve consultation, the mutual exchange of information and a candid discussion of programming intentions. Owing to security requirements, these conditions are as difficult for a government agency to meet as they are repugnant to many non-governmental organizations, which attach great value to their freedom of action. But a mutual accommodation would appear necessitated by Title IX, at the risk of a futile intensification of "project ad hocism."

CAMPUS REVOLUTIONARIES LAMBASTED

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 20, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is encouraging to be reassured that not all members of the academic community are lacking in courage and determination in the face of the campus revolutionaries. Dr. Dwight L. Dumond, a distinguished professor emeritus of history of the University of Michigan, shows by his article that he is neither intimidated nor fooled by this motley collection of unwashed

yeggs, hoodlums, and misfits now masquerading as students.

Dr. Dumond was a liberal pioneer in the fight for the freedom of the Negro in America and is particularly well qualified to comment on what is happening on American campuses and on the goals and action of Negro students on the campuses.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Dumond's article, published in the Arizona Republic of June 11, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SCHOLAR LAMBASTS CAMPUS REVOLUTIONARIES (By Dr. Dwight L. Dumond)

(NOTE.—Dr. Dwight L. Dumond is a distinguished professor emeritus of history of the University of Michigan, who specialized in the history of the American South and taught in this field for 35 years at Michigan. He is the author of several definitive works dealing with the abolitionist movement, the antislavery origins of the Civil War and similar subjects.

(As a student of Southern slavery and its aftermath, Dr. Dumond was a liberal pioneer in the fight for the freedom of the black man in America. He is particularly qualified to comment on the tragic effects of the disruption of American campuses and the goals and actions of Negro students on those campuses.

(Dr. Dumond is now the A. Lothrop O'Connor professor of American Institutions at Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y.)

Rioting on college campuses in the United States has now become such a disgrace that we may well be caught in the tentacles of worldwide revolution.

We are dealing with a unique institution. It is the most precious establishment in a democratic society, so fragile as to be an alluring temptation to every would-be dictator and propagandist spawned in a free society.

It consists of two essential elements—professors and students. But if present disruptions continue, we may have to turn more and more to research institutes, unburdened and unencumbered by hordes of students.

There is a deep cleavage between administrators and professors. It worries the administrators, annoys the professors, confuses the students and destroys morale.

The arrogance and power of administrative officers depends largely upon their control of finances. There is enormous competition between deans for larger budgetary allowances for their colleges, between chairmen of departments in division of college funds, and between professors for ever higher salaries. Great inequities exist in all areas.

Herein lies the deadly virus that has done more to weaken and destroy independent teaching and research than all other things combined.

There never has been a revolt without the encouragement and assistance of a portion of the faculty. It is precisely in those areas which have been neglected and suffer the inequities that trouble starts.

The administrators have little to do with teaching and research.

Today, students, who know nothing at all about anything much, also are demanding and are getting membership on all policy-making boards and committees, and making important college and departmental decisions.

Disaster first struck when we were compelled to educate, or try to educate, a great unwieldy mass of young men and women who had no definite objective in a system, designed, organized and operated with reasonable success for an intellectually elite,

or at least culturally oriented and carefully selected, minority.

Barriers dropped or requirements lessened perceptibly. Students came without language equipment, without an ability to write intelligent English, without adequate preparation in subject matter, and, worst of all, without manners.

Almost before anyone knew what was happening, a group generally considered riffraff showed up—disreputable characters who dressed like tramps, smoked incessantly, used drugs and seldom bathed. They had no apparent respect for themselves, for anything or for anybody.

They had no social consciousness.

They had nothing, in fact—did nothing useful—but wanted every experience in life in a day and night and took what they wanted. They thought no one before them ever had any problems or any experience, ever did very much, or ever did anything right.

What we soon had to deal with was an oligarchy of ignorance, conceit and plain immorality.

The second area of conflict embraced personal conduct. The age of drug addiction, sexual promiscuity, and nudity was upon us. The demand was for all restraints by faculty or administrative officials pertaining to student behavior to be abandoned.

If they wanted to have sexual relations in lounges or university buildings or in the rooms of men's dormitories; if they wanted to use drugs to release all inhibitions; if they wanted to hurl obscenities at professors; if they wanted to come to class half naked; or if they wanted to put on plays while nude or publicly show films formerly found only in bawdy houses or at stag parties—if these or other acts ordinarily considered immoral and degrading pleased them, then no one should interfere.

They said that God was dead and religious tenets were no longer respectable.

The third area of conflict was that of foreign and domestic policy as related to the Vietnam war. This was a legitimate, perhaps compelling subject for investigation and discussion in the halls of learning at the proper time and place.

We started out with proper seminar discussions, but degenerated to desecration of the flag, insults to and about men who had died in the service of their country, demands for the end of ROTC training, cancellation of all recruitment and research, obstruction of the shipment of war supplies, invasion of official conferences with government authorities and sit-downs in court rooms and legislative halls.

All of this, vulgar as it was, pales into insignificance beside the source and purpose of the initial agitation.

Not all, but a substantial part of the entire business bore a direct relation to civil rights. Two premises will haunt professors of history from now until eternity, if they do not recognize and deal with them:

(1) The bitter crusade of denunciation and vilification of President Lyndon B. Johnson and his Vietnam policy was begun by men who had never lifted their voice in support of civil rights, who were suspected of strong racist tendencies and who aimed at confusing and confounding the entire civil rights movement.

(2) They were aided and abetted by pseudo-liberals, who, frightened by progress of the crusade for equality of Negroes and whites, dared not openly oppose it and sought to retard it by attacking the President who had done more in six years for the Negro and the poor and the underprivileged than all the other presidents combined since the founding of the Republic.

We might have tried with as much success to brush back the tides with whisk brooms as to bring order out of the chaotic situation at that point, and the worst was

yet to come. We were entering the fourth area of conflict. The black militants were on the march.

Negro students began with a demand for full integration, passed to a demand for courses in Negro history and ended with a demand for autonomy and separation. Along the way they made many demands conforming to the various stages of the power struggle going on among the Negro population.

Black power is the battle cry—black colleges in the cultural complex of a university; black professors; courses designed for and by black students; and admission without requirements, as if blackness removed all handicaps to the understanding of higher mathematics, political theory or genetics.

They had no program but shifted from one demand to another day by day. They had no proposed curriculum of studies and wanted none.

They wanted to invade and participate in faculty meetings. They wanted college and university funds to spend running around from one campus to another, to import speakers, many of whom have deliberately violated the law and thumbed their noses at the courts, and to publish and distribute propaganda.

They wanted separation, but white money. They wanted autonomy, but the benefits of university degrees. They were supported in all of these demands by a small but violent minority of white students and intruders on the campus.

Who are these youngsters that demand the very segregation and alienation that generations of their forebears fought to overcome?

Most of them know little or nothing about the work of Walter White, or Roy Wilkins, or Thurgood Marshall. They know of Martin Luther King because in their impetuous ignorance they destroyed him and abandoned his philosophy of nonviolence.

They know nothing about how black and white men working together in mutual respect and understanding overcame lynchings, secured abandonment of segregation by law in education, in housing and in public accommodation, or about the painful struggle for support of Negro colleges in the South.

They have been misled and deceived. They demanded black colleges, black teachers, and black studies—other names for subordination, ghettos and apartheid.

Black power is not a thing of virtue.

The true basis of power is economic, political, intellectual and moral. The highways to achievement run along these lines. There are no other roads. Division of the country or any part of it, or any of its institutions, on the basis of color, is no more possible than division of freedom.

There is no such thing as black freedom, or white freedom. Everyone is going to have it or no one is. No person ever was accepted, or evaluated, or elevated to power for long because he belonged to a group—only on the basis of ability, knowledge, and individual achievement.

I am not an amateur in the writing or teaching of history, or on the lecture platform, and few men have done more in the area of human relations or for the cause of racial equality, but a leader of the militants at Howard University dared to say to me in the classroom, "I don't want to hear any more about your constitutional democracy."

After a public lecture at Colgate University, one white student called me a "damned radical" and a black student called me "another of those — liberals."

This is what we have come to in our universities; a composite of intolerance and ignorance.

Rejecting integration, young Negroes talk of black history, art, economics, political action, leadership, nationalism and capitalism. They say they will go it alone. Nobody is going anywhere alone. Black racism and white racism are equally bad and both are beyond the pale of respectability.

The young Negroes in the universities are being misled by power-hungry men who exploit their gullibility for personal reasons of money and power.

The demands of black militants are supported by many white students through ignorance, a desire for segregation, an impulse to help a minority group regardless of merit, or their own gain. It may have elements of exaggerated self-pride, of inferiority complex, or narcissism, of budding masculinity.

They talk about doing their "thing," thus revealing an intellectual poverty and subservience to ignorant leadership.

They want power without knowledge. Those who come from wealthy homes, and many do, say over and over again that they never have to work if they don't want to, and intend to create such wide-spread fear by rioting and destruction that people will get down to the serious business of creating the kind of society they want. They are adventurers and revolutionaries, and happily so.

University administrators, totally unprepared and uninformed, were paralyzed into inactivity when the rioting began.

Students who seize university officials and buildings, disrupt faculty meetings and conferences, resort to arson and bombing, and make it impossible for law-abiding students to go about the business of getting an education for which they paid, are guilty of crimes sufficient to send them to prison for life.

Every one of them who attacked police, security officers, and national guardsmen with weapons could have been killed in the melee and it would have been due process of law.

I am not saying that severe repression is wise, or advocating resort to it, but facts are facts; and when law enforcement officials are called upon to perform their primary function of protecting persons and property someone is certain to get hurt.

In many respects the situation is more serious than crime in the streets. In every case, militant students have demanded complete immunity from law enforcement—no one should be arrested, offenders should be released from jail, excused from trials, and reinstated in school without being disciplined. This is anarchy, and when mobs attack public officials it approaches planned insurrection or treason.

Universities alone cannot handle this problem of law enforcement, but they can expel those students who are involved and dismiss participating faculty members. Law enforcement agencies have their responsibilities as do parents.

Students do not lose their rights as individuals when they enter a university, but neither do they shed their obligation to obey the law. In fact one of our most precious rights is to live under the rule of law.

To make martyrs out of men who violate the law is to invite anarchy. The legal principle must be sustained on the college campus as elsewhere. Why then has there been so much delay in correcting this serious and disgraceful business?

Agitators are not interested in discussion or reform, but in destruction and domination. They have no intention of making the educational process a continuing and ever-changing one.

The idea is to create havoc, confusion, destruction. Whether the basic motives can be classified as Communist, fascist or plain anarchy, the actual program is plainly identifiable as destruction of educational institutions rather than reform of educational processes.

The militants follow a practice of staying away from classes and public lectures; and of mutilating books, magazines, and manuscripts which do not conform to their momentary mood.

They check out thousands of books to disrupt the learning process, but never bring a precious tome to class. Instead, they bring

coffee and doughnuts, hamburger sandwiches and soft drinks. Some of them come to classes in pajamas and with everything from garlic to cigarettes on their breath.

They cannot speak without obscenities. They cut great holes in desks, write erotic notes on desks at which decent people have to sit after them and burn holes in the carpets and cork floors. They have revolted against everything that is decent and respectable. Their study habits are irregular or nonexistent.

Faculty members have become so accustomed to these things and so intimidated by colleagues who go along with the students' behavior that they cease to be concerned if someone throws a brick through the window.

Professors have a long tradition of concern for the dignity, and security of the students and educational process. They know that some of the students' complaints are legitimate. In fact, they know more about that than anyone is willing to admit.

Too many administrators and faculty members, also, have been more interested in their own security and advancement than in the students.

Just as some of the problems of the cities lie in the poverty and illiteracy of the rural South whence the immigrants came, so do the problems of the universities lie in the homes, the public schools and the churches. Youngsters coming to college have never been disciplined. This is a permissive society. Our cultural level is in steady decline.

Children have never been failed in public schools, since there are no standards for promotion from year to year. They have never been taught respect for persons and property.

Universities cannot in a few months make up the deficiencies of parents, schools, churches, and public officials over a period of 16 to 18 years; and they have more sense than to try to do it by repression.

Governors, legislators, even congressmen and the President shun the problem and find justification for their inaction in the peculiar nature of educational institutions, or in the structure of the federal system which lodges police power in state and local government.

This is not a local matter. There is revolution involved, and the campus disorders are calculated, whether by design or not, to contaminate the vast reservoir of moral and intellectual power which is the great strength and security of a democracy.

The right to dissent does not mean the dissenters' views must prevail. Militant students say it does, that their demands are not negotiable. It does not include a right to destroy property, to prevent by obstruction, noise and physical violence, the vast majority of the students from going about their business of getting an education.

Militant students who call themselves Afro-Americans are devotees of black power.

To many it means unity in everything—to act as a black person though elected as a delegate to a political convention, appointed to a teaching position, given public office and so forth.

It means no longer to be a responsible person but a member of a group in politics, in business, in education, in religion. Their professed objective is a worthy one, of giving to black people a sense of dignity, of belonging, the need of which may well be overemphasized, but the value of which cannot be denied.

What then has been the result of these campus disorders? What has it all gained? What are the losses?

Those things which militants among the students want are not within the province of anyone to give. The structure of a university cannot be changed overnight, in all probability should not be changed at all.

Teaching methods, the content of admis-

sion requirements, the intellectual attainments which justify conferring degrees—all of these elements in the educational process are constantly under scrutiny and revision by college faculties. There is always intellectual ferment, though not always change because change does not always denote progress.

The militants are not progressives, not liberals. They are reactionaries of the most extreme sort. They seek to destroy, not to build, and they are achieving little except chaos and retardation. When the revolution has consumed its leaders, as always happens, and the wreckage is cleared away, we will be about where we were before the trouble started.

Those responsible have:

Destroyed academic freedom.

Betrayed the educational process by seeking objectives through ultimatums, threats of force, and destruction of property.

Infringed upon the rights of others to improve their talents and skills.

Greatly retarded understanding and peace between people of different colors by demanding separation instead of integration.

SEAL BEACH RESERVOIR INCORPORATES LATEST TECHNOLOGY

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 22, the city of Seal Beach, Calif., will dedicate its new reservoir and the event is significant far beyond the city's boundaries. Completion and operation of its newest reservoir will mark several achievements.

The additional 3.6 million gallons of water storage will assist in providing the necessary water supply for the present population and for growth of the community for several years. A 900-foot well, which has been sunk at the site, supplies water to the reservoir. Other water for the city comes from additional wells and from the metropolitan water district.

The most distinctive feature of this reservoir is its nylon-vinyl air-supported cover, a radical departure from the standard use of concrete. The nylon-vinyl cover performs the necessary functions of preventing evaporation and contamination, but at much less cost—slightly over 3 cents per gallon of storage capacity, instead of 5 to 10 cents per gallon with concrete cover.

The cover weighs almost 2 tons. About 2½ pounds per square foot of air pressure prevents a collapse of the roof. The pressure is supplied by two 1½-horsepower motors. Both motors would have to be inoperative for a full day before the cover would settle to the waterline. The cover was designed by Industrial Covers of San Francisco to cover an acre of ground to a height of 36 feet. It is the largest inflated roof on any water reservoir in the United States.

Other improvements completed as part of the project include a 4,000-gallon-per-minute pumping station, approximately 3 miles of 18-inch and one-half mile of 12-inch water mains.

The project was financed by a grant of 50 percent of construction and other eligible costs from the Department of

Housing and Urban Development and the city of Seal Beach.

The total water system improvements represent an expenditure of approximately \$800,000. Construction crews have been working on the project since December 1968.

CONSERVATION OF OIL AND GAS DEPENDS ON RETAINING DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, during our consideration of the revision of the Internal Revenue Code, it is appropriate that we discuss depletion allowances. I favor retaining the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance because, in my humble opinion, its reduction or elimination would drastically curtail the exploration of oil and gas. If we are to preserve for the use of future generations adequate supplies of petroleum, we must continuously locate and identify reserves. The essence of the question then, is conservation.

In this context, I call my colleagues' attention to the following comments of James Lambert, editor of the Natchez Democrat. It follows:

[From the Natchez (Miss.) Democrat, June 3, 1969]

NEED DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

When Congress proposed, and the State ratified, the income-tax amendment to the Constitution in 1918, the intent clearly was to tax net income from constant assets.

Replacement of ordinary capital investment, such as for machinery and equipment, was provided for by tax deductions for depreciation.

For mineral and certain other natural resources such as forests and fisheries, where the capital is a wasting asset, replacement of the capital investment is partly provided for by the 'depletion allowance' tax deduction. In the case of mineral resources, the specific asset is irreplaceable and a new 'asset' must be found by exploration.

Since most extractive industries are high-risk enterprises, incentive for risk capital to invest in mineral exploration could only be provided by greatly increased profits, if tax relief through depletion allowances did not exist. Since independent studies have repeatedly shown that current profits in the extractive industries are, on the average, about equal to or less than those of industry in general, and the tax load also about the same, this means that greatly increased product prices would be needed to offset exploration costs and risks.

The degree of exploration risk is theoretically balanced by the amount of the depletion allowance, based on the discovery value principle. Thus depletion allowances range from 5 to 27½ per cent of the gross value of the product produced, depending on exploration costs, but in no case may exceed 50 percent of the producer's net income from the property concerned.

Periodic studies over the past 40 to 50 years by committees of the Congress and by other investigative bodies have repeatedly reaffirmed the justice and economic soundness of the depletion-allowance principle. Criticisms, of this principle seem unjustified, particularly the one for oil and gas.

An adequate supply of minerals—fuels for power and transportation, metals for construction, and minerals for crop nutrients to maintain life—and absolute requisite for any modern industrial economy, now and in the future.

There are limited quantities of these needed minerals on or in the earth, and these quantities of these needed minerals are now being depleted at increasing rates as population growth, and demand increase.

Exploration costs rise rapidly as the most easily found deposits are exhausted. There is therefore a need to reexamine depletion allowances periodically and increase them as necessary to provide the incentive for investment of risk capital by balancing rising exploration costs.

The fact that, in the past few years, discovery of new reserves has not kept pace with production of oil and gas, and of some other minerals, indicates that this objective is not being attained in all cases.

OUR ECONOMIC CRISIS DEEPENS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 19, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I view last week's increase in the prime rate for bank loans as an extremely unfortunate development for our economy. But I view with even greater alarm a more recent talk by leading U.S. bankers that a further increase in the prime rate may be in the offing.

This latest report came from Copenhagen, where the American Bankers Association is conducting its annual international Monetary Conference. Reports indicate that many of our bankers feel a further prime rate boost to 9 percent would be likely unless business loan demand drops in the next few weeks.

I wonder how the average American wage earner feels about these pronouncements emanating from the castles, palaces, and luxurious restaurants in which our bankers are conducting their conferences?

Does anyone believe the typical family is content to be trapped in the ever-tightening vise of higher prices and higher taxes?

Whether this latest increase in the prime rate was due wholly or in part to a lack of adequate guidance from the administration is an academic question at this point, although it is significant that no spokesman for the administration has said anything definitive or indicated how it might view yet another increase. What should really concern us now is the urgent need for a more evenhanded approach to our economic problems and a far better balance in the use of monetary policy and fiscal policy.

As the New York Times pointed out in a recent editorial, the effective prime rate actually is more than 10 percent. And the latest increase will make it difficult, if not impossible, for thousands of families to obtain credit to buy homes and for small businesses to finance their operations.

For many Americans, our economic boom has actually been something for a

recession. As the gross national product has soared, the standard of living for the average worker and his family has actually declined. Latest Labor Department figures show that the typical worker has a weekly pay of \$112.13 but purchasing power of only \$77.62. This is \$2.24 below last September's figure and below the yearly averages for each of the last 4 years.

The buying power of the average worker's family has actually been declining for more than 10 years. Every increase in wages has been more than overcome by increases in taxes and by inflation. One prominent economist has predicted that purchasing power for the average family will continue to erode and that even while pay scales may increase, the standard of living will decline.

Higher local, State, and Federal taxes are part of the reason. But another important reason is the proclivity of business firms to merely pass on higher taxes and higher credit costs to the consumer. An official of City Stores Co. of New York

was quoted as saying that the recent prime rate increase "is just one more reason to raise prices," and predicted a price increase of 4 to 5 percent over last year's levels.

A leading consumer finance company said it will increase charges on loans wherever possible. And a large savings bank said it will increase its charges on home mortgages guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration.

If this vicious cycle continues, it is clear that the typical worker simply will not be able to win enough pay increases to offset the costs of inflation. At the same time, labor efforts to offset inflation by improving their pay contracts would probably serve to intensify the price spiral.

The ineffectiveness of the income tax surcharge in curbing inflation and its obvious unfairness in adding to an already inequitable tax structure make it obvious that substantial cuts in Federal spending and comprehensive tax reform are matters of highest priority. The

modest budget cuts proposed by the administration are commendable, but leave considerable fat untouched, particularly in the areas of public works, farm subsidies, highway construction, space, the supersonic transport and a military budget that proposes to take more than 60 percent of our free funds. At least \$10 billion in additional cuts can and should be made in the new fiscal year.

Combined with a tax reform program that will ease an unfair burden on the average family while opening up new sources of revenue, these spending cuts could achieve fiscal stability and reverse the dangerous cycle which has characterized our economy in the past few years.

At the same time, we must demand that monetary policy and those who make it be fully responsible to the national interest—not just to one segment of the business community. It is long past time that the American consumer and taxpayer stopped paying blackmail to domestic and international bankers.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, June 23, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ.—Galatians 6: 2.

Eternal God, who hast called us to pray and to work, sustain us with Thy power that we may be daily mindful of Thy presence and ready to help bear the burdens of others.

Guide us with Thy spirit that we may understand this troubled time in which we live and so lead us that we may use our talents to bring forth the fruit of faithful living.

Grant unto us the wisdom to order the life of our Nation upon the principles of justice, righteousness, and good will.

Give us the readiness to render real service to Thee, our country, and our fellow man, that out of our efforts may come peace to our world, peace to our Nation, and peace to our own hearts.

Again death has invaded this Chamber. In the prime of his life our colleague has entered the life immortal. We thank Thee for his presence in our midst and for the contribution he made to our country through this body. Bless his family with the strength of Thy spirit and the comfort of Thy love: through Jesus Christ, our Lord, in whose name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 19, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1437. An act for the relief of Cosmina Ruggiero;

H.R. 1939. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth;

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Mario Santos Gomes;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Lourdes M. Arrant;

H.R. 4600. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States", approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 804);

H.R. 5136. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed;

H.R. 6807. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Klaus Josef Strauss; and

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of Dartmouth College.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Romeo da la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanano;

H.R. 2336. An act for the relief of Adela Kaczmarek;

H.R. 8644. An act to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots; and

H.R. 11400. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8644) entitled "An act to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GORE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11400) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and

for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 152. An act for the relief of Dr. Joaquin Juan Valentin Fernandez;

S. 632. An act for the relief of Raymond C. Melvin;

S. 690. An act for the relief of Chong Pii Lee;

S. 912. An act to provide for the establishment of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Colorado;

S. 1087. An act for the relief of Vernon Louis Hoberg;

S. 1123. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chong Suk Stroisch;

S. 1173. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity;

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Dr. Augusto G. Usategui;

S. 1704. An act for the relief of Lillian Blazzo;

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States;

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution to recognize the 10th anniversary of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway; and

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, without creating a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in that portion of the RECORD known as the Extensions of Remarks today, and to include such extraneous material as may be relevant.